

Very poor print

SERIES VOL. I—No. 1.
Whole Number, 9.

WHITESBORO, N. Y., FEBRUARY, 1813.

WILLIAM GODDARD, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times.—DAVID, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

numbers in a volume. To be published monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.

copies for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and the money without expense to the publisher, will receive a copy for his services.

If procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies as service.

If procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies as service.

OR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

of any particular number will be sold, separate thereof, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen	\$0 50
Twenty-eight papers for	1 00
Sixty papers for	2 00
One hundred papers for	3 00

Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters containing money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE I.

SLAVERY, OR APPARENTLY NEUTRAL CHURCHES, AND ANTI-CHRISTIAN.

Nothing can be more certain than that in the ading struggle between Christian freedom and American slavery, there are, in reality, no draws; and that churches not actively engaged in pleading the cause of the enslaved, and corresponding efforts for breaking their fetters, (in the language of James G. Birney,) "are lukewarm" of the slave system. "He that is not with me," said the Saviour, "is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad." And the plea of neutrality, it could be sustained, would involve the element of self-condemnation. "Imagine," as you did not understand of the heat of these," said the Saviour, "ye did it not unto me." And again, "I would that ye were cold or hot. So, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

Of such churches, in America, whether at the north or at the South, and by whatever denomination; name they may be called, we affirm that they are apostate, corrupt, anti-Christian! His statement will startle many, and offend many. And one grand reason of this astonishment and offense, may be found in the fact that the idea of the possible corruption and decay of the "Protestant" churches in Christian America, has no distinct place and only in the public mind. It is, some how, taken for granted that such a thing cannot be. It will be useless, therefore, to enter into the discussion, and to spread out the proofs of our position, unless the reader shall first settle it in his mind whether such apostacy be possible. Then, the questions that follow be deliberately pondered.

1. Is it possible that a Protestant church, America, believing itself to be a Christian church, may, nevertheless, apostatize and become anti-Christian?

2. May a church, originally a spiritual, Christian church, thus apostatize, and, unconsciously to itself, become corrupt?

3. Among the various signs and marks of a corrupt church, are we to reckon such things as the following, viz: an habitual disregard of fundamental morality—of the prohibitions of the decalogue—of the essential claims of humanity—of the inalienable rights of man—of the righteous claims of the oppressed poor?

And perhaps it may not be amiss to add one question more. For, although it will not be formally discussed at the present time, yet its anticipation has much to do in closing men's ears against the evidences of corruption in the churches, viz:

4. Is it the duty of Christians to secede from incorrigibly corrupt churches, lest they become "partakers of their sins, and receive of their plagues?"

If the reader is prepared to give to each of these four questions an intelligent and decisive answer, and if these answers be affirmative, he is not only prepared to enter upon the discussion before us, but he has anticipated its result. He has already arrived at all the dreaded conclusions to which we would bring him.

But what would be thought, if we should seriously attempt to bring our readers to the opposite of these conclusions? Suppose we should maintain that Protestant churches, once truly Christian, can never apostatize and become corrupt? That they are not exposed to the dangers which proved fatal to the Seven Churches of Asia, to the Roman Church, and to the Greek Church? Suppose we should affirm that no Protestant churches in America, planted by the pious Puritans, had ever departed, at vital points, or ever should depart, from a sound Christian faith? Suppose we should teach that the Christian character of a church is in no wise affected by its habitual disregard of fundamental morality—its contempt of the decalogue—its deadness to the claims of humanity—of human rights—of the oppressed poor? Or, suppose, instead of this, we should maintain the Christian duty of clinging to a corrupt, anti-Christian, and apostate church, whatever moral delinquencies it might exhibit? Who would listen to us, as to trustworthy expounders of Christian ethics, then?

But, while few persons could be found who would write out negative answers to the four questions above stated, and affix to such a paper their own proper names—and, while no one would listen to us, for a moment, as sound expounders of Bible morality, if we should adventure to do so, yet, as already hinted, our affirmative response to these questions will give great offense, and the spread of such sentiments will be deprecated as most calamitous and alarming. Equally true is it, that thousands of Christian abolitionists converse, and argue, and act, every day, precisely as though the negative, and not the affirmative answers to these questions, were the truth. They are busied in declaiming against the atrocities and the abomination of slavery—they are loud in their complaints that

the churches with which they are connected are the bulwarks of the slave system; or, at least, that they do not oppose it—they profess not to deserv any imputations of repentance and amendment on their part; and yet they cling to these churches as though they thought them Christian churches, or as though they thought it schismatical and disorderly to secede from a corrupt, anti-Christian church! This inconsistency their opponents faulted them with, many years ago. Yet they have permitted this inconsistency to cripple them, till they have well nigh lost all their courage and strength, so far as efforts to purify the Christian church are concerned. In this direction they have almost ceased to act, and seek preparing to float down the current of a proslavery and corrupt church. Under such circumstances it becomes necessary to spend not the proof of the proposition with which we commenced, and which may be thus stated.

Churches that wilfully and persistently neglect to plead, earnestly and practically, the cause of the oppressed and enslaved, give fearful evidence that they are not the churches of Christ.

"To the law and to the testimony." If we speak not according to these, let our doctrine be condemned, and our accusations unheeded.

PROOFS OF THIS POSITION.

I. THEY ARE NOT LIKE GOD.

Our first proof is, that such churches are opposite, in their character and efforts, to the character and purposes of God. And no church can be truly said to be His, of which such an affirmation may be truthfully made. Christian churches are assemblies of Christians. And Christians are God's men. That is, they are godlike. They are followers of God. They are His children. They reflect His image. The purposes He cherishes, they cherish. The work in which He is engaged, they are engaged.

But God is the Father of the oppressed; a refuge in time of trouble. Psalm ix, 9. "A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is God in His holy habitation." Psalm lxxviii, 5. He is the avenger of the oppressed. He beholds the proud nation. He lifts the beggar from the dunghill. He designs that the meek shall inherit the earth. He has promised that He will elevate the depressed and debased of mankind. The institutions of His religion are therefore adapted and designed to promote this end. And it will assuredly be accomplished; and that too, by the instrumentality He has provided, and by the people whom He has chosen to be His. These, therefore, shall sit under His vine and fig tree, and shall have no one to molest or make them afraid.

Churches that are not engaged in this work can not be His churches, because they are not

The Christian Advocate, and other papers of that stamp, have been forward to remind abolitionists that if slaveholding is the sin they desire it to be, they ought to regard those churches that tolerate it as anti-Christian, and seek to withdraw from them.

25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100

like him and do not enter into his designs, and cherish his aims.

II. THEY DISOBEY GOD'S COMMANDS.

Such churches can not be Christ's churches, because they habitually and perseveringly refuse to obey Christ's plain commands. They call him, "Lord, Lord!" but do not the things that he says. Look at a specimen of the express injunctions of the Holy Scriptures that they constantly make of none effect, and tread upon under their feet.

"Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction." "Open thy mouth, judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy." Prov. x. i, 8, 9. "If thou forbear to deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain; if thou sayest, Behold we know it not, doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it? and shall he not render to every man according to his works?" Prov. xxiv. 11, 12. "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them." "Execute judgment between a man and his neighbor." "Execute judgment; deliver the spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor." "Break every yoke. Let the oppressed go free." "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee, in all the gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and they shall rule the people with just judgment." "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." "For he is the minister of God to thee, for good."—"attending continually on this very thing"—"not a terror to good works, but to the evil." Romans, xiii. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." "Come out from among them, and be separate, and I will receive you." "Not to keep company,—if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railor, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one do not to eat." "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." 1 Cor. v. "Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." "Hide the outcasts; bewray not him that wandereth: Be thou a covert to them from the face of the spoiler." "Let my outcasts dwell with thee." "Thou shalt not deliver to his master, the servant that hath escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, in one of thy cities, as liketh him best." "Take away from the midst of thee the yoke, the putting forth of the finger, the speaking of vanity." "Bring the poor that are cast out to thine own house, and hide not thyself from thine own flesh."—"Give thy bread to the hungry—when thou seest the naked, cover him." "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." "If ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin. Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, with respect to persons. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man with vile raiment,* and ye have respect to him that hath the gay clothing, and

say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts." James, ii. "Cry aloud! Spare not! Lift up thy voice like a trumpet. Show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sin." Isaiah, lviii.

Such are a few of the many commands, to the same import, which God gives to his professed people, in the Bible. And they cover, completely, the whole ground of the measures he requires them to employ, on behalf of the oppressed. To set up the workers of iniquity and elevate oppressors to places of power, he has explicitly told them is the climax of apostasy and rebellion. [Malachi, iii. 15.] And when they wilfully disregard all these commandments and warnings, and will not listen to the voice of admonition, nor consider their ways, they give all the evidences that human conduct can give, that they are not his true people. He that is of God heareth God's words. He that heareth his sayings and doeth them not, is like unto a foolish man, that, without a foundation, built his house in the sand. Be not deceived. He that doeth righteousness, (and he only,) is righteous. Be not deceived! God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.

III. THEY EXHIBIT THE CHARACTER WHICH GOD ASCRIBES—NOT TO THE RIGHTEOUS, BUT TO THE WICKED.

Those churches that are not actively engaged in the work of pleading for the oppressed, and executing judgment for the spoiled, do not exhibit those distinguishing traits of character which the Bible reveals as the marks of God's children. On the contrary, they exhibit the characteristics which the Bible, everywhere, insists, belong only to worldly and wicked men.

The Bible abounds with definitions, distinctions, and declarations, clearly pointing out the essential and radical distinction between the righteous and the wicked. And by attending to these divine instructions we shall find that the churches that have been described, are not, and can not be churches of Christ.

Listen to the definition which the spirit of inspiration gives of a righteous man and of a wicked man.

"The righteous considereth the cause of the poor, but the wicked regardeth not to know it."

How easy and how common is it to preach about the righteous and the wicked, in utter forgetfulness of the meaning of the words, as God himself has defined their meaning.—Whenever God speaks of the righteous, he means those who consider the cause of the poor, and whenever he speaks of the wicked, he means those who do not care to know their condition.* Some say that churches who will not plead the cause of the oppressed and the poor are true Christian churches, but their delinquency is owing to ignorance of their cause.—But their condemnation, in God's sight, is, that they do not know, and do not care to know. They can not get time to attend to it. Like Cain, they say in their hearts, and sometimes with their lips, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

*By this, it is not meant that the righteous and the wicked are not distinguished by other characteristics; but that they are always distinguished by these. Nor is it intended that all whose outward acts are in favor of the poor, are really and truly so, in their hearts. But if their acts are not in favor of the poor, there can be no evidence that their hearts are.

For ten long years, tens of thousands of persons have been at work to make the churches of America consider and know like unto the poor of this land. And if any do not know at this late day, it is because they refuse to consider. A large portion of them will not of their places of worship for the discussion of claims of the poor, nor permit a notice of a discussion to be read. A large majority of church members, in many sections of the country, and in most of our populous cities and towns, will not attend any such discussions when they are held; nor read publications in which the cause is considered. They feel it an intrusion when their friends would converse with them on the subject. They will not sign a petition for the deliverance of the oppressed. Can any thing be more manifest than that persons regard not to know the cause of the poor? And is it not a flat denial of the Bible to say that churches composed of a majority of such men, or controlled by them, are the churches of Christ?

The oldest theological discussion now extant, the most venerable relic of polemic controversy to be found in the world's literature, furnishes proof positive to the point at hand. It establishes the fact that among the most ancient of God's people, of whose controversies and discussions any record is left us, whatever might be their dissensions and recriminations, there was one thing, in regard to which, all parties were agreed. There was one fundamental truth, mutually recognized, which they could refer to, as an undisputed axiom. It was this, namely: that the true servant of God may be known by his earnest advocacy of the claims of the oppressed. The turning point in the controversy between Job and his mistaken friends, was this: Whether the distinguishing traits of Job's character were those of a hypocrite, or of a good man. When they charged him with maintaining a hollow and heartless profession of godliness, he persisted in maintaining the integrity of his character, and in vindicating his claim to be recognized and owned among the people of God, instead of being cast out of their number, as a deceiver. Translated into modern phraseology, it was sort of church trial, in which Job was cited to show cause why his name should not be blotted out from the book of the faithful. [And would seem, by the bye, that a positive exhibition of good fruits was expected, in those days as the *sine qua non*, of a continuance in church fellowship, even in the case of a member as good and distinguished as the man of Uz: a rule of discipline which he does not appear to have contested.] And in what manner did Job defend himself, successfully, against his accusers? After a long controversy, the report of which runs from the fourth chapter of the book to the twenty-ninth, and having exhausted every other topic of defense, but to no purpose, he availed himself of the grand principle, already adverted to, and appeals to it, as to an axiom from which no one could dissent. He took it for granted that if he could show evidence that he was an earnest enemy of oppression and the active hearty advocate of the oppressed, then, in that case, (but not otherwise,) he should exhibit the characteristics of a good man. Then, (but not otherwise,) would his vindication be made clear. Referring, therefore, with confidence, to his well known habits and acts of his past life, he exclaims:

*How much more absurd and wicked must it be to make this distinction on account of the color of the skin, which God made, and man can not change!

When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; when the eye saw me, it gave witness: because I delivered the poor that cried, fatherless, and him that had none to help. The blessing of him that was ready to slay came upon me, and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness, it clothed me: my judgment was a robe and a diadem. I was eyes to the blind, and was I to the lame. I was a father to the fatherless, and the cause which I knew not, I searched out. And I brake the jaws of the wicked, plucked the spoil out of his teeth."

In this eloquent strain he proceeds, till (in 30th chapter,) he breaks out again: "Did I weep with him that was in trouble? Was my soul grieved for the poor?" And then, in, in the 31st chapter: "If I did despise the cause of my man servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me: what shall I do, when God riseth up? and when visiteth, what shall I answer him? Did not that make me in the womb, make him?—did not one fashion us in the womb? If I have withheld from the poor his desire, or used the eyes of the widow to fail—or have taken my morsel alone, and the fatherless have eaten thereof, (for from my youth he was brought up with me, as with a father, and I have aided her from my mother's womb.) If I have seen any perish for want of clothing, or any without covering, if his loins have not girded me, and if he were not warmed with the fleece of my sheep—if I have lifted up my hand against the fatherless, when I saw my help in the gate, then let mine arm fall from my shoulder-blade, and mine arm be broken from my bone." * * * * *

"The stranger did not lodge in the street, but I opened my door to the traveler." * * * * * If my land cry against me, and the furrows thereof likewise complain,—if I have eaten the fruits thereof without money, or caused the owners thereof to loose their life, let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockles instead of barley. The words of Job are ended."

Here he rested his defense. And the reporter of the debate immediately adds: "So these three men ceased to answer Job." And well they might, after such a summing up of the evidence as this! In the sequel, God himself, speaking out of a whirlwind, is introduced, attesting the validity of the plea, reproving the cursors of his servant, and bidding them seek, through his prayers and oblations, the forgiveness of their wrong doing.

But what if, instead of all this, it had appeared that Job was one of those on whose behalf it might have been pleaded, that—poor man! he had not particularly acquainted himself with the claims of the oppressed poor! No. He had moved in circles where their cause was not pleaded. Religious circles, they might have been—assemblies of godly men, where the story of the crushed and perishing could not be told—nor a notice given, of a meeting in their behalf, lest it should offend some wealthy member of the congregation, or disturb the meditations of the devout, or reduce the spirituality or influence of the priest—or hazard the peace of the church! Suppose Job had sympathized with such associates—had sought instruction and edification in such assemblies—and information from such sources of intelligence as men of that stamp might be expected to supply, rejecting all the means of information offered him by the

advocates of the oppressed? Or suppose that, claiming to have a sufficient knowledge of the facts, he had actually assisted in elevating to places of power and authority over the crushed poor, the wicked rulers, whose jaws and whose teeth, he well knew, were grinding, not simply the spoil of the poor, but the poor themselves—body and soul! Suppose he had done this, on the plea that there were "other great interests" to be guarded, that could not otherwise be secured!

Will any man blaspheme his Maker by saying that God's voice, out of the whirlwind, would have vindicated the character of Job, then? Will any one, except it be a disorganizer, who denies the propriety of any distinction between a wicked world and the church of God, pretend that such an assembly of worshippers as has been described, should be regarded as a true, Bible church?

Turn over the Bible and search where you choose, for any distinction between the righteous and the wicked, more definite and emphatic than that which distinguishes the advocates of the oppressed from those who neglect to plead in their behalf. Just glance, if you please, at the third chapter of Malachi, and see whether God made the same moral distinctions, in the days of that prophet, that he did in the time of Job. Listen to his declaration, that he would thoroughly purge his church and priesthood, as gold and silver is purged, separating and consuming the dross, as in a refiner's fire; and destroying that which can not be cleansed, as the polluted garment is either cleansed or destroyed, under the action of the fuller's soap. Hear him declare that he will do this, by becoming a swift witness against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and those that turn aside the stranger from his right—those that call the proud happy, and set up the workers of iniquity. Hear him describe the consternation and terror of those, in the church and in the priesthood, who can not abide the day of his coming, nor stand when he appeareth. And finally, observe the result of this separating and excising process. "Then"—when this work shall have been accomplished—"then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years." "Then, shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not." A plain and emphatic declaration that the fundamental distinction between the people of God and the children of the devil, had been lost sight of, even in the church, and that, in no other way could it be restored, but by drawing a dividing line between the oppressors of the poor and their supporters; on the one hand, and those who, on the other hand, feared the Lord, who spake often one to another, and who should be spared, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him.

The wit of man may be defied to produce an intelligible and a full and fair commentary on that chapter, that shall not draw the line of separation between the righteous and the wicked precisely there, where the same line is drawn between the supporters of oppression, and those who return unto the Lord and fear him, and acceptably call on His name.

The same may be said of many similar portions of Scripture. We will turn to the New Testament next, and, by way of specimen,

take up the Saviour's account of the final judgment, as recorded in the 25th chapter of Matthew, from the 31st verse to the close. Our Lord's object, evidently, is to delineate the characters of the sheep upon His right hand, and of the goats upon His left.

And upon what point is the decision made to turn? Why were the righteous rewarded?—And why were the wicked condemned? The righteous, we are told, had ministered to the wants of their Lord, when he was an hungered, thirsty, a stranger, naked, sick, and in prison. The wicked had simply neglected to perform for him those kind offices. This neglect was sufficient to condemn them. It was not necessary to prove that they had actively inflicted positive injuries upon him. They were not charged with having robbed him of his last morsel—or having washed the cooling draught from his lips—of having forcibly thrust him out from his kindred and home, or denied him the right of peaceful residence and unfettered travel and sojourn in the land of his birth—of having made him a stranger in his own land. It was not alleged that they had, in any way, by heaping upon him heavy tasks, or driving him to hard labor under scorching suns, or in dank swamps, or otherwise, been instrumental in impairing his health. Nor is it intimated that his loss of personal liberty, his imprisonment, was owing to any arrangements of their making. It was merely that when he suffered these physical evils, he received no assistance or sympathy from them. And the story of his sufferings, under their neglect, does not include such deadly injuries as are inflicted by American slavery. He does not describe his condition as that of a chattel—a thing—bidden to earn or hold property—bidden to make any contract—to sustain and enjoy the family relation—or to read the consoling records of Divine Love.—Nothing of this bitterness entered into his cup. And yet their apathy to his woes was the ground of their condemnation to everlasting punishment, while those who extended to him their aid, were welcomed into life eternal!

And was this award founded on the superhuman dignity of his person—his character—his claims? Certainly not, for neither those who succored, nor those who neglected him, knew any thing of all this! If they had, the test would have been less clearly decisive of their character. For the hope of reward, or the fear of punishment might have prevented their showing out their hearts by their actions. And, in fact, it was not to Him, literally, and in person, that the righteous extended aid. It was not, literally, from him, in person, that the wicked had withheld succor. It was their own and His brethren—the least, the most despised, the most abject and degraded of the human family, that he had constituted his representatives. It was such of whom he said, Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me.

And the decision was perfectly in accordance with the law of love—the golden rule—by which, we know, all men must be judged. And the evidence produced, to prove their violation of this law, was the kind best adapted to draw out, to try, and to exhibit what was really in their hearts—whether they loved humanity or no—humanity or its circumstances—humanity or the benefits to be expected from it. It was humanity to which God had respect when He said, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

And an order to show, whether it was humanity that they really regarded, what could be more appropriate than to exhibit their treatment of human beings in such a condition that nothing but their bare humanity could attract their regard? The dictates of common sense, and the first principles of natural law, as well as revealed religion, correspond with the rule of judgment laid down by our Saviour, in this chapter, and elsewhere.

Blessed are the merciful, for they, (and they only,) shall obtain mercy. And who is the merciful man? Just imagine yourself a slave, for five minutes, and you can not fail to behave correctly. If you were a slave, would you consider the man merciful who would not plead earnestly for your liberation—pray for it—petition for it—vote for it? You know, you would not. You could not. You might not.

We might as well deny the doctrines of the final judgment—the radical distinction between the righteous and the wicked—and the difference between right and wrong—we might as well disband our churches, and burn our Bibles, as to maintain the *Christian character* of those who perseveringly refuse to plead the cause of the oppressed. And the character of a church is nothing more nor less than the character of its members, of the majority, or governing portion of them.

IV. THEY ARE NOT FOLLOWERS OF CHRIST.

A Christian church is "a congregation of faithful men"—"an assembly of believers" in Christ. To be a follower of Christ, is to be engaged in his work. What, then, is the work of Christ?

"For this cause was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." Does not slavery comprise the works of the devil? Challenging human beings—annihilating the marriage institution—blotting out the family relation—selling the image of God at auction—blotting out the human intellect—withholding the light of the Bible—using a neighbor's services without wages—separating those whom God has joined together—supporting and carrying on, under the light of the gospel, a slave-trade—equally cruel and demoralizing with that which our own laws punish as piracy?—"the sum of all villainies."—Are not these the works of the devil? If not, tell us what are? And can men be followers of Christ, and not be enlisted against these abominations? Is not Christ enlisted against them? Where, then, is His army, that fights under Him and for Him? Where is His church militant, if it is not to be battling this battle?

Here the Saviour open and read His commission—"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year [the Jubilee] of the Lord." Mark, iv. 18, 19.

Statement of the compilers of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, as the basis of the

creed of Presbyterian and Congregational churches. Judge, Church, of Washington city, with eleven hundred citizens of the District of Columbia, in their petition to Congress against the *slave-trade* of the District. See also Henry Clay's testimony that slavery and slaveholding can not be separated from this same domestic slave-trade.

John Wesley.

This was the mission of Christ. Who then are Christians? And what is a Christian church? Is it an assembly that will not preach good tidings to the poor? Nor preach deliverance to the captives? Nor suffer it to be preached, in their hearing? Nor permit a notice of such preaching to be read?

Say not that it was a spiritual and not a physical emancipation of which the Saviour was speaking. Does not American slavery bind its victims in spiritual bondage? Does it not withhold the Bible, and annul marriage? Has not the Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia declared that the mass of the slaves are as really heathen as those of India, and that such must be their condition while the present system continues?

And did not the Saviour's mission extend to the bodies as well as to the souls of men? Was it not our entire humanity that He came to redeem? Does He not claim our bodies as well as our souls? And have they no manner of connection with each other?

When John sent messengers to Jesus, saying, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus answered and said, Go, and show John again the things which ye do hear and see. The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Matthew, xi. 3—5.

Christ's claim to the *Messiahship*, He distinctly founded upon the fact of His doing good both to the bodies and to the souls of men—especially to the most miserable—the most needy—the crushed—the bruised—the poor. Can any man of common sense believe that his test of discipleship does not cover the same point? If Jesus could not be the Christ, the anointed of God, that should come, without preaching deliverance to the captives, how can men be so stupid as to imagine that they can be Christians while they refuse to engage in the same cause, and enlist in the same work?

Notice, next, the scathing denunciations of Christ, against the oppressors of His times; even against those who sat in Moses' seat, and who were revered as the most holy men of their day—men whose missionary zeal led them to compass sea and land, even for the prospect of making one proselyte. Our Saviour's terrible reproofs of these men, while they furnish proof direct to the position we maintain, viz: that no outward forms nor religious zeal can make men the children of God, while they consent to oppression, as did the Pharisees, show us, likewise, how Christ treated oppressors, and especially oppressive religionists and ecclesiasties, and how He expects and requires his disciples to treat them.

First, He lays open to the surrounding multitude their true character. "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders, but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers."

This He said "to the multitude," who had hitherto confided in them as safe guides, bidding them not to follow their ungodly example. Thus He agitated the subject among the common people, and warned them not to follow such hypocritical religious teachers. Then He addressed himself, directly, to the delinquents themselves:

"Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a

pretense make long prayers, therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, ye have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." [See Matt. xxiii.]

No one, probably, will pretend that the oppressions of these men bore any comparison to those of American Slavery. The specifications do not warrant such a conclusion. No records that have come down to us, give an impression of such facts. There is no evidence that chattel slavery then existed among the Jews. But the Scribes and Pharisees made heavy exactions upon the people: in the matter, probably, of their perquisites; their tithes their fees. These they would have, of the poor whether they were able to pay them comfortably, or no. Not a farthing of their exaction would they reduce. Thus they devoured the habitations of the widows. Perhaps this was sometimes done by extortion or fraud, in settling their deceased husbands' estates. But it is no said of them that they devoured the widows themselves, by selling them for bread, in the market. Nor is said that they enacted or apologized for laws and usages by which the mothers of the large mass of the laboring poor were, on system, reduced to a condition of widowhood; being never allowed to enjoy the protection of husbands. Had the Jewish church and priesthood participated in, or connived at, enormities like these, they might then have been considered on a level with the churches and ministry that sustain slavery in America.

Yet it was by reproving the oppressions of the Scribes and Pharisees, that Jesus of Nazareth, (whom the common people heard gladly,) excited the revenge and rage of the oppressors: it was by their instigation that He was crucified, and for this cause. It was from them that the Saviour anticipated, beforehand, the results that were afterwards witnessed. He told His disciples that He "must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the Elders, and Chief Priests, and Scribes, and, be killed." Matthew xvi. 21. As to the low rabble—the mob—who were induced to cry, "Crucify! crucify!" He understood very well that, like the similar mobs of persecutors against the reformers of other nations and ages, they were but the miserable instruments and the servile echoes of the oppressors in Church and in State, whose iniquities had been reprov'd. And, accordingly, He makes no account of them, and does not even name them among the deadly enemies He was to encounter. No. It was the "Scribes and Chief Priests" whose oppressions He had reprov'd, and whose hypocrisy He had thus exposed, that He regarded as responsible for His crucifixion. Yet He made no concessions to appease them. He framed no courtly apologies in their behalf. He ceased not the agitation of the topic. His testimony against oppression, His attestation of the hypocrisy of the oppressors, He sealed with His blood. His fidelity was tested, and was made manifest on this very point. His sympathy for the heavily-burdened poor—His exposure of the widows' wrongs, and of the heartless hypocrisy of the wrong doer—these He never relaxed, though He distinctly foresaw that His fidelity to God and to humanity would cost Him his life. The commands of His Father he could not but

keep; and then Ho became obedient to death, even the death of the Cross. No fact on the page of the world's history, comes down to us in bolder relief, or more fully attested than this.

And can men call themselves Christ's disciples, and Christ's ministers, who will not rebuke oppression in high place, nor plead the cause of the oppressed poor? Can they boast of bearing His Cross? Can they imagine that they follow in His steps? Alas! It is even so! The work of caring for the poor, and of vindicating the oppressed, is altogether too profane and "secular" a business for them. They must be excused from such a task, on account of their important labors for men's souls! Their saintly character, and their ministerial influence would be put in jeopardy, if they were to stoop to such low matters, to meddle with such exciting topics, as the heavy burdens of the poor! No! They must call men to repentance, and therefore they must not offend them by the mention of their specific sins! They must "preach the gospel," and therefore they can not proclaim good tidings for the poor, nor deliverance to the captives! They must "know nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified," and therefore they must maintain or affect the most profound ignorance of the character and work of Jesus Christ, and of the occasion, and circumstances, and immediate causes of His crucifixion! "While He sacrificed His life in the work of denouncing sacerdotal oppressors, they can do nothing of the kind, lest they should impair their spirituality, or hazard their influence, or sacrifice other great interests," or "disturb the peace of the church!" Can heaven and hell be farther removed from each other, than the Christianity of Christ and the Christianity of such professed disciples, or of a church or assembly of such men?

V. THEY ARE NOT "OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES."

Churches that will not reprove oppressors, nor plead for the oppressed, can not be true Christian churches, because they are not "built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

Begin with the first chapter of Isaiah, and read all the prophecies to the last chapter of Malachi. Or, if this task be too burdensome, select the first, and fifth, and fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah; the fifth, and seventh, and twenty-second of Jeremiah; the thirteenth, the twenty-second, and the thirty-fourth of Ezekiel; the second, the fourth, the sixth, and the eighth of Amos; the second, the third, and the sixth of Micah; the second and the third of Nahum; the first of Habakkuk; the third of Zephaniah; the seventh and the eleventh of Zechariah; the second and third of Malachi. Then turn to the apostolic epistles. Examine the second and fifth chapters of James, and the fourth of John.

Consider well these specimens of the religion of the prophets and apostles, and then say, in the

*The eternal purpose of God, in sending His Son to die for our sins, and the efficacy of His atoning sacrifice, are neither forgotten nor set aside, in this statement of the immediate circumstances and occasion of His death. Man's designs and agency in this tragedy, are not frustrated but fulfil the designs of God. So said Peter—"Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and wicked hands have crucified and slain." Acts ii. 23. They had their motive. And that motive was the reward and punishment of a reprobate or hypocritical and oppressor.

fear of God, and in view of the coming judgment, whether you sincerely think the same religion is cherished and exemplified by those churches and ministers of religion in America who refuse to reprove American slavery, and plead the cause of the enslaved.

And, if you decide that they are of the same religion, then tell us, if you can, wherein the distinguishing characteristics of that religion consist. Specify the main points of agreement between the churches that have been described and the men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. And, if convenient, just refer to the sermons, and cite the newspaper and magazine essays and paragraphs of the churches and ministers that have been described, that you would like to see placed by the side of the scriptures to which we have referred, in proof that they breathe the same spirit, disseminate the same sentiments, and promote the same ends. Or tell us in which of the volumes, or periodicals, or journals of those churches, such paragraphs, sermons, or essays would be likely to be found. Would you specify the National Preacher, the Biblical Repository, the Christian Spectator, the Literary and Theological Review, the Vermont Chronicle, the Boston Recorder, the Christian Watchman, the New York Observer, the Christian Advocate and Journal, the New York Baptist Register, the Churchman, the Christian Intelligencer, the Protestant Vindicator, the Puritan?

Or, if it has to be conceded that the religion of the churches in this country, that do not plead the cause of the enslaved and reprove the enslavers, does not harmonize, in this particular, with the religion of the prophets and apostles, let it be shown, if it can, by a just reference to the fundamental principles of religion, natural or revealed, that the discrepancy is only in minor and incidental matters, the time of rue, anise and cummin, while in the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and fidelity, an essential agreement between them is maintained.

This suggests another distinct proof of our position.

VI. THEY ABUSE THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION.

The great law of rectitude, which is identical with the law of love—the law of equal and impartial love to our neighbor—the command to love our neighbor as ourselves—the golden rule of doing to others as we would have others do unto us—this great second commandment of the law, which is like unto the first, and upon which, in its connection with the first, hang all the law and the prophets—this entire law, is practically abjured and set aside by those churches that will not reprove the enslaver, and plead the cause of the enslaved. All this is too self-evident to require formal proof. For no man can doubt that if he himself were enslaved, he would desire and demand the advocacy of all men, and especially of those who claimed to be lovers of God, of goodness, and of mankind.

This divine law of love is, moreover, the model upon which the character of God himself is formed. His purposes and His aims correspond with this law. His commandments and precepts are so many illustrations of its meaning. Moral distinctions are all to be referred to this standard. The righteous are pronounced righteous, and the wicked shown to be wicked, according to their conformity with, or opposition to,

this law. To magnify and make it honorable, Christ came into this world, and to its requirement all His actions were conformed. Apostles and prophets witnessed a good profession, in so far as they followed in the same track. What, then, shall we think of religionists who practically trample this law under their feet? Can their assemblies be called churches of Christ? If so, to what churches shall we refuse to give (if they claim it,) the same name? And what good reason shall we give for the refusal? In what terms shall we describe the radical distinction between the church and the world?

The churches and ministers that refuse to plead the cause of the enslaved and reprove the enslavers, have been forced to defend and excuse themselves by positions and arguments wholly subversive of the leading doctrines which they profess to believe.

Sometimes they labor to prove that there are cases of innocent slaveholding; because, if this point could be made out, they could then say that slaveholding is not the practice that is to be reproved, (because it can not be sinful,) but only the bad treatment and the cruelties that occur under the system. But, in making this plea, they deny, in effect, the paramount authority of God over every human soul—an authority that excludes the conflicting claim of the enslaver. They deny, too, the free moral agency of the slave, and account it innocent to hold him "entirely subject to the will of a master, to whom he belongs." They deny, likewise, in effect, the radical distinction between the immortal soul and a chattel, between a man and a brute, and admit that the image of God may be rightfully made merchandise!

But, if driven from this position, and compelled to call slaveholding sinful, they will next plead for its gradual or future abandonment, on the ground that immediate emancipation would be unsafe or disadvantageous. And thus they deny the doctrine and the duty of immediate repentance and abandonment of all sin.

Or, sometimes, they will plead that the slaveholders should be offered a compensation before they can properly be admonished to repent of such a profitable sin. Thus, they deny the doctrine and the duty of unconditional submission to the authority of God, and teach that sinners may estimate the profits of transgression before they make up their minds to relinquish it, and govern themselves by their calculations of profit and loss!

Sometimes they will profess to believe that the great mass of the slaves are contented and well treated, tho' they know perfectly well that they are unprotected by law, and that they are under the unlimited control of irresponsible masters, who, for the most part, make no professions of exercising that love to God and man which characterize the true Christian. And to their professed belief in the depravity and selfishness of unrenewed men, is discovered to be, at best, superficial and unmeaning.

They profess to believe that the claims of God's law can never be relaxed or relinquished, inasmuch that no one sin could have been pardoned without the shedding of a Saviour's blood. But this same law, they nevertheless maintain, may be innocently set aside, or

*In doing this, they falsify, of course, their abundant professions of believing that slavery is wrong in the abstract—in other words, wrong in itself, unconditionally wrong, abstracted or separated from the circumstances with which it is connected.

Although the pretended dangers and disadvantages of immediate abolition are now no longer urged, yet the gradualism and postponement proffered on the supposed dangers are, by no means, retracted or disavowed! A fact that speaks volumes on the state of the churches.

its demands postponed, in the case of the enslaved, rather than that the pecuniary, or political, or ecclesiastical arrangements of the country should be interrupted or put in jeopardy.

They profess to believe in the necessity and in the efficacy of the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit, in turning men from their sins; and they hold it a Christian duty to call sinners to repentance, in confiding reliance upon this divine aid. But when we present to them the case of the man-stealer, they will either deny the propriety of interfering in other men's concerns, or else they will tell us that the usages of slavery are so interwoven with the habits and laws of the people, that none but fanatics will expect to be successful in waging so unequal a contest. Thus their faith in God, and in the power of His truth and His Spirit, are found to be a dead letter—at least, in the presence of American slavery.

They profess to believe in the future and speedy triumph of the gospel over the whole earth, and they call on Christians to pray and labor in faith for the conversion of the world; but the conversion of slaveholders, and the evangelizing of the heathen in our own land, made such by our own wicked laws, is a work in which they have no faith, and in which they refuse to engage.

They profess to believe and to teach the infinite value of the human soul; but on account of "other great interests," which worldly statesmen propose to secure by deferring to execute judgment, they will consent to sacrifice the immortal souls of one-sixth part of the nation, as truly heathen as those to whom we send the gospel in India!

They profess to believe that God has made of one blood all nations—that all men are descended from Adam and from Noah, as the Bible affirms—that all men are equal brethren, bound to love each other as themselves. How much they *truly* believe in all this, may be learned by their words and their deeds—by their declarations that the colored man must be colonized, because he can never rise in this country—by their hue-and-cry of "amalgamation" (a word without a meaning, unless the colored man be a brute,)—by the exclusion of colored men from their seminaries of learning—above all, by their *negro per!*

In short, there are no doctrines nor duties of religion which are not readily denied and renounced by the churches and ministry that will not reprove the enslaver and plead the cause of the enslaved, rather than give up their vain pleas and excuses, and engage in the work in which Christ was engaged.

If then, the *practical maintenance* of a sound evangelical faith, be essential to the character of a true Christian church, then the churches that do not and will not heartily plead for the enslaved, and reprove the enslaver, are weighed in the balances and found wanting. They have abundantly shown, by their words as well as their deeds, that they do not practically believe in their own church creeds. They retain them only on paper or on parchment—not in their hearts or in their lives. It would add nothing to the evidences of their apostasy from the Christian faith, if they should blot out or burn up their paper or parchment creeds; though it would do something towards proving them (at least in a modified sense,) consistent and honest and conscientious men. Their position would be much more respectable, then, and their course less disingenuous and unmanly than at present.

VII. THEY REFUSE TO DO THE WORK OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

No churches are Christian churches any longer than they continue to do the work for which Christian churches were instituted and organized. When the

salt loses its savor, it is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. The vineyard, though planted by God himself, that fails to bring forth the fruits of righteousness, after a fair trial, is no longer to be recognized as His vineyard. It is to be broken up and laid waste. [See Isaiah, v. 1—8.]

Christian churches were designed to embody true Christians and exclude wicked men, and thus exhibit the distinction "between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not."—But when man-stealers, and robbers, and oppressors, with their apologists and those who elevate them to power, find a welcome place in the church, it ceases to answer this end of its organization. [See Malachi, chap. iii.] It does not exhibit the distinction between the church of God and a wicked world. It can not be called the church of God with any more propriety than the world can be called the church of God. In other words, it ceases to be a true Christian church.

Christian churches were designed and instituted not only to embody Christians and exclude wicked men, in the first instance, but to preserve their own purity, by the maintenance of healthful discipline. But the discipline of a church must be regarded as radically defective, useless, imbecile, extinct, worthless, when it does not discipline man-stealers and their apologists, and those who elevate them to places of power. Attempts of such churches to discipline minor offenders, such as those guilty of petty crimes and misdemeanors, must become contemptible and unavailing—as facts show. And thus the church ceases to answer this end of its organization.

Christian churches were designed to bear testimony against all sin—to co-operate in the work for which the Son of God was manifested, viz:—"to destroy the works of the devil." But in this work, the churches that will not enlist in the warfare against slavery, refuse to engage; so far, at least, as the countless abominations of slavery are concerned. They, therefore, cease to answer this end of their organization.

Christian churches were designed to call sinners to repentance, to evangelize the heathen, and to instruct men in all the duties they owe to God and to mankind. But churches that refuse to call man stealers and oppressors to repent of those sins—that pass by the claims of their own heathen, made such by laws enacted by their own members, and held in compulsory heathenism by the same men—churches that will not instruct their own members nor the perishing world around them in the duty of executing judgment between a man and his neighbor—churches like these, manifestly cease to answer these ends of their organization. They will neither call sinners to repentance, nor evangelize the heathen, nor teach men the high duties that God has enjoined.

Hence, they fail to be God's instruments in introducing that universal reign of righteousness, peace, and freedom, that Christianity is adapted and destined to establish in the earth. That work God will perform through the instrumentality of His churches. And, therefore, the churches that can not be enlisted in the work, give conclusive evidence that they are *not* His, and must be superseded and displaced by churches of an opposite stamp, before the triumphs of Christianity can be witnessed.

The leading idea of the gospel of Christ is the elevation of the poor—the depressed. This was the tenor of Christ's commission—this the essence of His Messiahship—this His work—this His life—this His death. Christians are His followers—Christian churches are organizations to carry out the designs of Christ,—to

realize the leading idea of the gospel. Churches that will not plead the cause of the enslaved—the poorest of the poor, the most degraded of the depressed—do not answer this end of their organization.

Why, then, call them churches of Christ? Can Christ so regard them? Or, is He honored, or is His work promoted, by calling them after His name? By giving them the currency among men which His name is adapted to give them?

VIII. THEY ARE SELF-CONDEMNED.

The churches that will not plead for the enslaved and reprove the enslaver, stand condemned out of their own lips. Not only do they profess to believe in the fundamental doctrines and duties of religion, to which we have referred, as binding them to perform the work they repudiate; but, on this very subject of AMERICAN SLAVERY, their professions have been sufficiently explicit and emphatic. They commonly claim to be as much opposed to slavery as those who urge them to the performance of their notoriously neglected duties. And the charge of being pro-slavery, they not unfrequently repel, as a slander. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in their *Confession of Faith*, and the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Minutes of their *Proceedings*, in former times, and in their *Book of Discipline*, have described and condemned slavery in as strong and as pointed language as that which, in the mouths of "moderate abolitionists," they condemn as "denunciatory, vituperative, and unchristian." By giving these sentiments a perpetual place in their "Confession of Faith," their "Discipline," and especially in their "Proceedings," they have fully recognized, not only the inherent sinfulness of slavery, but the duty of the churches to take cognizance of it—to purify themselves from it—and even (in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church,) to circulate, through the aid of their ministers and ecclesiastical bodies, petitions to the Legislature for its abolition.

In another way, these churches, whether Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Dutch Reformed, have abundantly recognized their duty, as churches, to labor for the abolition of slavery. For many years, their patronage of the Colonization Society was extended to it on the ostensible ground, chiefly, that it furnished the best and only means of abolishing slavery. When anti-slavery societies began to be organized, in 1832, and before they had taken a stand against colonization, they were generally opposed, on the plea that the Colonization Society, already in the field and enjoying the confidence of the Christian community, was doing, and in the best manner, all that could be done on behalf of the enslaved, and for the ultimate overthrow of the slave system.* For this alleged tendency of Colonization, it was ostensibly supported at the North, whatever opposite tendency was urged in its behalf at the South. And even now, tho' its anti-slavery tendencies have sometimes been disclaimed, and its support on that ground often abandoned even at the North, it is not uncommon to hear ministers and church members decline doing any thing in any other direction, for the enslaved, or against slavery, on the plea that they support the Colonization Society, and can not be expected to do any thing more.

If we give them credit, then, for honesty, in their support of the Colonization Society, as a means of abolishing slavery, (or whether we do so or not,) we have

*So late as the winter of 1834-5, Gerrit Smith, then connected with the Colonization Society, but friendly to abolition, took great pains, but with little or no success, to induce leading colonizationists to relinquish this exclusive claim to the support of the opponents of slavery.

their recognition of the principle that the churches ought to labor for the abolition of slavery. We have their admission, likewise, that in this work, the churches may properly co-operate with voluntary associations composed partly of men of the world, and managed by them, (for such men, including even gamblers, deists, and slaveholders, were officers of the Colonization Society.) We have their authority, too, for church action in favor of a professed anti-slavery enterprise, eminently political in its aspect. For the abolition of slavery, then, as now, was, itself, a political result.

The Colonization Society sought aid from the national government, and received it from State Legislatures. Its board of managers assumed political powers and governed a colony. The political enterprise of building up an empire in Africa, and the commercial and political advantages our country was to derive from it, were among the recommendations of the scheme, along with its missionary and military exploits. Yet this scheme, with all its mingled anti-slavery, political, military, commercial, and missionary claims, could be recommended by churches and ecclesiastical bodies, could be spread out, in minute detail, by laymen and ministers, before the churches, and collections taken up, on the Sabbath, without any complaints of the desecration of the house, the pulpit, or the day. No difficulty ever occurred, in obtaining leave to open the house, or to procure the reading of a notice for a colonization meeting. Not a word of the kind! Nor were there any scruples about its being a secular subject—a political subject—with which the churches must not intermeddle—no—not even while Rev. Dr. Proudfit, during his labors as a Colonization Agent, made no scruple to avow his object of placing the President of the Colonization Society, Henry Clay, in the Presidential chair of the United States, for the purpose of securing a national administration that would aid the Colonization Society from the national treasury. And all this time it was never discovered that such anti-slavery efforts, by churches and ministers, were inconsistent with their exclusive attention to the "preaching of Jesus Christ and Him crucified;"—that they tended to divert attention from religion, to obstruct the progress of revivals, or prevent the conversion of souls.

When, therefore, these same churches and ministers bring objections of this sort against anti-slavery efforts by the churches and ministry, are they not condemned out of their own mouths? and by their own acts? Do they not refuse to do the work which they have recognized as appropriately belonging to them, and which they profess to have commenced doing? Let us see.

It was anti-slavery work that they recognized as their proper work, in such records as are to be found in the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith," in the Methodist "Minutes," and "Discipline," (and which are still retained in their books,) and in every repetition of their declaration that they are as much opposed to slavery as any one else, and in their support of the Colonization Society, on professed anti-slavery grounds.

Has the work been performed? Are they performing it? We ask them, not whether they are doing it in our way, but whether they are doing it at all?—Whether they are doing it in their own way? And whether they can tell what that way is, and what they are doing against slavery?

Do they oppose slavery by supporting the Colonization Society? Will they say so now, after all the developments, and concessions, and disclaimers that have been made? Very few of them, when pinned to the point, will say any such thing. Those of them who continue to support colonization, will say that they support it on other grounds, and not as a means of

abolishing slavery. The truth, we believe, is, they support it chiefly as a means of counteracting abolitionists and killing the anti-slavery excitement.—Not unfrequently this object has been distinctly avowed. And no fact in history is better sustained than that mobs against abolitionists have been extensively fomented in colonization meetings. But not to insist on any thing in this direction, the point to which the community—from some cause—has now arrived, is such, and the operations of the Colonization Society are now so well understood, that few persons will pretend to use it as a means of abolishing slavery. That delusion is dissipated, and can not return.

What, then, are the churches doing against slavery? Those of them, we mean, that do not engage in the anti-slavery movement, as it is commonly carried on? They find fault with the measures of others. But what are their measures? Do they consist in deprecating the agitation of the exciting subject? In refusing to open their mouths for the dumb? In declining to circulate or sign anti-slavery petitions? In throwing obstacles in the way of those who are engaged in so doing? In forbidding members of the same churches to introduce the discussion of the subject in church meetings? In declining to meet with them, and unitedly ask counsel of God on this subject? In refusing to read anti-slavery publications? In closing their meeting-house doors against an anti-slavery lecture, and not allowing a notice of an anti-slavery meeting to be read? Do they oppose slavery by inviting slaveholders to their pulpits, from which the advocates of the enslaved are excluded? Do they oppose it by voting for slaveholders and their abettors, whom, they know, will continue to support the slave laws? Do they oppose it, by cherishing their ecclesiastical connections with slaveholders, while they denounce or disorganize end schismatics, those who insist that slaveholders and their apologists should be excluded from the family of believers? By maintaining the cord of caste in their pulpits, in their houses of worship, at their homes, and in their colleges and theological schools?

Do not the dishonored professions of such churches bear testimony that they act against their own convictions, and that they are not the true churches of Jesus Christ?

IX. TESTIMONY OF REASON, CONSCIENCE AND COMMON SENSE.

The unsophisticated common sense of mankind in general, forbid them to recognize, as God's people, the churches that have been described. Unpopular as the abolition cause still is, the day hastens, and even now dawns, in which the claims of a church and ministry that have not pleaded, openly, the cause of the enslaved, will be treated with common contempt. Men know, (whatever their own course may be,) what conduct a Christian profession requires of those by whom it is made. They are shrewd enough to discover when ministers and churches compromise their principles and truckle to secure popular or patrician favor. And though the treason is acceptable so long as it is profitable to them, the traitor is, nevertheless, despised. Developments in this direction have already commenced, and will multiply apace.*

Let the supposition be made that we had attempted to prove the very reverse of the sentiment that has now been maintained. Suppose that we had labored to prove that churches that refuse to plead the cause of the enslaved,

*Not a few time-serving ministers whose lips have been sealed to the claims of the enslaved, as a means of preserving their "influence," have already been discarded and thrust off as dead weights, by the very congregations to whose distinction they had truckled. They could not respect such ministers, nor trust them. And the popular tide, perhaps, was turning the other way.

and reprove the enslaver, are faithful and trustworthy, churches of Christ, that they are preparing for the plaudits of a "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter ye into the joy of your Lord." Suppose we had undertaken to show how they resembled the God of the poor and needy, the refuge and the avenger of the oppressed—how they had honored his commands—to execute judgment and plead for the oppressed—how they had imitated Jesus Christ in his reproofs of oppression—how they had symbolized with the prophets and apostles, (quoting and comparing their writings,) how they had honored, in their arguments and objections on this subject, the sacred articles of their church creed—and how their works corresponded with their professions. Who does not see that any such attempt would, of necessity, appear like irony?

And how could we persuade men, (if we should undertake to do so,) that a religion that could be thus described, was entitled to their confidence and respect—that it could make men wiser and better—that it could define and guard human rights—secure civil liberty—cement the bonds of human brotherhood—make earth a paradise and fit men for the presence of their common Father? Conscience and reason must be blotted out, before men of common sense and reflection can be made to believe it. Nothing short of the stupidity begotten by sectarian bigotry and superstition could induce any body to risk their immortal souls upon the supposed divinity of a religion so evidently hollow and selfish, and scenting so strongly of the nethermost pit.

X. DIRECT TESTIMONY OF GOD.

But we are not left to wander in the wide fields of conjecture. Nor is it by mere inferences, (however manifestly just and proper,) from self-evident and time-honored axioms, that we are obliged to arrive at our conclusions on this subject. God has spoken himself, and declared positively that He owns and recognizes no people as His true worshippers, who do not plead for the oppressed, bear testimony against oppression, and wield all their lawful powers for its overthrow. No sacrifices and oblations—no fastings and prayers—no new moons, and Sabbaths, and callings of assemblies, will satisfy Him without this. No worship will He accept, without the breaking of the yoke—the letting of the oppressed go free—the pleading for the oppressed, the judging of the fatherless, the pleading for the widow. Those who boast their connection with "The Temple of the Lord," while they refuse to execute judgment, He rebukes for trusting in "lying words," that "can not profit."

Read these divine declarations in the first and fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah, and in the seventh of Jeremiah. Then say, if you can, that those churches that refuse to plead for the oppressed and rebuke the oppressor, are true churches of the living God: Whatever speculations men may indulge, the word of the Lord, that shall stand. Let God be true, and every man a liar.

QUESTIONS—OBJECTIONS.

"But would you found Christian churches solely upon this 'one idea' of abolishing slavery?" No. Nor upon the one idea of abolishing image-worship—or infanticide—or duelling—or gambling—or sheep-stealing. Nor upon the one idea of maintaining public worship—or a speculative belief in the doctrine of regeneration, or of final retribution. But we nevertheless maintain that if a church fails in one of these fundamental points, it is guilty of all—is radically defective, corrupt, anti-Christian. And whenever the churches become wedded either to image-worship, or infanticide, or duelling, or gambling, or sheep-stealing, (or will not reprove or discipline their members for these practices,) whenever they renounce the worship of God, or the doctrines, either of regeneration, or of final retri-

but in, then, (whatever their position in regard to slavery may be,) we will abandon them as anti-Christian, if they can not be reclaimed. Are we, then, monomaniacs, on this "one idea" of abolition?

"But shall we infer that the churches are anti-Christian, because they are not absolutely perfect?" No. Nor are we to give up the radical distinction between the righteous and the wicked, because good men and Christian churches are not absolutely sinless. The worst men in society might successfully and righteously demand admission into the churches, on this same argument of Christian imperfection, if it could avail for those who *habitually* and *continually* stand aloof from the claims of the oppressed.—*Christians habitually love God.* But if a man love not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen? He that pretends to do so is a liar, and the truth is not in him. He adds hypocrisy to impiety. If the common distinction between fundamentals and incidentals, in religion, is to be recognized, and if common honesty and decent morality are to be chased among the fundamentals, the problem is easily solved.

"But how can we discard churches that were founded by the Puritans—by Whitfield—by Edwards—by Hopkins—by Wesley, and such holy men? Churches that retain orthodox creeds, that maintain public worship, that exhibit religious zeal, and that make many proselytes?"

In other words, how shall we err in judging from *appearances*, instead of judging *righteously* in judgment?—How shall we renounce carnal rules of judging, and adopt the spiritual rule of our savior? How shall we judge of the tree by its fruits, instead of its flowers? How shall we judge of churches by their *character*, instead of their professions, their pedigree, their genealogy, their parchments, their rituals, their records, their apostolic successions? How can we refrain from judging by the rules of the Romish Church, and rushing back into her bosom, as so many are beginning to do, in despite of the pathetic warnings of their pastors and editors, who deprecate the fanaticism and schism of forsaking pro-slavery churches?

In truth, we know of no remedy for all this, so long as any thing, besides *Christian character*, (by the Bible and common sense definition of it,) is made a test of church membership, or of the claims of churches professing to be Christian. If pedigree, genealogy, parchment, records, apostolic successions, and patronage of ancient saints and good men, instead of *present Christian character*, are to form our data of judgment, then the Romish Church, of all others, has the argument, (as multitudes perceive,) and it ought, in common honesty, to be conceded to her.

"But are there, then, no Christian churches among us? And have there never been?" Doubtless there are, and have been. But why is the question asked, unless the questioner be conscious that many, very many churches, among us, do not plead for the oppressed and reprove the oppressor? Our argument includes none of the professed Christian churches, by whom that duty is declining. If there are no delinquents, then none are brought under condemnation. Again, what means the inquiry, whether the churches of the puritans and of the early Wesleyans, &c., &c., were not Christian? What if they were? The Romish Church, and the seven churches of Asia, were once Christian. Did they always continue to be such? The churches that excluded slaveholders, on the teachings of Edwards, and Hopkins, and Wesley, were Christian churches. Granted! Does that prove that their successors, who receive slaveholders, and who refuse to pray or preach for the slave, and who suffer nobody else to do it, in their meeting-houses, are likewise Christian churches? The logic of the argument is not very apparent. But, thank God, there are still Christian

churches among us, and those that do not shrink from, but welcome, the test exhibited in this essay. Were it otherwise, the truth would not pierce, and God would not change, nor would His promise to His church fail. He is able, of the stones in the streets, to raise up children unto Abraham, while proud Pharisees, who despise the poor, congratulate them with the vain consolation, "we have Abraham to our father."

CONCLUSION.

Are the things so? It becomes all true Christians to inquire into their ecclesiastical connections—whether with Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Dutch Reformed, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or Friends. Their connection with local societies or churches—with ministers—with clerical or ecclesiastical bodies of any and every name—as associations, conventions, Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, Quarterly or Yearly meetings, Conferences, General Conferences, Dioceses, Tricennial Conventions—Missiary Boards. What is the character of these bodies? Of the members of which they are composed? What is the testimony they maintain?—What the efforts they put forth? What the example they exhibit? What the influence they exert? Do they open their mouths for the dumb? Do they plead the cause of the oppressed? Do they identify themselves with the crushed poor? Do they heartily and openly espouse the cause of the enslaved? Do they manfully contend with the enslaver? Do they exercise judgment, and use the civil powers they freely wield, as individuals, for this end? Do they admonish and exclude unrepentant oppressors from their fellowship, their communion, their pulpits?

If questions like these must needs be answered in the negative—if they do none of the things you have a great and a solemn duty to perform. You have to remonstrate with them, (if you have not already done so,) and, failing to reclaim them, you are bound to secede from them, as corrupt, apostate, and Christian. God does not own them as His people, nor permit you to do so.—His voice to all his true children connected with such churches and organizations, is, "Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues." "Come out from among them and be separate, and I will receive you."

On this duty of secession from incorrigibly corrupt and anti-Christian churches, (with a view to the organization of true churches of Christ,) we hope to enlarge, in our next number, in which the nature, the reasonableness, the importance, the obligation, and the necessity of the duty, will come under discussion.

Christian Investigator.

Published, February, 1823.

We insert, at length, the first number of our new series, and offer the volume of twelve numbers to our subscribers according to the terms in the imprint on our first page. Subscribers will commence with the first number, of which (with the coming numbers,) copies will be reserved for their supply.

We offer to sell, likewise, the successive numbers as they come out, for retail, at the prices named on our first page. This will enable persons desiring to circulate any particular number that may interest them, to do so to the extent they may desire, or find it convenient to do, without having much money go to pay for unprinted tracts, the completion of which they can not foresee.

It is intended to have the twelve numbers contain a connected series of lectures on the great work of Christ in Israel, which, in the Editor's view, the times imperiously require. Hitherto he has been surveying, with many others, the desolations of our Zion. He is now among the increasing number of those who feel determined, in the strength of the Lord, to "arise and build," even in troublous times.

It is intended to publish *monthly*, if practicable, and even oftener, if the money is forthcoming with promptness. If it comes tardily, the publication may lag a little, but there seems to be a fair prospect of furnishing subscribers with the twelve numbers, for which they pay in advance. If those who have subscribed for the

Editor's support, on the plan recommended by the Whitesboro Convention, will now pay up their subscriptions, (or half, *if they* find the rest in a month or two,) the way seems to be clear. Aiding himself, by the *efforts*, of the offer made by friends in Haverhill, (if nothing profitable offers,) he may hope to keep the wheel moving. But, in the mean time, he must depend chiefly on the pledges of friends in this region, and elsewhere, and on remittances by mail; particularly as the loss of his horse (not yet supplied) lessens his collections by travelling.

Friends who patronized our former series, on the *distribution plan*, are invited to become subscribers to this new volume, and send us remittances accordingly. It is true that some of them have not received, *themselves*, in papers, the amount of their payments; [this was not promised them,] but we have distributed them in their stead, according to the plan proposed,—furnishing thousands who never paid us a cent, and beyond the amount of the means furnished us. So that, while contributors have expended small sums in this distribution, the Editor has expended, for the same object, on a much larger scale. Friends, however, who, within a short period, have made remittances, (and especially such as have lately sent their second and third remittances,) will be supplied with the new volume. Indeed we would gladly supply all, so far as possible, but we are dependent for the means.

Some back numbers are indeed on hand, and will be distributed where most wanted. Of number 6, and number 7, there are more than of the others. And the return of some packages that we had supposed were distributed, enables us now to offer a few full files of the seven numbers; while, for some time past, we have not had

RECEIPTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Of D Clark Holland Patent 1 00; W Cotton Clarkville 1 00; A Seymour Union 50c; T B Van Alstine Richmondville 1 00; G Smith Peterboro 5 00; C Kelly Peterboro 25; Colleton Peterboro 80c; J S Fitch Marshall Mich 1 00; E Lewis Leaze 25c; A Palmer Clockville 25c; C B Hyde Middleville 75c; N Miller Shakerboro 30c; S S Bradford Homer 1 00; E W Goodwin Albany 25; A Walker Oberlin 25; S 00; do 3 00; S P Hough Whitesboro 50c; Paul Avery Clinton 1 00; G McNeil do 25c; W S Gates Schenectady 75c; Mrs H Gilman Dieter 1 00; A Sedgwick Ogden 1 00; S Bishop Haverhill 50c; J Pennell Jr 60c; T Barkley do 50c; P Kennedy do 25c; J Cobb do 25c; H Short do 25c; H B Webster do 25c; Gideon Pitts do 1 00; L Noble do 25c; D B Pitts do 1 00; Mrs Ayer Union 7 00; own Office Leira 1 00; J Van Alstine Altona 1 00; collected at Whitesboro Convention towards extra 1 00; J Stanton Cassville 1 00; S W Brown Little Falls 1 00; Roy D N Loring Salisbury 1 00; A Simons Dryden 1 00; Rider Litchfield 25c; Mrs Mann Haverhill 1 00; W W Chapman and C Wyoset, Haverhill 1 30; K Wilder do 25c; Rev A Sedgwick, do 1 00; Church-Tailmadge Mich 20c; Joseph Beal, do 1 00; Blackner Hemlock Lake 25c; G Mann Whitesboro 37 1-2c; J Roberts Lockport 1 00; Ephraim Gregory do 1 00; R Gregory do 50c; E Gregory do 25c; H A Gregory do 25c; J A Albany do 1 00; B A Liberty do 50c; J W Albany do 50c; R T A Albany do 50c; S Albany do 25c; T B Albany do 25c; H Albany do 25c; B Albany do 25c; T Albany do 25c; J Albany do 25c; L Albany do 25c; B S Kinney do 25c; Amasa Ous E Galley 1 00; P Gregory Lockport 25c; do 25c.

Also, for sales of Christian Investigator No. 8, 100 Rights and Wm of Haverhill 1 00; do 1 00.

Also, the following towards additional support of the Editor, on the plan adopted at the convention in Whitesboro:

Rec'd at Snyman Convention (Subscription in part) 5 50; of G Smith Peterboro 5 00; J Carpenter Stockbridge 1 00; J Halbrook Marshall 1 00; T Sims Rockville 1 00; A Ward Holland Patent 3 00; J Mosher Cheshire 1 00; L Wadsworth do 25c; T Stronger do 25c; J Hovey do 50c; J Carr Chapmanville 1 00; D H Dayton Larned's Corners 50c; G Dunkle do 50c; S Bates Parsonsburg 1 00; J March Jr Peter 1 00; M Norton do 25c; J Porter E Elmfield 1 00; Gideon Pitts Richmond 5 00; Hiram Pitts do 3 00; J R Hopkins Andover 1 00; Mary Sill Whitesboro 1 00; Dea C Grant Chardville 5 00.

Amount \$11 75

Very poor print

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. I—No. 2
WHOLE NUMBER, 10.

WHITESBORO, N. Y., MARCH, 1843.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix. 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

[NEW SERIES.]

is published monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.

Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cts., always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services:—

Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—

Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate in the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen,	\$0 50
Twenty-eight papers for	1 00
Sixty papers for	2 00
One hundred papers for	3 00

Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters on sending money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE II.

THE DUTY OF SECESSION FROM A CORRUPT CHURCH.

"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Rev. xviii. 4.

Our protestant commentators tell us that by "Babylon" of the Apocalypse we are to understand a corrupt church, and that the revelation which John heard in heaven—"Come out of her, my people," is to be regarded as a divine admonition to all faithful Christians, warning them to secede from such a church, as from the Anti-Christ, doomed to ruin, on the brightness of the Savior's appearing.

It is true they suppose, that the corrupt church, particularly intended, is the church of Rome; but it is nevertheless equally true that in construction of the passage involves and founded upon the principle that *whenever wherever a church (however distinguished, or by the divine presence and favor) becomes corrupt and apostate, it is the duty of true Christians connected with it to secede from it, because it has thus apostatized, it is become corrupt.* It has never been denied that the church of Rome was once a true church, and the reason always given for coming out of her, is her apostacy and corrup-

tion. Nor is it pretended that the Romish church is the only corrupt, apostate, anti-Christian church that the world has yet seen, and that is to be found. The Greek church has commonly been considered by Protestants to be essentially on the same foundation with the Roman. And both in Old England and New England, the founders of our present churches and denominational arrangements, have recently gone through the process of "gathering churches out of churches," on the same

otton Mather's prediction concerning the church of New England.

principle. The puritans derived their name from their efforts to secure, in this way, a pure church. And if it be true, as it doubtless is, that secessions have often been made on lighter grounds than the alleged apostacy and anti-Christian character of the church seceded from, that fact only places in a still stronger light the universal recognition, by Protestants, of the duty of seceding from an anti-Christian church. Indeed, to deny that duty would be equivalent to renouncing the Protestant faith, and would require our return to the Romish communion.

Our commentators, moreover, do not commonly construe the Babylon of the Revelations to mean *exclusively* the Romish church, nor do they confine the application of the command, in the text, to the Protestant reformers, nor to the duty of seceding from the Romish communion. Thomas Scott says, expressly:

"This summons concerns *all persons in every age*; they who believe in Christ, and worship God in the spirit, should separate from so corrupt a church, **AND FROM ALL OTHERS THAT COPY HER EXAMPLE** of idolatry, persecution, **CRUELTY** and **TYRANNY**, and avoid being partakers of her sins, even if they have renounced her communion, or else they may expect to be involved in her plagues."

In describing, still further, the anti-Christian practices, on account of which the Romish church, and "all others that copy her example," should be renounced, and separated from, as corrupt and anti-Christian, the same writer adds:

"Not only *slaves*, but the *souls of men*," are mentioned as articles of commerce, which is the most infamous of all traffics that the demon of avarice ever devised, but by no means the most uncommon. The sale of indulgences, dispensations, absolutions, masses and bulls, hath greatly enriched the clergy and their dependants, to the deceiving and destroying the souls of millions, and thus by feigned words they made merchandize of them; nor has the management of church preferments and many other things, been any better than *trafficking in human souls*; and it would be gratifying if we could say that this merchandize has been peculiar to the **ROMISH anti-Christ**."

Again, in his "Practical Observations" on the chapter, the same commentator says:

"Too often **INJUSTICE, OPPRESSION, fraud, avarice or excessive indulgence** are connected with extensive commerce, and to number the *persons of men* with *hasts, sheep and horses*, as the stock of a farm, or with *bales of goods*, as the cargo of a ship, is, no doubt, a most detestable and unchristian practice, fit only for **Babylon the Great**."

And, after alluding again to those who "traded in the souls of men," in the way of ecclesiastical traffic in cures and benefices, he adds: "How fervently should we then pray that God would raise up reformers, who may

contend as firmly, as perseveringly, and as successfully, against this vile merchandize, as some honorable and philanthropical persons have against the *accursed slave trade*. For, when Christ shall come again, to drive the buyers and sellers out of the temple, he will have much to do with *other places besides Rome*." Again:

"But the vengeance of heaven is coming upon Rome, not for gestures, garbs and ceremonies, though multiplied, ridiculous, and of bad consequence in themselves, but for idolatry, ambition, **OPPRESSION, CRUELTY** to the people of God, **imposture, AVARICE, LICENTIOUSNESS** and spiritual **TYRANNY**. These are the sins, which have reached to the heavens, the iniquities which God remembers, and the evils **FOR WHICH** we must **STAND ALOOF** from her communion, and that of **ALL OTHERS THAT RESEMBLE HER**, or we shall be involved in their destruction."

Thus we have Scott's authority for identifying the abominations of a pro-slavery Protestant church with those of the church of Rome—for applying the warning voice of the text to the former as well as to the latter—for insisting that "cruelty, tyranny, injustice, oppression, the trafficking in the *souls of men*," the numbering of the persons of men with beasts, sheep and horses—with bales of goods—are pre-eminently among the iniquities, a participation in which makes a church (however once favored and spiritual) an anti-Christian church—"the evils for which we must stand aloof from her communion, and that of all others that resemble her, or we shall be involved in their destruction."

It was a flagrant outrage upon self-evident and fundamental morality, on the part of the Romish church, that arrested the attention of Luther, and convinced him that such a church could not be the true church of Christ. That sale of indulgences to commit crime, was nothing different, in character, from the tacit consent of the American churches in general, and with few exceptions, that those to whom they extend religious fellowship, and with whom they voluntarily sustain ecclesiastical relations, may continue to practise abominations equal to any conceived or provided for by the customers of *John Tetzel*: and this is true, whether commercial, political, ecclesiastical or social advantages constitute the purchase money pocketed by the churches. The common complaint that the agitation of the subject disturbs and endangers the churches, and hazards their peace, sufficiently attests this.

But are our commentators right in teaching the duty of secession from a corrupt and anti-Christian church—a church guilty of cruelty, tyranny, oppression, avarice, injustice—a church that traffics in slaves, in bodies and souls of men—a church that consents to, or tolerates, or licenses such abominations among its allies and supporters? And were the Protestant Reformers right, in acting upon this same principle of secession from such a corrupt church?

In maintaining the affirmative of this ques-

tion, we shall endeavor, first to explain, and then prove, and illustrate the duty of secession from an apostate church.

I. FALLACIOUS CREDENTIALS.

The discussion before us requires a clear understanding of what is meant by a corrupt, or apostate, or anti-Christian church. In order to this, it may be well to notice a few things, very commonly relied upon, as evidences or credentials of a sound Christian church, which, on reflection, will be found to be no evidences at all; being common to true churches and to many of those that have apostatized.

1. HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

Many persons seem to take it for granted, that their church must be a true church because it was founded by the authority of God, and by wise and good men, or because it consisted of good men, at the time of its organization or at some past period of its history—because it was founded on the true model, was enriched with divine influences, was abundantly favored with effusions of the Holy Spirit, and was remarkably instrumental in the conversion of sinners, and the spread of the true religion.

Many of the descendants or successors of the Puritans seem to reason in this way. So do many of the followers of John Wesley. At least they evidently feel thus, if they would not adventure to frame an argument upon the assumption. On the same principle, other sects boast the apostolical succession of their ministers and bishops. The Romanists, by the same rule, prove their church to be the true church, and all seceders from it to be schismatics. And the Pharisees could defend themselves, in the same way, against the scathing denunciations of the Messiah, who reproved them for their oppressions, by boasting, "We have Abraham for our father!"

This method of proving a church to be a true church of God, will never become plausible until it is made to appear that men whose forefathers or predecessors were righteous are always righteous themselves, or that God will accept men for the righteousness of their progenitors or predecessors, whatever their own characters may be. But it is a method which will probably continue in use, so long as any thing else besides the exhibition of present good fruits, and of sound Christian character, shall be made a test either of church membership, or of the character of an assembly or church.

2. RITUALS—OBSERVANCES.

Either with or without a reference to the historical document, of their sect, many persons seem to claim a Christian character for their respective churches, on account of their present adherence to a scriptural church polity—regular organization—regularly ordained pastors—exact, and scrupulous observance of positive institutions—rites—ceremonies—ordinances—baptisms—sacrifices—fasts—feasts—sabbaths—meetings—prayers—worship.

One sect is founded and supported on the simple ground of its supposed scriptural accuracy in respect to water baptism—another on the ground of its supposed observance of the precise day originally designated as the Sabbath—another on the ground of its rejecting outward rites and observances altogether. Partizans of these and other religious sects, not unfrequently manifest their reliance on these circumstances, in estimating the Christian char-

acter of their church or sect. Tell them wherein their church or sect has openly violated the fundamental principles of a sound Christian morality—trampled upon the crushed poor, or neglected to plead faithfully in their behalf—alas! they know it all—they confess it all—they lament it all. They are even loud, perhaps, in their complaints of these delinquencies; they have been so, for many years, and they see no prospect of a change for the better. But they can not think of seceding from their sect or church. Oh! not that would be the sin of "schism." Why so? Because they think their church is, after all, a true Christian church, and they thus judge, because their definition of a church of Christ obliges them to give the Christian name to all the churches that they regard as having been scripturally constituted and regularly organized and governed, and who maintain in their purity and integrity the scriptural observances and rituals of religion.

If this sort of credentials can prove a church to be a true church, then the Pharisees, in Christ's time, and their fathers in the days of Isaiah and Jeremiah could have readily proved themselves to constitute the true church of God. The first and fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah, and the seventh of Jeremiah, will show in what estimation God regards credentials of this sort, when separated from a practical regard for the oppressed and the crushed.

3. AN ORTHODOX CREED.

But when, in addition to their historical and ritual credentials, the members of a church can point to their correct orthodox creed, they often seem to think that the evidence is complete, and that no dereliction of duty towards the oppressed can prove that such a church is not a true church of Christ.

A profession of correct Christian principles is a very good thing, but it is only a profession, after all, and professions without practice will avail nothing to prove Christian character, either in an individual or in a church. The creed of a church is its profession—and if it be a correct creed, it is a profession of sound principles—nothing more. These principles or "doctrines" are "according to godliness." They furnish the grounds, the reasons, the motives for a correct Christian practice. If truly loved and obeyed, a correct Christian practice and a sound Christian character will be the result. An intelligent profession of these principles amounts to an intelligent promise to perform all the duties of religion; and therefore a church covenant is appended to the church creed. But what if the promise is habitually and constantly broken, at vital points, instead of being performed? Will the promise avail instead of the performance? If so (but not otherwise) a correct orthodox creed may prove the Christian character of a church that neglects and refuses to plead for the Lord's poor! Till then, it will be true that the orthodox creed of such a delinquent church will be its condemnation, instead of its security. It will be the sure evidence of its guilt. It will testify that (unless the creed were stupidly adopted, without a consideration even of its meaning) the church has sinned and is sinning against its known and recognized principles of duty, and must therefore be doubly condemned. The orthodox Pharisees, on this account, were more pointedly condemned by the

Savior than the heretical Sadducees, who made lower professions. The grossly heretical churches of our own day, that do not plead for the oppressed, have sinned against less light, and probably contracted less guilt and become less intolerably odious and offensive in God's sight, than many of the churches that rely on their evangelical creeds to screen them from censure on account of their practical derelictions. They do less dishonor to God, to Christ, to Christian principles—to the very principles in the distinctive profession of which they glory; and on the loving reception of which human salvation depends. When God rises to judgment, the churches that "hold the truth in unrighteousness" must drink a double portion, and drain the cup of trembling to the last dregs. Far be thy feet, Christian reader, from the threshold of such churches, then! In that day it will be seen that the positive institutions of Christianity and the revelations of a sound Christian faith, in their integrity and purity, were talents put into the hands of the churches, to be improved; and that if buried and disregarded, they will prove swift witnesses against them.

4. MISSIONARY ZEAL—EFFORTS TO CONVERT SOULS—RELIGIOUS EXERCISES.

These are often regarded as the sure signs that a church is, of course, a true Christian church, and no exhibitions of its inhuman CRUELTY and its CONTEMPT of fundamental MORALITY will reverse the decision! All this betrays an utter ignorance or forgetfulness of true religion itself—of the things wherein it essentially consists. "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." The "pure religion" of James—not the "golden rule"—of the two great commandments on which "hang all the law and the prophets," seems to have no place even in the conceptions of those who rely on such tests. Equally regardless are such men of the facts of the world's history and of its present spiritual condition. The Pharisees could compass sea and land to make one proselyte. In their devotions they were sufficiently vociferous and earnest, breaking out, as by irrepressible impulse, at the very corners of the streets. They were by no means the cold-hearted, stiff, dull, phlegmatic formalists that some men picture them to be. Paul regarded himself as having been exceedingly mad, absolutely insane, with the prevalent enthusiasm of the sect, before his conversion. The same spirit composed the atmosphere of the Romish church, at the very period when its spiritual despotism and its manifold corruptions were engendered and ripened into giant maturity. The present numeraries and superstitions of that church are but the skeletons, the shells, the monuments of its ancient enthusiasm, fanaticism, mysticism and rhapsody. To galvanize this skeleton into its former life and activity, to revive again and to restore the departed spirit of its now unmeaning rituals—the spirit of the most soul-stirring and wide-spread

* See "Spiritual Despotism, by the author of 'Natural History of Enthusiasm'—a work in which the rise of the papal power is traced with a graphic pen and shown to have grown up, along with its absurd and blasphemous pretensions and dogmas, out of the rank soil of a spurious religious excitement, in which reason and common sense were outraged, and the practical duties of life set aside, as unworthy the attention of the spiritually minded and devout.

ing enthusiasm the world ever saw—appears to be the object of Dr. Pusey, and the writers of the "Oxford tracts." And not a few of the most zealous among the English clergy, of the "evangelical" stamp, the patrons of "revivals," have been captivated by them, and drawn away to "wonder after the beast, whose deadly wound" is likely to be "healed" by the process. If modern travel, as may be credited, something of the spirit invoked by the Puseyists has been conjured up, in Popish countries, not infrequently, within the last century. At Naples, in Sicily, in various parts of Italy, in Portugal, and in South America, there have been repeated religious excitements, among the Romanists, in our own day, the description of which casts into the shade—so far as excitement and intense emotion are concerned—the religious excitements of our own country. Whole cities have spontaneously thrown aside their secular avocations, for a succession of days, and in some cases for weeks, it is said. The population en masse have eagerly thronged the streets in procession, moved by alternate terrors and transports—sometimes wringing their hands in agony, dashing themselves headlong upon the pavements or into the mire, and imploring the intercession of the "Blessed Virgin" for the forgiveness of their sins. Then receiving absolution from their priests with frantic gestures and clamorous exultations. But did these Romish "revivals" bring forth the fruits of righteousness? Ah! That is the question by which Protestant as well as Romish revivals should be tested. What should be thought of revivals conducted by itinerating evangelists, who carry, likewise, a traffic in men, women and children, during their travels? Such things have been witnessed, and a prominent minister lately preached, in Baltimore, with a pair of handcuffs in his pocket, which, immediately after the sermon, he put upon a female slave, on ship board, to be transported to the South. And we have, all over the country, "revivals" conducted by preachers who will not plead for the enslaved—nor listen to such a plea—nor suffer their church doors to be opened for one—by preachers in close fellowship and brotherly intercourse with the slave-buying preachers of the South,* and making up a common purse with them, to send the gospel to the heathen! What shall we think of such efforts to convert sinners, and to evangelize the world? Can such missionary, exertions and revival efforts, with the excitements growing out of them, prove that a church, though devoid of humanity, and trampling decent morality and common honesty under foot, is a true Christian church? If so, why may we not join with the clergy of Rio Janeiro and of Naples, in promoting revivals, and with the Jesuits in carrying the gospel to China? No revivalists have got up greater excitements. No missionaries have been more enterprising, or have numbered a greater company of converts. There is a philosophy that counts it a sign of a sickly state of religion, to make metaphysical distinctions between true religion and false. The healthiest state of religion, it teaches, is that in which men are religious,

without knowing why, or wherefore—without understanding or inquiring wherein true religion consists. If this be sound philosophy, and if ignorance be, therefore, the mother of devotion, all we need is zeal and excitement, and we may venture to harmonize with all who exhibit *quantum sufficit* of those qualities, without stopping to dissect, to analyze, to scrutinize either their character or their fruits. But if religion be "a reasonable service"—if God invites us to "consider our ways"—to "know what manner of spirit we are of"—to "examine" ourselves—to "try the spirits whether they be of God"—to "beware of false prophets"—to "take heed and beware of man"—then the philosophy of unconscious, unknowing, undiscriminating, impulsive, mystic, unexplainable religious excitement should be tossed to the breeze or into the moonbeams; and manly reflection, and logical scrutiny, and homely common sense should be welcomed into the field of experimental religion, as well as of every day business and demonstrative science. The missionary and revival claims of churches in league with oppressors will be understood and adjusted, then.

Are we censorious, severe, profane or hostile towards revivals of pure religion, because we thus speak? Turn over the voluminous writings of our own distinguished American theologians, on this very subject. Examine what Edwards, and Bellamy, and Smalley, and Hopkins, and Emmons have written concerning religious revivals and conversions, and upon the necessity of discriminating between the false and the true. You shall there see, in substance, all we have here written, and much more, that we have not room to write. You shall learn from those unimpeachable witnesses, the abundant occasion there has been, in this country, to enter into discussions and discriminations of this sort. You shall be instructed that religious excitements are, (of themselves, and aside from the good fruits they produce,) no evidences in favor of either an individual or a church, being common to all the religions of the known world, the false as well as the true, the Romish as well as the Protestant, the Pagan as well as the Christian—that they are as common on the banks of the Ganges as on the Connecticut or the Hudson—that nothing short of practical good fruits and holy living can furnish any evidences of truly gracious affections, and that where love to God and man, and a filial discharge of the relative duties of life are not exhibited, all religious emotions and excitements and transports are worthless and vain. An almost incredible amount of labor, (and by the ablest and most honored ministers of the country,) has been expended to expose the worthlessness of "revivals" that do not bring forth the fruits of righteousness. And yet, after all, the well substantiated and unrebuted charge against a large portion of the "American churches," that they are the very "bulwarks of American slavery," with all its abominations and its blood, is gravely met, forsooth, with the plea that these churches must not be charged with apostasy, because they are blessed with "revivals"!

To this very point the closing part—the climax of "Edwards on the Affections" is devoted, and the absurdity of the too prevalent notion to the contrary is shown up with the cool, latent, solemn, weighty irony, for which the gigantic author is so remarkable. "Edwards on the Revival" contains much to the same purpose.

3. CONVERSIONS—PIOUS MEMBERS AND MINISTERS.

It will be pleaded, nevertheless, that there are, to some extent, true revivals of religion, in the churches that stand aloof from the cause of the enslaved—at any rate, that some instances of true conversion take place in their midst, and that among their members and ministers they enrol many persons of undisputed piety, including a large portion of the active friends of the enslaved. How, then, it will be asked, can we come to the conclusion that they are not to be regarded as true churches of Christ? And how can we be called upon to abandon the churches which Christ has not abandoned, and whom he still visits with the converting and reviving influences of his Spirit?

Answer.—Zecharias and Elizabeth, and many others of their day, were pious persons, and were converted, of course, in the bosom of the Jewish church. But the Jewish church, at that time, was nevertheless apostate, and as such was doomed to be cast off, speedily, and overthrown. And the multitude of converts, afterwards, under the preaching of John the Baptist, of Jesus Christ, and of their disciples, and even on the day of Pentecost, did not prove the Jewish church to be in a sound state, nor avert the catastrophe that followed. The great majority, including the leading and governing influences and officials, were corrupt, and instead of repenting, filled up the measure of their iniquities, in the midst of these conversions and revivals. And so the Jewish church, as such, was broken off for its unbelief.

The Romish church, in her worst state, could boast her truly pious members and ministers. True conversions, of course, took place in her bosom. Who doubts the piety of Thomas à Kempis, and Fenelon, and Massillon, and Bourdaloue—men whose writings are still read for edification and instruction by the best Protestant Christians? Luther and the reformers were converted while members of the Romish church. Was that circumstance a good reason why they should not repudiate and abandon her, as anti-Christian? By this rule, the Protestant Reformation could never have taken place. For none would abandon the Romish church for her anti-Christian character, before they were themselves converted, but as soon as they were converted, the rule we have under consideration would require them to regard the church wherein they were converted a true church, because of their conversion, and therefore it would be schismatic to secede.

It is commonly held that the true church was comprised for the most part within the Romish communion, until the time of the Reformation, when it "came out" in accordance with the admonition of our text. Had they listened to the objection under review, they would nevertheless have remained. And when the Protestant secession took place, it was not on the principle that no true Christians were left behind, or that conversions there had utterly ceased to take place; but it was on the principle that the church, as such, the church as a body—the church as governed, was anti-Christian and corrupt.

The truth is, the converting grace and power of the Holy Spirit are not limited wholly to the churches and the communities that Jesus Christ regards as truly Christian—nor to the instrumentalities that true churches embody

* The editors of our northern religious newspapers or the most part are just as ready to record, in tones of railing, the revivals in the slave States, as any others; though they can not be ignorant that the preachers are commonly slaveholders, and that the mass of the converts continue to be slaveholders or slaves.

and wield in his service. God converted Abraham amidst the idolatrous worshippers in Ur of the Chaldees; but that did not prove the idolaters true worshippers, nor nullify the call to Abraham to come out from among them, and be separate. He converted Cornelius, and "in every nation, he that fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him." Muhammedans and Hindoos, when converted at all, are converted *before* they secede from their anti-Christian ecclesiastical connections, but this does not prove that those connections are sacred and divinely approved. In short, the objection assumes a principle which would prove that the wide world itself, is the Christian church, for it can not be doubted that conversions sometimes take place in the world, and without the employment of any direct instrumentalities by an organized church.

We conclude then that neither historical credentials—nor ritual observances—nor orthodox creeds—nor missionary zeal, nor religious excitements—nor real conversions, nor a minority of truly pious members and ministers, nor all of these combined, can prove a church, *as a whole*, to be a true Christian church.

II. DEFINITION OF A CORRUPT CHURCH.

What then do we mean by a corrupt church?

A church is not to be renounced as corrupt and anti-Christian, merely because its members are not absolutely faultless:—nor merely because it may contain some corrupt and wicked members, whose hypocrisy is undetected by their associates—nor because its faith and practice may be, in some measure, and in minor particulars, defective and faulty.

But a church becomes manifestly corrupt and anti-Christian, whenever a majority of its members, or its leading and governing members, and officers, and influences, become so.—A Christian church is an assembly or congregation of "*faithful men*." An anti-Christian church is an assembly or congregation of *unfaithful men*. The character of an assembly or church is nothing distinct from the character of the members of which it is composed, and the influence which, as a body, it exerts.

A professed Temperance Society ceases to be really such, when its members, or a majority of them, cease to be temperance men, and to exert, individually, and *as a body*, an influence in favor of true temperance. And so a professed Christian church ceases to be truly Christian, when its members, or a majority of them, cease to be so, and when, at vital points, they fail, either individually or collectively, to exert an influence in favor of righteousness, humanity and truth.

A church may prove itself corrupt and anti-Christian, by its course, in either of the following particulars, viz:

By its renunciation of any of the fundamental truths of the Christian religion:

By trampling on humanity, or disregarding its essential claims:

By habitually violating the precepts of a sound Christian morality:

By becoming carnally minded and covetous, instead of spiritually minded and benevolent:

By an absence of the spirit of Christ—or by ceasing to do his work—the work for which Christian churches were founded:

By despotic usurpations—and lording it over God's heritage:

By wilfully retaining ungodly and wicked

men in their communion and fellowship: for, "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." (1 Cor. v. 6—13.) The church becomes responsible for, and infected with, the iniquity which it sanctions, by its fellowship with the transgressor.

And, on the same principle, the individual church member becomes responsible for, and contaminated with, the guilt of a corrupt and anti-Christian church, of which he continues to be a member. So says the text. They are partakers of their sins, and must receive of their plagues, unless they come out from them.

III. SECESSION A REASONABLE AND INDISPENSABLE DUTY.

What good reason can any one give for retaining a connection with a corrupt church—an anti-Christian church—such a church as has been described? For what purpose should you remain? What obligation do you thus discharge? What divine precept do you thus obey? What heaven appointed relation do you honor? It can not be the relation between Christians and the church of Christ, for an anti-Christian church is not his.

What is there to cling to, in remaining with such a church? Do you thereby fasten yourselves to the throne of the Eternal—to the great principles that form the pillars of the universe? Do you thereby cling to God—to Christ—to the Holy Comforter—the Reprover of Sin—the Revealer of Righteousness and Judgment to come?—On the other hand, do you not weaken, if not sever, the cords that bind you to these—to the Kingdom of Heaven, by cherishing connections of so opposite and hostile a character? Ponder, carefully, a few of the reasons why you should secede from such an apostate church.

IT IS A SHAM CHURCH—A DECEPTION.

Its credentials are fallacious—its claims are not valid. It relies on its historical documents—its parchments—its rituals—its creeds—its professions—its partizan zeal—its proselyting activity—its periodical or occasional excitements. It claims to be true, because there are true men, who have not yet deserted it! It claims to be Christ's church, because its iniquities have not yet wholly intercepted and quenched the overflowing streams of divine mercy, and driven away the Divine Spirit from all of its members, and from the entire human race! This is the full inventory of its fair claims. Here its appeal rests. Farther than this, it can not honestly go. As for performing its abundant promises—as for preaching deliverance to the captives—executing judgment for the oppressed—pleading the cause of the poor—delivering the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor—remembering them that are in bonds as bound with them—showing the people their transgression and the house of Jacob their sin—coming up to the help of the Lord against the giant crimes of the age—cleansing her own garments from the clotted gore of human victims—*this*, this is a work that she can not pretend to have performed—to have commenced—to have desired—to have contemplated, at all! How worthless, then, are her claims!

Such a church professes to be what it is not. It is a counterfeit—in imposition—a deceit—a sham. What right can any man have to cling to a deception—to say by his connection with it that he considers it a veritable reality,

a thing of worth, and a source of salvation and confidence? Reader! Can you believe such a church to be Christ's church, you are deceived, and do dishonor the Savior, and the institution he has founded. If you believe no such thing, and yet maintain a connection with it, you certify to an untruth, for your connection with it says, to every body, that you consider it a true church.

CONNECTION WITH SUCH A CHURCH MUST BE SINFUL.

You can not maintain a connection with a corrupt church without becoming partaker of her sins, and receiving of her plagues. So says the voice from heaven, which John heard, in Patmos. And conscience, and reason, and common sense testify to the same thing. In all human affairs, the principle now insisted upon is practically recognized.

GUILT OF ACCESSORIES.

All communities hold persons responsible for the crimes to which they are accessory, by giving countenance and support to the principals, or actual offenders. If a person merely looks on and sees the commission of a crime, but does nothing to prevent it—if he conceals it, or still associates with the wrong-doers, thereby giving them the currency and support of his influence in society, and thus enabling them to continue and extend their injuries in the community, all men will hold such an individual responsible for the crimes of his associates; and in most cases the civil law itself will deal with him as severely as with the principal transgressors themselves.

If an organized society or association of any description, commits a criminal act—if, for example, it authorizes the murder of one of its own members, or of any other person, whom it may deem an enemy or an offender—if the murder be accordingly committed by the officers or committees of the society, or by volunteer executors of its will; an intelligent and right-minded community will hold each and every member of that society responsible for the crime, if they knew of it, either before or after its commission, and did not do all in their power, either to prevent it, or to bring the criminals to justice. And in case the society, as such, or its leading members, seek to shelter the criminals, or justify or apologize for the crime, or refuse to repent of its commission, the persons who still continue to remain members of such a society, will always be held more or less culpable and guilty, whatever protestations of their own personal innocence they may make. This weight of responsibility will rest on them, so long as they live, unless they withdraw their fellowship and support from the society or association that committed the crime, or sheltered the criminals. God has so framed the human mind that men must and will, of necessity, throw the blame of a society's criminal acts upon the individual that continues to give the society his support. And God himself has abundantly revealed (as in the text) his own fixed and settled determination to do the same thing. On the same principle, the punishment of national sins falls upon the individuals, however humble their station, of whom the guilty nation is composed.

Suppose now that, instead of the crime of murder, a society commits the crime of enslaving or imbruting their fellow-men—or of countenancing its members or others in that pro-

ties—what reason can be given why the same principle should not be applied? And suppose that society should call itself a church—a Christian church—a Presbyterian church—a Methodist church—a Baptist church—a Congregational church, can any body tell why the same rule should not apply to the associated body, and to the members of whom it is composed? Will the sacredness of church institutions release them from the operation of those great moral laws by which God governs the universe? Such a thought would savor of blasphemy! It would contradict the express declarations of God. It is, specially, and emphatically, in respect to a corrupt church, that God says, "Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and receive not of her plagues." Of all the societies that ever existed among men, a professed Christian church is the association to whom the universal principle of holding the members responsible for the acts of the body, should be most faithfully applied. For the nature of the organization and of the objects it was designed to promote, give prominence to individual accountability, and repudiate the doctrine of subjecting the conscience of the individual or of the few to the control of the many. The very business of this organized society is to teach and exemplify human duty, and when it becomes itself a transgressor, and betrays its high trust, a tenfold weight of obligation rests on the individual member, to withdraw the support of his connection with the apostate body.

A church, like every other associated body, is nothing distinct from the individuals of whom it is composed. And their individuality is not to be destroyed or merged in the "corporation." To deny the duty of secession from a corrupt body is to deny and reverse these self-evident axioms. It is to make the man the creature of the association. It is to nullify the command, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." We moreover, to deny, in effect, that accountability or guilt can pertain to associated action, for if these do not pertain to the individuals of whom the body is composed, they can exist no where, at all.

SECESSION IS REQUIRED BY COMMON HONESTY.

It can not be consistent with honesty to remain connected with a corrupt and anti-Christian church, especially with a church that will not protest against the dishonest robberies and thefts of slavery—a church that maintains fraternal fellowship with the robbers, which is "a companion of thieves, and a partaker with adulterers." If there be any dishonesty in slavery, there is dishonesty in the churches that sustain it, and there is dishonesty in those individuals by whom such dishonest churches are knowingly sustained. To deny this is to deny that men can be "partakers in other men's sins."

And it must be doubly dishonest to remain connected with such a church, when convinced that the church is anti-Christian, apostate, corrupt. For such a church, as already noticed, is itself a deception, a counterfeit, a sham. And he that knowingly gives his countenance and endorsement to a deception, a sham, becomes himself a deceiver. He leads others, so far as his influence extends, to rely upon that which, he is persuaded, in his own mind, is unworthy of confidence—to rely upon that upon which he is unwilling himself to rely: a plain

branch of the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Suppose you should join with some of your neighbors in establishing a bank, the business of which, you suppose, is to supply the community with a sound circulating medium, a truly trust-worthy currency, that may be depended on, a currency of intrinsic value, and in reality what it professes or purports to be. But after a while you discover that the main business carried on by the company or the directors is to manufacture and put in circulation a spurious or counterfeit currency, of no real value, but which the people around you, relying on the reputation and standing of the company and its members, (including such men as yourself,) are ready enough to receive, and render an equivalent for, and pass from one to another. Some of them part with all they have to obtain it; they hoard it, and think themselves independent for life, while you know, or suspect, that they will find themselves bankrupt, whenever a scrutinizing eye, that of a creditor, perhaps, comes to be fastened upon it.

What would people think of you, if, with a full persuasion of all this, you should continue your connection with such a company? And what would you think of yourself? Would you ever suspect yourself of being an honest man? Or could you satisfy your own conscience, or vindicate your course to your neighbors, by merely declaiming against counterfeit money, and scolding, perhaps, at the directors for making and passing it? Or could you satisfy yourself or your neighbors by pleading that the company was regularly organized—that its officers were duly elected and commissioned—that the forms and etiquette suitable or authoritatively prescribed for such companies had been scrupulously observed—that they had been very active, zealous, indefatigable, in prosecuting their business, and in multiplying, to the greatest possible extent, the specimens of their workmanship, and in filling every nook and corner of the land or of the world, with them? Would you maintain that, after all its delinquencies, it was nevertheless a true and trustworthy banking company, on the whole, because of these things, or because, in addition to them all, it had, for a long time, in years past, very faithfully circulated a sound currency, and because, even now, a certain proportion of genuine and good money was to be found among its issues? Would your remonstrance against the spurious emissions satisfy your own conscience or your injured neighbors, so long as you continued your connection with the company, supported its cashiers and clerks by your payments, met with the company at its festivals, enjoyed its warm fires and its sumptuous fare, pocketed your portion of the dividends, and discountenanced by your example the efforts of those who would have the charter of the company taken away, for its malpractices, and the community warned against its deceptions?

The cases, to be sure, are not parallel, in all things, for "parables" (as the old divines tell us) "do not run upon all fours"—they do not and can not agree in all the minor traits of the picture. The simile can not fully explain the infinite, nor things temporal shadow forth, perfectly, the things unseen and eternal. The loss of an estate, by counterfeit money, is a small matter, compared with the loss of the soul, by receiving, as trust-worthy, a counterfeit and worthless religion. The man that makes and passes counterfeit money commits a small crime, and inflicts a light injury, in the comparison with him who gives currency to a spurious religion. A sham church is as much more mischievous and abominable than a sham bank, as the bankruptcy of the soul, for eternity, is worse than pecuniary insolvency, for life. The difference between time and eternity, between gold and heaven, between dollars and holiness, is the measure of the different degrees of criminality between the adherent and supporter of a sham bank, and the adherent and supporter of a sham church. No wonder then, that God says—"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

COMMON HUMANITY REQUIRES IT.

If the keepers of a light house, on the sea coast, instead of maintaining a true light, should hold out a false light, calculated to deceive the mariner, and make him think himself on a remote and safe point of the

coast, when in fact he was about running on a reef of rocks, all mankind would cry out against the inhumanity of the person who should continue to lend the keepers of that light house his support, while he knew perfectly well the mischief they were doing. But the church is set to be the light house of the world, and a false church is a false light house, and lures men to destruction. The man that knowingly supports such a church, is equally guilty with those whose character and teachings make it a false church. Nay, he is often times more guilty than they, because he aims against more light. The pro-slavery members and ministers of a pro-slavery church may really think it to be a true Christian church. But abolitionists belonging to such churches know better, or ought to know better, and can not well plead ignorance in extenuation of their conduct, in supporting such false and mischievous moral lights. If the light that is in them be darkness, how great is that darkness!

DUTY TO THE UNREGENERATE.

Men who know not, experimentally, the truth and reality of religion, have a claim on us for truthfulness and fidelity, in all our exhibitions of the religion we profess. Those exhibitions are most impressive that are made by our example. When they see us maintain a visible connection with a church, they have a right to infer that we regard it a true Christian church, and that the example there exhibited is, in our view, and in the main, and notwithstanding our complaints of some defects, a fair Christian example—a specimen of Christian conduct—an exemplification of the religion of Jesus Christ. But if the church is radically corrupt and apostate, then we hold 'up to them a false specimen of the Christian religion. If they rely on our truthfulness and fidelity, they will be led into fatal mistakes in respect to the nature of that religion. If they are disgusted with it, on account of its injustice and despotism, their rejection of it will be likely to involve their rejection of Christianity altogether, believing (as they must needs do, if they credit our testimony) that injustice, pride and despotism are not inconsistent with the Christian religion. But if injustice, pride and despotism be their besetting sins, and if they are intent on finding a religion that will allow them for the practice of these vices, then our testimony will embolden them to trust in the religion of a pro-slavery church (and the more especially if we profess to be the earnest friends of the enslaved), but such a religion being a false religion, and not the religion of Jesus Christ, will do them no good, but bind them more firmly in the delusions of the grand deceiver of souls.

DUTY TO OUR FAMILIES.

Some abolitionists can not bear to think of disconnecting themselves with the pro-slavery churches to which they belong, because, as they say, they want to take their families to some religious meeting, on the Sabbath, and they know of no other place of public worship where they could attend. But the first question to settle is whether slavery be a self-evident and aggravated sin, utterly inconsistent with the Christian religion—and whether an earnest advocacy of the claims of the oppressed be essential to the character of a true Christian. If this be the truth, then an incorrigible pro-slavery or neutral church is an anti-Christian church. And to educate your family in such a church is to educate them in a false religion, which they must renounce before they can be saved; and the renunciation of which, as already observed, will be likely, under such circumstances, to be connected with the renunciation of the Bible itself. If you would do all in your power to shut up your children to the horrible alternative of either embracing a false religion, or else rejecting religion altogether, the most effectual way of securing the result will be, while you profess to abhor and loathe slavery, to educate them in a pro-slavery church, to which you lend the sanction of your own membership and support. Would you educate your children in the Romish church, or teach them to worship in a Mahomedan mosque, because you could get access to no other place of public worship? You know you would not. And there are professed Protestant Christian churches in this country, whose errors are such, in your view, that you probably would not educate your families in their places of worship. But can they be more odious in God's sight, or more dangerous to your children, than those professedly evangelical and orthodox churches, where the Lord Jesus Christ himself (in the persons of his crushed poor, "the least of his brethren") is scornfully thrust into a corner or out of doors, and where not a lip must be uttered in his behalf?

DUTY TO THE CHURCHES—TO CHURCH-MEMBERS.

We are bound to deal truthfully and honestly with

COVENANT OBLIGATIONS.

OUR HONESTY—INTEGRITY—AND USEFULNESS.

Abolitionists are evidently losing the public confidence, on account of their inconsistency in this respect, and especially are they losing their influence with the members of the churches to which they belong. Just as their reputation and influence were destroyed at one time by their adhesion to the political

DEBTY 'TO THE STATE'

THE HONOR OF GOD—CHRIST—OF RELIGION—OF THE

• The Legislature of the State of New York excused themselves from transacting the Constitutional extension of the elective franchise to the colored people, because, as they alledged, the Christian churches did not give them an equal place, in their houses of worship, and seminaries of religious learning !

• TEMPTATIONS--APOSTASY.

"Evil communications corrupt good manners" in a meeting house, and in a church, as well as every where else. "Lead us not into temptation?" is a prayer that requires of the petitioner that he runs not wantonly into temptation; nor remain there, without necessity and without warrant. How shall a Christian and a friend of freedom secure himself from the seductions that must beset him in a corrupt church—in a proslavery church? What warrant has he for so doing? Or where is his warrant for so doing? right lies hid to expect the divine protection while regarding the injunction—"Come out of her, my people?" In what way can such a person be preserved from temptations?

ation and from apostasy, but by being induced to comply with this command. If he continues to protest against slavery, as heinous sin, and against the support of it by the church, as inconsistent with his Christian character—and if (the church still retaining its position) he nevertheless continues his connection with it, and thus endorses its Christian character, then his acts contradict his professions and he makes shipwreck of his fidelity in this way. The only alternative left him (short of secession) is the more common one of relaxing, modifying or suppressing his testimony against slavery, defending his continued connection with the church by seeking out apologies for the church itself, and thus bringing his principles down to the low standard of his penitents. Scores of prominent ministers, and thousands of active church members, once zealous in the cause of Christian freedom, have in this way, and for the sake of peace and quiet with their religious associates, and of maintaining a reputable standing among them, (and under the delusion of making themselves useful by this means,) relaxed their exertions in the cause of the oppressed, till their voices are no longer heard in their behalf, and they cease to identify themselves with their former fellow-laborers in the cause. This well-known power of pro-slavery churches and ministers to neutralize that, and then silence, their anti-slavery members, constitutes altogether the most formidable obstacle with which the anti-slavery cause has ever had to contend, and the prolific parent of apostasy, in its varied forms. The readiness of professed abolitionists in their political relations, may be chiefly charged to the delinquencies of the churches and ministers by whom their political ethics have been slipped; and let must that man know of human nature, or of human history, who should expect the purification of the state, without the purification of the church.

As this power of a pro-slavery church and ministry is most effectual against freedom, so we know it is the power most relied upon by the conservators of oppression, both at the North and at the South. Such churches and ministers calculate, with certainty, upon the ultimate dereliction of the abolitionists whom they can retain in their connection. Hence their confident boasts and predictions, that "the excitement will speedily subside." And hence, too, their active outcry against any attempts at secession, on the part of those whom they designate as "fanatics," "secessionists" and "disorganizers," and whom they ought to have excommunicated as such, long ago, if they were sincere, and probably would have done, but for their encouraging prospects of success, and progress in curing them of their sympathy for the enslaved.

The Christian church was designed as an asylum into which men of integrity might run, in order to secure themselves from the evil communications and temptations that almost overwhelm them elsewhere. But when churches become the most effective temples to transgression, it is high time for the people of "God to" come out of them; lest they partake of their sins, and receive of their plague.

PERVERSION AND MISDEEDS.

And this suggests the general remark, that Christians are bound to secede from corrupt and apostate churches, because, instead of answering the original ends of their institution and organization, they become, by their perverted use, the most effective of all possible or conceivable instrumentalities for destroying the cause of righteousness. They were designed to promote and for promoting the cause of righteousness which they were intended to destroy. Universal church history may be cited as presenting one extended commentary on this remark. And those who shall come after us, will read and perceive, in the records of our own age and nation, one of the most striking illustrations of the same truth. Commemorative teaches us the absurdity of sustaining organizations and wielding instrumentalities that produce results directly opposite to those which they were intended to subserve, and which their supporters design to promote. To this, likewise, the sacred Scriptures agree. The salt that has lost its savor is to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. The well arranged and highly cultivated vineyard, that, instead of producing grapes, brought forth wild grapes, was to be trampled down and laid waste. (See ch. v.) Of churches, as well as of individuals, it may be demanded—If the light that is in us be darkness, how great is that darkness? And the candlestick that can not be made to diffuse useful light, is to be removed out of its place. To cling to a corrupt and perverted church organization is to sacrifice the end to the means. It is to idolize the instrument instead of the thing; nay, after it has become an instrument of evil, instead of good; it is the essence of apostasy, and the very way in which the worst superstitions are engendered, introduced and perpetuated.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

The duty of secession from a corrupt church is the same thing, in essence, as the duty of maintaining gospel discipline in a true church. In both cases, the point of the matter is the separation of the good from the evil, and the evil from the good—that the faithful may be preserved from corruption, and that the apostate may be reformed and, if possible, reclaimed. In both cases, the duty devolves on each and every member of the church, and is not confined to his officers or to those in official station. It was as competent in Luther to excommunicate the Pope and the Romish church, as it was in the Pope and the Romish church to excommunicate Luther.

DEFINITION AND OBJECT OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Secession from an anti-Christian church is demanded by the very definition, as well as by the object of a true church. "A church of Christ is an assembly of believers"—"a congregation of faithful men." All, therefore, who honor and prize the Christian church, are bound to secede from a congregation of practical unbelievers—of unfaithful men. To do otherwise is to sin against the organization itself. It is disorganization, of the worst kind. It mixes good men with bad men in the church, just as they are mixed in the world, and thus it practically denies the distinction between the church and the world. Equally clear, is it that no Christian can have a right to support a church, or remain connected with it, if the church does not promote the object for which Christian churches were originally founded. Christian churches were organized to separate God's people from a wicked world—to embody their Christian example—to secure their mutual watch care over each other—to maintain wholesome discipline—to act as a reformatory body—to instruct the ignorant—to rebuke and reclaim the transgressor. To support churches that fail to do these things, and that do the very reverse of them all—(churches that knowingly admit and retain the wicked within their enclosures, that exhibit an ungodly example, that strengthen the hands of the wicked, that oppose reformatory efforts, that make instructive discussion, that apologize for flagrant transgression)—to support such churches, we affirm, is to oppose the high and holy objects for which Jesus Christ instituted a church upon the earth.

CHURCH, OR NO CHURCH.

In a word, the reasons for seceding from a corrupt and ungodly church are the same with the reasons for joining and supporting a true Christian church. For the one is the opposite of the other. No man can belong to and support a true church and ministry, while he belongs to and supports an anti-Christian church and ministry. All the time he retains a membership in a corrupt church, he neglects, of course, the duty of joining himself to, and supporting, and being supported by, a true Christian church. He does that which, if every other Christian should do, there would be no Christian church (as an organized visible body) on the earth, and there would be no organized churches except corrupt, anti-Christian churches, to be used for the conversion of the world. Whether the final triumph of Christianity are to be achieved under such auspices, let those judge who have learned that "out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

IX. HOW THE DUTY SHOULD BE DISCHARGED.

The duty of secession from a corrupt church implies, of course, that all proper and scriptural measures for its reformation have been kindly and faithfully, but unsuccessfully, employed. Such a work as secession is not to be undertaken without counting the cost, nor without seeking counsel of God, in humble reliance upon the divine aid. No selfish or partizan feelings should be admitted or indulged. The too common practice of breaking up church relations in a pet, in a spirit of personal contention, with angry altercation and expressions of resentment, can not be too pointedly condemned. Whenever churches are divided in this way, the seceders, though they may have the right on their side, (and though the deserted church may be never so corrupt,) can accomplish little or nothing in favor of the objects they would promote. Their bad temper and wrong conduct will be observed and perhaps magnified, and the moral effect of their testimony will be neutralized, if not destroyed. And when the excitement shall have subsided, they will discover, perhaps, themselves, that they have acted passionately and rashly, and not in the spirit of Christ: Intelligent Christian principles, and a deliberate, conscientious, holy, disinterested regard to God's glory and the good of mankind, having had little, comparatively, to do with their movements, do not now come to their aid, to sustain them in their now and trying position. They are thus exposed to the dangers of seduc-

tion and compromise; and, under given circumstances, will be likely to revert to their ground, and in alliance, either in church relations, or by associated religious effort, with the same corrupt churches from whom they had come out, or with some others of a similar description. Thus the cause of church reformation will be retarded, on the whole, instead of promoted, by their secession. On this subject, we can not now treat as fully as its importance demands, but we may be certain that the true spirit of Christian Reformation is evermore the spirit of holy love, of consecration, of humility, of prayer, and of a sound mind.

As a matter of form, it should be added that, whatever efforts may have been previously made to enlighten and reform a related church, the final measure of secession should not ordinarily, if ever, be taken, without distinctly stating to the church, in some formal way, by letter or otherwise, the grievances of which the parties complain, and stating also that unless those grievances are redressed, by a return of the church to the path of Christian duty, a division or secession must, of necessity, take place. If this communication produces no salutary effect, the way will then be open for going forward, in the work of secession, and of organizing a new church. This measure will cut off occasion for saying that the secession was irregularly made, and that it was a breach of the covenant obligations into which Christians enter, when uniting themselves to a church.

V. OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. "Schism! schism!! Schism!!!" —What is "Schism" to come out of Babylon? If it be schism to be separated from the churches of Jesus Christ, then it is "schismatic" to remain in an anti-Christian church—not schismatic to come out from it.

2. "But we are too few and too feeble." In whom, then, is your strength—your life? Is it in yourselves, or is it hid with Christ, in God? You had better not enter into or hold any church relations, until you learn that the strength of the church is in Jesus Christ—not in herself, nor in the number and reputable standing of her members. "Where two or three are met together, in my name," says the Savior, "there am I in the midst of them." And he says this with special reference to church organization and church action. (See Matthew xviii.) If the real Christians belonging to a church are "too few and too feeble" to constitute a church by themselves, how much more strength do they gain, in addition, by their connection with those who are not the people of God, and who oppose, instead of cherishing their aims? You would not (would you?) maintain ecclesiastical connections with Belial, on account of the precarious strength he might afford you?

3. "But what if I can not find 'two or three' to come out of Babylon with me. Must I come alone?" Yes, certainly, if you would not "partake of her sins and receive of her plagues." At Constantinople, at Rome, at Mecca, you would not ask whether you ought to stand alone, or stand with the enemies of the cross of Christ. Would you? Why then ask the same question in the State of New York, or in New England, or in Ohio?

4. "But we are conscious of a low state of spirituality among ourselves, and do not feel competent to the task of organizing a new church." No wonder your spirituality is at a low ebb, and that you are chilled, almost to death, by the ice-bergs that embrace you? Have you to get warmth in such company? The slaves, it is sometimes said, are not yet prepared for freedom. But is slavery the school in which to prepare them? God commands you to "come out from among them, and be separate," and he "will receive you." This plain command you disobey, and excuse your disobedience by pleading that you have little spiritual life! Disobedience is not the way to gain spiritual vigor. The way to gain more spiritual strength is to exercise what you have. Then shall ye know, if ye follow on, to know the Lord. Ye are not straitened in him. Ye are straitened in your own selves. To obey is better than sacrifice. Let not obedience be deferred, because the fire upon the altar burns dimly.

5. "But by separating from the church with which we are connected, we shall lose our influence with the members, and can then do them no good." How much good are you doing them, now? What progress have they made under your influence, during the past year? for the last five years? Is it you that are exerting an influence upon them, or is it they that are exerting an influence upon you?

The probability is, that you have lost your influence upon them, already, by your inconsistency, in maintaining a connection with a church that your professed principles require you to regard as anti-Christian; and that no measure except secession, on your part, can give you

any hold upon their consciences or make them believe that you are sincere, and in earnest. The case must be so, if you have continued your connection with them for many months after the righteous cause they contend had been fairly presented, or offered to be presented, before them, and they had turned a deaf ear, or rejected the claim. If your duty in this respect has not yet been discharged, you should have no time in discharging it, and not make the neglect of one duty your excuse for neglecting another. The claims of the slave have been distinctly before the nation for ten years. And the justice of the claim was declared "self-evident" by that nation, nearly sixty-seven years ago. It is the simple question whether a man should be made a chattel—a *serf*—and such a question need not perplex a Christian church, many weeks.

6. "Our secession would weaken and discourage those who, in the main, hold our views, but who can not, at present, be persuaded to abandon their church." Answer.—They ought to be weakened and discouraged, in a course of wrong doing. Your example of obedience may encourage them to the discharge of the same duty. What if Luther had remained in a corrupt church, until he could have persuaded all whom he considered true Christians, to come out with him? And until he could thus persuade them, without setting, himself, the example?

7. "But secession, as a means of reformation, is without precedent. Even Luther did not secede, till he was first thrust out of the church." Perhaps the church of England, the Puritans and other Dissenters, might furnish us with a precedent for secession, not to claim higher authorities, which our objector might be inclined to dispute. But if the practice were without precedent, it would not be without command. The text is explicit.—"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Suppose nobody had ever furnished us with a "precedent," by complying with this divine injunction, would that blot it out, or excuse our neglect of it?

8. "But we must wait till we are excommunicated for our faithful discharge of duty, before we secede." Who says so? Does God say it, in the text, or any where else? And what is the philosophy of the maxim? How can we "faithfully discharge our duty," while our actions contradict our professions, and while we give our support to an anti-Christian church? And suppose Satan should adopt the more cunning policy of not casting us out of his Babylon, at all? Must we remain there, and give it our sanction, until the mighty Angel from heaven takes it into his hand, and plunges it like a mill stone into the sea, to be found no more, at all? Shall we not be in danger of sinking with it, and of remaining so, whether Satan ever gets ready to thrust us out of it, or not? What says the text? And what warrant have we for deferring to obey the divine mandate, until Satan chooses to give the signal for us to obey? Or will it be said that a church does not give evidence of being anti-Christian until it excludes all pious persons from its communion? What occasion or what meaning could there be in the command to "come out" from a corrupt church, if we were to remain till we are thrust out?

9. "But if the persons whom you call upon to secede from a corrupt church, be admitted to be godly and righteous persons, not, notwithstanding their present connections, (and to such only is the exhortation addressed), how can it be made to appear that their quitting the church is necessary to their escaping the divine judgments? If they are Christians already, is not that sufficient? Will secession change their character? Will it make them more than Christians? Or will the Judge of all the earth destroy the righteous with the wicked?"

* Will any suggest that the principles of Christian union are violated by leaving a corrupt church? Those principles, certainly, can not require us to cling to such churches, nor to the corrupt portion of them. Such an union would be anti-Christian union. And as to the sound portion of such churches, we can not be bound to hold anti-Christian connections, in order to remain with them. If seceders from such churches will establish new ones on the principle of receiving all Christians, they will be guilty of no schism, and it will be no fault of theirs, if some of their brethren consent to a separation from them, rather than quit a corrupt church, to go with them.

† What was it but secession, when the Apostles organized new churches among the Hebrews and the Gentiles? Whenever the members of an old church organize a new one, are they not accounted seceders? But the Jewish church was a national church, from which the Jewish prophets could not secede, as they might have done under the New Testament economy.

Imagine to yourself the righteous Lot, addressing this same plea to the angel that was urging his speedy flight from Sodom! What would you say to such an argument? Would it not occur to you that "the righteous are scarcely saved"? That persevering obedience to the divine commands is the only condition of their salvation? That in such obedience the salvation of the Bible is continually consists?

But be it so, that good men may live and die in the bosom of a corrupt church, and escape final perdition, at last, what then? They may possibly do this, because they are not aware of the corruption of the church, or because their duty to come out of it, has not been distinctly presented to them. If their ignorance be their excuse, can you make the same plea? "Or are you content to do wrong, to support a counterfeit church, and thus destroy souls, so long as you can be persuaded that you are safe, yourself? Is this the religion that can preserve you amid the seductions of a corrupt church? Beware! It is a hazardous experiment, at best, and remember that a mere chastisement and inner tribulation, short of final banishment, may punish your derelictions of duty.

10. "But we make a wide distinction between Christian fellowship and church connection. We do not extend Christian fellowship to corrupt churches, or to the corrupt portion of them. Our connection with these is merely nominal—it is a nonentity."

But the church of the living God, to which you ought to belong, is no "nonentity"—no counterfeit—no sham. And a vital connection with such a church and its members is not "merely nominal." What right, or what good reason can you have for maintaining a nominal connection with a "nonentity"—a sham? A "nonentity," too, that claims to be a true church of Jesus Christ? That is recognized and honored and confided in, as such, *because*, perhaps, of your "nominal" connection with it? Of all shams, church shams are the worst, and from their sure doom, how shall their supporters be divorced?

To say that you maintain a connection "nominally" is to say that you maintain that connection "by name or in name only." It is to say that you profess to maintain a connection which you do not maintain *really*. What right have you to make such a hollow profession? After all, are you quite certain that such a connection is "merely nominal"? When Paul urged the Corinthian church to put away from themselves that wicked person, (1 Cor. v.) he demanded, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" What if the Corinthians had argued that the connection was a merely nominal one?

11. "But is not the kingdom of heaven likened unto leaven hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened"? Yes, truly. And this parable was designed to illustrate the power of truth on the heart, or the power and progress of the gospel, or of a true church (remaining such) in converting the world. And mark? The leaven must be wholesome leaven, not saturated with poison! The figure is never used in the Bible to show that Christians must remain in a corrupt, anti-Christian church, in order to restore it, nor has church history yet recorded the successful experiment. The "old leaven" of iniquity is always to be "purged out" of the church (1 Cor. v. 7).—the very doctrine for which we contend.

12. "But the tares and the wheat must be permitted to grow together until the harvest." Where? In the church? Or in the world? Christ's own exposition of the parable (Mat. xiii. 38.) informs us explicitly that "the field" in which the tares and the wheat are allowed to "grow together" is "the world." Nothing of the kind is said about the church. And those who apply to the church what Christ says of the world, very evidently take it for granted that there should be no distinction made between the church and the world; and no more church discipline maintained in the one than in the other! "Disorganization" follows, of course.

13. "But we can not see into men's hearts." Judge not, that ye be not judged." (Mat. vii. 1.) This text, as Scott justly observes, can not forbid the exclusion from the church of such members as disgrace their profession—nor forbid Christians to withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly. In the same chapter, Christ bids us, "Beware of false prophets," and because we can not see directly into men's hearts, bids us know "the tree by its fruits." Censorious and rash judgments alone are condemned. Some judgment of men's character, were not but form and express.

14. "Does it not savor of Pharisaism to secede from churches, and call them corrupt?" No. Not if

* "Nominally. By name or in name only."—Webster's Dictionary.

the evidence of their corruption is plain and palpable—no more than it does to refuse the admission openly wicked men into the church, in the first place—no more than it does to gather churches out of the world, in any case, (unless all are permitted to join the church, who desire it.)

GENERAL REMARK.

Of each and every one of these objections, and of my answers, like them, it may be observed that, if valid at all, they are equally so against secessions from all corrupt churches (the Romish, for example,) as well as from corrupt Protestant churches, in America. They like to forbid all excommunications of unworthy members. They equally forbid all tests of church membership, particularly those predicated on evidences of Christian character. They involve principles which, if carried out, would disband all the church organizations in the world, except those (such as national churches, for example) that claim or welcome the entire community, and had indiscriminately, as their members. Above all, they are objections against the discharge of a plainly revealed Christian duty.

It will be understood that we advocate secession from anti-Christian churches, with the view of organizing Christian churches in their stead. Of this work, we intend to treat, in our next number.

Christian Investigator.

Whitesboro, March, 1843.

Expecting to remove westward the first of May, as before mentioned, we wish to issue the April and May numbers before we remove. For this purpose, we need all the money our friends can spare us, immediately. Those in this region and eastward, who are subscribed on the "Plan of the Whitesboro Convention," are particularly called upon, in this crisis, and their remittances can be more conveniently made now than after our removal.

ONEIDA INSTITUTE.

The Institute term will commence on Thursday, April 6th. The advantages offered will be much the same as those of the last year. The students, however, will be expected to sustain the boarding-hall expenses themselves. Their labor, so far as needed, on the farm, may be applied in defraying, in part, the expenses of the board.

WHITESBORO ASSOCIATION.

A Quarterly Meeting of the Whitesboro Association will be held, with the leave of Providence, at Theberg, on Tuesday, April 4th, at 1 o'clock, P. M.

H. ELMER, Registrar.

Whitesboro, March 23, 1843.

RECEIPTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

O. D. Marsh Cayuga 1 00; G. Smith Peterboro 5 00; S. Darling Somerset 1 00; F. Liebholt Utica 1 00; J. Delong do 50c; A. B. Hunt do 5 00; A. B. DeForest Albionville 1 00; of M. Stickney Lockport, for W. G. T. best Cambria 1 00 and D. W. Lockett 50c and P. Gooding do 50c; Mrs. Sandford Utica 50c; G. Mar Pulaski 25c; W. Hecox Seneca 1 00; W. E. Porter Whitesboro 25c; J. P. Mann Mansville 25c; H. Mann do 1 00; Mrs. F. Skinner Utica 40c; R. Pratt Westmoreland 50c; J. Cole Salisbury 1 00; J. Dewey Leyden 50c; J. Wells Holland Patent 50c; H. Houghton Martinsburg 50c; H. Gilbert Volney 50c; W. R. Bor Palmera 50c; P. Thomas Utica 50c; H. E. Sherman Rochester 50c; J. D. Underwood Herkimer 50c; B. Hayward Montpelier 1 00; H. Y. Barnes do 50c; J. Benham Larned's Corners 50c; A. Sawyer do 50c; Dunkle do 50c; J. Devel do 50c; D. D. Dalton do 50c; Furman do 50c; J. Stanton Cassville 50c; D. Thurston Wintrop 50c; D. Carr do 50c; L. Noble Crane Corners 50c; paper, bound 4 00; Amount \$26 65.

RECEIVED ON "PLAN FOR EDITOR'S SUPPORT."

D. Bartlett Whitesboro 5 00; F. M. Hopkins Troy 1 00; J. Holt Sherburne 2 00; J. Campbell Litchfield 30c; E. Holcomb Winfield 1 00; S. P. Hough Whitesboro 5 00; Amount 17 00.

S. W. GREEN, PRINTER.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. 1—No. 3,
WHOLE NUMBER, 11.

WHITESBORO, N. Y., APRIL, 1843.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix. 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

[NEW SERIES.]

Twelve numbers in a volume. To be published monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.

Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 60 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services:—

Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:

Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, \$0 50

Twenty-eight papers for 1 00

Sixty papers for 2 00

One hundred papers for 3 00

Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE III.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION—CHURCH ORDER—CHURCH GOVERNMENT—CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

These subjects must come under discussion, of course, in any serious inquiry or movement upon the subject of a reformation in the church. To amend is "to amend, to correct, to restore to a former good state." It is "to form again, to create or shape anew." [Nash Webster.] Such a work must imply and require a correct idea of the original model upon which the thing to be amended was constructed, and of its beneficial workings, while in a sound condition. Without such an idea, no surgeon or watch-repairer can be qualified for his task. And just so, in a church reformation, the very first thing, after learning the fact of derangement, is to ascertain the primitive model, by a return to which, former order may be restored. For though the form may exist, for a time, without the spirit, there is no reason to expect the spirit without the form.

PREJUDICES AGAINST THE DISCUSSION;—THEIR ORIGIN, AND MISCHIEFS.

Many serious Christians cherish a strong aversion to any discussion of church order and church government; a still greater number take no decided interest in the subject, and even a majority, perhaps, of church members will confess their neglect of it, and their consequent inability to state with precision the principles of the church polity with which they are themselves connected, or the reasons of the usages to which they conform, and to which they lend their sanction. Still less able are they to compare the polity of their own church with that of other denominations around them, and to give a reason why they prefer the one to the other, if indeed they are distinctly conscious of any denominational preference, on these grounds, at all. And these most strenuously attached to the usages of their own sect;

are often found to be quite as ignorant in these particulars as those whose adhesion is confessedly a matter of mere wont or accident.

All this is manifestly wrong. But it is not difficult to account for this state of things. The benefits of "church organization" have not been as marked and as manifest as they should have been: "church discipline" has sunk into disuse, or has been wielded as an engine of oppression, or as a medium of prosecuting personal quarrels. "Church order" has become, in many instances, the watchword of bigotry, or the convenient instrument of checking personal independence and activity, and arresting efforts for necessary reforms. "Church government" has furnished an arena for sectarian rivalry, for ecclesiastical ambition and preferment. Under such circumstances they have excited disgust. The pious have sought other sources of edification, in preference to those furnished by ecclesiastical assemblages—other fields of activity and usefulness. They have noticed that a zeal for the forms of religion is often connected with the utter destitution of its spirit. They have witnessed instances of shining piety under almost all forms of church government—they have concluded (and correctly enough) that men may find their way to the Mercy-Seat, and to the Haven of final Rest, notwithstanding much that may be deemed defective or even vicious in the polity of their sect. It is the substance, and not the form of religion, that they would labor to promote. They find, perhaps, their dear and chosen fellow laborers connected with a church polity, different from their own. With a good natured charity—a Catholic liberality—they conclude to leave the forms of religion, and the usages of church polity to be settled or contested, as they may, by those who seem to have nothing else, of particular importance, to do!

Precisely as Satan would have it! If the good men in the church (as in the state) will only just leave the little matter of Organization, Order, Government, Discipline and Polity with him, he can manage it all to his own liking, and so shape things as to suffer little annoyance from the two grand institutions ordained of Heaven—the one, for his restraint, and the other for his overthrow! Nay more! He may even wield them for his own ends!

THEIR UNREASONABLENESS.

The good men in the church, who have been tempted to undervalue the importance of church government, should look at the other side of the picture. Divine institutions, when perverted, should not be abandoned, nor their perversion sanctioned. They should be reformed: or if existing organizations can not be reformed, then others, on the true Bible model, should be established in their stead.

Be it so, that correct forms may be held, without the living spirit. What then? Are forms of church polity indifferent? If so, then the usurpations of Romanism are indifferent, and the grand contest whether Jesus Christ or the "Man of Sin" shall govern the church is to be given up, without further struggle.

And be it so, that the true-hearted soldier of the cross, with defective armor, or in company with false or unskillful allies, or under leaders, whose irregular evolutions greatly diminish his efficiency, may receive at length the approbation of his Master in heaven, is it nothing that half his strength has been wasted or worse than wasted? Is it nothing that his influence has been on the side of usurpation and disorder? Is it nothing that the final victory of the church militant over a rebellious world is delayed through tedious centuries, for want of heeding the prescribed order and discipline of the GREAT LEADER? Has the Christian nothing to do but to secure heaven for himself? And has the prayer of piety, on his behalf, no other petition to make for him, than that he shall not finally perish?

If Christ has ever established a church, at all, it is for some definite object, connected with man's social nature, and for the accomplishment of good among mankind. Such an object requires organization and order. And these must be ascertained and honored, before the intended effect can be produced.

CRIMINALITY OR INDIFFERENCE.

To be ignorant of church order, or indifferent towards it, is to be ignorant or indifferent, in respect to the divinely-appointed means of reclaiming a lost world. It is, in effect, to give up, in practice, the institution of the church, altogether! The question involved, is that of church or no church. Some definite order and polity churches must have, if they exist at all, and these can not be matters of indifference or of light import.

The whole question of human liberty, political and religious, is bound up in the question of church government. No people enjoy a greater degree of religious liberty than their church polity permits them to enjoy; and civil and political liberty, in order to deserve the name, must spring from spiritual freedom; from pure religious liberty. In the church, as in the state, "eternal vigilance is the only price of freedom." What would be thought of our prospects as a community, if the people in general were as confessedly ignorant and indifferent in respect to civil government as they are in respect to church government? But their liberties depend quite as much upon the latter as upon the former. Whatever of liberty is incorporated into the political institutions of this country, was derived from the ecclesiastical polity of our puritan fathers, and we should have had a purer liberty in the state, had it been found in the church. No people will long maintain a higher or a purer liberty, in the state than is maintained in the church arrangements of their current religion. To suppose otherwise is to suppose the stream to rise higher than the fountain. It is to suppose the manifest self-contradiction that man can be free from the tyranny of man, while he permits man to restrain the free intercourse between man and his Maker!

SPECIAL NECESSITY FOR THE DISCUSSION.

In addition to the general importance of the

subject, and the obvious necessity for its discussion, arising from its prevalent neglect, there are special signs of the times that show plainly the necessity of attaining clear and correct views of church order. The elements, both of spiritual despotism on the one hand, and of disorganization on the other, are exhibiting simultaneous symptoms of activity and vigor. The struggle between them can not be far distant, and there is danger that the principles of true Christian freedom and holy church order will be lost sight of, in the contest, and become, if it be possible, still more indistinct and vague, in the minds even of good men, than they now are. The existing arrangements of the now divided church, (to the disorders of which, use and habit have strangely reconciled us,) may perhaps be subverted and succeeded by a confusion still more wild and chaotic, or swallowed up by that all-comprehensive deluge of combined Papal and misnamed Protestant usurpations, through which (as some think) the "deadly wound of the Beast" is yet, for a season, to "be healed."

At all events, there are evident preparations for a grand struggle, in which two elements, at least, to say nothing of a third, must be prominent. **Disorganization and Despotism** are already in the field. Whether **CHRISTIAN LIBERTY**, understanding her true position and great work, is to appear, in her divine panoply, remains to be seen.

What a rush do we witness—from the ranks of Episcopacy towards Romanism—from among Presbyterians towards Episcopacy—by so-called Congregationalists and Baptists towards Presbyterianism! What a flight of stairs have we here! How regularly the steps rise above each other! With what facility in the ladder ascended—in some instances, by two steps at a time—sometimes by a noiseless approximation in which the foot-fall is not heard—sometimes by a deceptive reclining posture, which leaves the feet near the bottom of the ladder, while the head rests, or the hand reaches, near the top!

And this effort to extend church authority and ministerial prerogative—how is it met—and by whom? Is it by rational, scriptural, thorough and faithful exhibitions of democratic, New Testament church order? Is it by those whose position marks them as the successors of the Puritan Independents? Or is it not rather the watch-word of "No church-organization," that is heard—and from the lips of men who have never entered into any of the existing organizations of the church, or who, having come out of them, seek and desire no purer church organizations in their stead?

Chattel Slavery, with its names of blasphemy on its forehead, seats itself in the high places of the church arrangements that now exist. There it expounds the Bible, and gives law to God's people! It presides over the Theological Seminary, even in the "free North." It occupies the Professor's chair. It proclaims its own bloody and obscene code to be a Bible institution. It enters the sanctuary, and erects its negro pew. It dictates to the General Conference the exclusion of colored testimony from the church of Christ; to the General Assembly the censure of those who exclude slaveholders from their pulpits—to the Triennial Convention the exclusion of its opponents from the Foreign Missionary Board. There it sits unrebuked by those in church power, while

those who do rebuke it are, in their turn, rebuked as "disturbers of the peace of the church"! There it sits, and all endeavors to exorcise the foul demon are deprecated as profane attempts—(tell it not in Gath)—to "rend the seamless garment of Christ!"

The church portals are guarded by those who will admit none who can not pronounce, distinctly, the shibboleths of the sects. In all the outward forms and ceremonies, there must be uniformity complete. This is enforced in the name of "Church Discipline" and of "Church Order." But "Church Discipline" and "Church Order" have nothing to say against enforcing labor without wages—withholding the Bible—annulling the marriage institution—chattelizing the immortal soul—selling the image of God, at auction—against those who do these things, the prevalent "church discipline" has "no law"—and when any church member remonstrates, he becomes an offender! He is met with the apostolic injunction, "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations!"

If the friends of humanity and freedom seek the reformation of the church, they are marked as *disorganizers*. In the holy name of "church order" they are warned against "schism!" No marvel that there are those, in increasing numbers, who are beginning to mock at the sin of "schism," and to suspect that "church order" is only another name for priestly usurpation and cunning! Do not the times require a thorough discussion of church organization, church discipline and church order?

No clerical warnings or ecclesiastical anathemas will avail with some now in the churches, to retain them in connection with pro-slavery or neutral church organizations, much longer; convinced, as they now are, or soon will be, that in many cases no reformation of those organizations is to be effected, and that they can not themselves remain permanently in such a connection, without bringing guilt upon their own souls. Multitudes of Christians, of different ecclesiastical connections, are beginning to find themselves in this position. They must either remain without any church connections, at all, or they must organize themselves anew. But on what model shall they organize? Shall they establish churches upon the principles of Congregational Independency? Or upon the principles of Presbyterianism? Or upon the principles of Episcopacy? Some of them have been accustomed to one of these forms of church polity, and some to another. Can they, henceforth, agree to come under the same church polity and act together? And if so, upon which form? And for what reasons? These are questions that they must satisfactorily decide, or else, after having left their old churches, on account of their departure from fundamental truth and sound morality, they will be unable to unite together in their defense. And they must adopt a church government in accordance with the principles of liberty and human rights, yet, at the same time, effective in the maintenance of a strict discipline, or else, between despotism on the one hand and licentiousness on the other, their enterprise will be wrecked.

A variety of circumstances combine to give significance to questions of church organization and church order, at the present time. More or less directly connected with the anti-slavery question in the churches, and with the

various positions of ministers and churches in respect to it, a number of ecclesiastical bodies have assumed unwonted and unexpected positions. Thus, the General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian church abdicates its judicial authority to get rid of condemning slavery, but readily resumes it again to check the efforts of its uncompromising opponents. Synods are willing either to be connected with the General Assembly, or to maintain an independent position, according to the bearing anticipated on topics of popular agitation. And yet a connection with the General Assembly, and a recognition of its high powers, is often insisted on, as belonging to the definition of Presbyterianism. In Ohio, the Presbyteries have decided that Congregational churches connected with Presbyteries, or what is called the "accommodation plan," forfeit their meeting-houses and church funds, if they adventure to dissolve the connection! In Central New York, a Presbytery has denied the validity of licentiations and ordinations of ministers, by a Congregational Association, because it contained a lay element in its composition! By the same precedent, the validity of all Baptist and Congregational ordinations, conducted on the well-known principles and ancient usages of those sects, might be denied. Assumptions like these can not fail to excite public attention to the principles of church order, and convince men that the discussion can not longer be deferred.

In one State of this Union, the liberties of the people, civil and political, have been violently subverted by a lawless rebellion, countenanced by the slaveholding chief magistrate of the nation, and upon the openly avowed policy of suppressing, in northern freemen, a precedent of popular sovereignty, which the slaves of the South might perchance be encouraged to follow. And foremost in this foul work have been leading pastors of the churches in that State, through whose influence church censures and excommunications have been resorted to, as among the most effectual measures for crushing the spirit of freedom, and bringing the populace under subjection to lawless tyrants, wielding irresponsible military power, and committing acts of barbarism that would disgrace the *3d* of the Vandals. These achievements have been celebrated by public thanksgivings; and men wielding ecclesiastical authority, and conducting the ecclesiastical press, in all the free States, have been seen to sympathize, deeply, in the operation! If such be the power of church officers, and if it be thus wielded, it can not be said that questions of church polity and official church authority are of slight import, to our fellow-citizens at large, as well as to members of the churches.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE INQUIRY.

Our hearts must first be imbued with the benevolent and holy spirit of Christianity, our souls absorbed in its grand object, and our wills bent on the prosecution of its sublime enterprise, before we shall be prepared to form any just estimate or clear conceptions of those positive institutions through which that spirit finds its appropriate expression, and by the instrumentality of which it urges the prosecution of its labors, and the accomplishment of its designs.

All the positive institutions of religion, and church organizations among the rest, are the

nificant expressions of its spirit, the natural forms of its living activity, the well-adapted means of compassing its high moral ends. The spirit of the institution, the character and aims of its divine founder, the benevolent objects he had in view, the moral changes he designed to produce in the earth, the habits and feelings he meant to foster in his disciples, the culture and discipline he wished them to employ for their mutual improvement, the services he determined to require at their hands, the position he intended they should occupy towards each other, and the exertions he required them to make for the recovery of lost men, these are among the particulars to be first ascertained, to be clearly understood, to be heartily prized, to be earnestly attempted, to be constantly kept in view, if we would attain to any correct conceptions of the institution, the order and the discipline of the Christian church. The institution is but the instrument for the accomplishment of these high spiritual and moral ends. From these it derives all its value. Without these it becomes worthless. All its details are arranged in the manner best suited to promote these. Just in proportion to the intelligence and fidelity with which we labor to promote these ends, shall we be able to understand and use gratefully the simple and well-adjusted instruments our Divine Master has ordained for our assistance. Here, as in every other department of human activity, we can understand the construction and use of the machinery only in the light of the purposes it was designed to accomplish. The true doctrine of church order, like every other doctrine of Christ, is to be learned in no other way than by doing his will. The worker, alone, is the true learner. None but those who accomplish, can properly be said to know. No marvel, then, that church order has so long been regarded with contempt, or made a subject of contention! Servants idle in their Lord's vineyard, would not earnestly or successfully study the appointed instruments of their labor. Content that the select few should relieve the masses from their work, they have left them to fashion their instruments as they might choose. These, (cultivating the deserted field of their master for themselves,) in their turn, would shape their instruments according to the work (of ambition and aggrandizement, it might be,) they were intent to perform. And clashing and rival interests, among such, would, in time, (or whenever their unity, in any way, should be broken,) give rise to contending and rival machineries or modes of operation. Complex or conflicting objects would beget complex or conflicting instruments. Hence, the confusion, and darkness, and conflicts of the ecclesiastical world, ago after ago. "All seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ." The prerogatives of the Pope, of the Episcopacy, or of some other ecclesiastical body, instead of the spirit and objects of a pure and benevolent Christianity, form the atmosphere in which, to a wide extent, the church polity of our "Christendom" is moulded. And nothing but a return to the spirit of primitive Christianity can ensure a return to its primitive institutions, or infuse its vitality and power into them, if restored.

THE RULE OF DECISION.

Our conceptions of Christianity itself, of its doctrines, its spirit, and its objects, must determine, of necessity, our conceptions of its institutions—its church organization, discipline, government and order. As for example:—

1. If we think Christianity to be in harmony with the spirit of *caste*, then we shall expect to see the spirit of *caste* exhibit itself, in the polity and order of the Christian church. And if we read the New Testament with these views, we shall, of necessity, interpret its language in accordance with the spirit we suppose it to cherish. And when we read of Apostles, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Pastors, and Elders, and Bishops, and Deacons, we shall instantly fancy these descriptions of men to differ from each other in their several *grades* or *castes*, like the castes among the Hindoos, where some are accounted noble and others servile, some sacred and some profane, according to the different, though useful, labors in which they are employed.

But if we conceive that the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of equality—of equity—of loving brotherhood—of meekness—of benevolence—of patient duty-doing—if we remember that the greatest among Christians is servant of all, that they are prohibited from exercising authority over each other, as do the lords of the Gentiles, that they are all a royal priesthood, and that all their labors are sacred, "to the glory of God"—then the idea of grades and castes in the church becomes inadmissible, of course. Official stations there may be, and duties growing out of them, but no distinct *grades*, since all the brotherhood are alike eligible to the same station. Diversities of gifts there may be, and a needful division of labor, but no privileged or revered *caste*—no distinction between honorable and degrading avocation.

2. If Christianity be regarded a convenient device for subjecting the many to the few, the poor to the rich, the base-born to the noble; of sustaining those social and political arrangements by which such ends are promoted; if it complacently smiles on the fleecing of the weak by the strong, and of the simple by the cunning—if this be our view of its proper work, why, then, we shall expect to see this spirit exhibited, and these objects promoted by its forms of church polity. It will then subject the many to the few, the simple to the cunning, the "commonalty" to their "superiors"—the laity to the clergy, the masses to the conclave. And thus the institution of the church will be made a fair expression of its supposed spirit, the fit instrument of its legitimate designs. Arrangements of this character would, of necessity, grow up, and extend themselves, in proportion to the depth and prevalence of such sentiments, and the growth of the one would be the growth of the other. In most cases, both would creep in gradually, and almost unperceived. The members of the local church, for example, might first submit to be governed by a Pastor, or Elders, or Church Session. A sisterhood of churches might next come under the control of a Presbytery of Pastors and Elders—a number of such Presbyteries might, in time, be subjected to a Synod, and at length the Synods to a General Assembly—all, perhaps, in a manner, giving the chief control to the clergy, organized by themselves as a distinct *caste*, a grade. Clerical Associations or Consociations of clergy and select laymen, might answer, partly, the same ends. And so might Conferences, and Yearly and Quarterly Meetings, composed, virtually, of a select few.* An-

* Provincial Conventions or General Meetings for a region of country, requiring the members to leave their homes in order to attend; though nominally open to

other steps, in the same road, would be to place the great body of the clergy under the control of a Conference, or Board of Bishops. And if the Bishops, themselves, should be subjected to a bench of Cardinals, and these, in turn, to a Pope elected by themselves from among their own number, (as the Pope at Rome is elected,) it would only be a consistent completion of the work first commenced, in placing the local church under the government of a Pastor and Church Session. For why should not the clergy give an example of the submission they impose on their lay brethren? If the spirit of Christianity be moved and exemplified in the one case, it can not be contradicted and disgraced by the other.*

But if the spirit and design of Christianity be the reverse of all this—if its message is good tidings to the poor—its leading idea the elevation of the depressed, and the protection of the feeble—if it abases the proud and elevates the meek—if, in its view, the pauper is the equal of the prince, and the vassal the brother of the monarch—if the *immortal* in man is all that it values, whether found in the palace or the hovel—if it recognizes no radical distinctions besides *character*—if it teaches human equality by requiring each to find himself in his neighbor—if its Great Captain, born in a stable, and washing the feet of his disciples, has undertaken to ennoble the so-called "lower classes" throughout the habitable globe—if this be the spirit, the scope, and the end of his religion, then its positive institutions must be in keeping with this spirit, and adapted to this end. Of course they will be the opposite of the arrangements that have been described. Equality will be the "order" of his church—its authority will be shared equally by all. And whoever attempts to "lord it over his heritage," will be guilty of "insubordination" and "disorder."

3. If Christianity considers *individuals* to be of little or no consequence, except as appendages to some great and magnificent organizations, political and religious, if the man was made for the church, and not the church for the man, then, of course, we should expect to see the Christian church so organized and governed, as to merge the individual in the organization, and make him the vassal and the automaton of it. And then, the essence and perfection of "church order" would be the aristocratic usages and polity that have been described, and which so widely prevail. The "church," as defined by arrangements of that character, must mean something quite distinct from the *individuals* of whom it is composed. It must be a church which the many are to obey, but not govern;—a church that the many do not constitute, but only support: a church, of which the mass of the subjects are not the component parts, but only the vassals.

But if the genius and spirit of Christianity be in opposition to all this; if it be upon the *individual*, chiefly, that God fixes his eye; if his churches are, in his view, but assemblies of his individual children; if the church was

all, are really under the control of those whose means and whose leisure or location enable them to attend.

* The biographers of the late Dr. Emmons have preserved among his familiar sayings the following: "Associationism leads to Associationism; Consociationism leads to Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy; Episcopacy leads to Roman Catholicism; and Roman Catholicism is an ultimate fact."

made for the man, and not the man for the church; if the church is to be the instrument of each and every individual that composes it, then no method or forms of church polity can receive the divine sanction, that do not conform to each and all, their due share in the activities and responsibilities of the church. And no church authority is to be wielded that does not leave to the individual his personal responsibility to his Maker, unfettered and unimpaired. This remark suggests another test (if it be another), by which the claims of any scheme of church polity may be tried.

4. If the known doctrines and acknowledged spirit of Christianity hold the individual church member amenable, chiefly, to his minister and his church, instead of his conscience and his God, if he must do what the church says, or believe what she commands, because she commands it, or may do what she permits, because she permits it, or may neglect the discharge of known duties, because she does not enjoin them,—if these be truthful statements of the spirit and requirements of true religion, then, of course, (but not otherwise) is Christianity properly expressed, appropriately embodied, and efficiently promoted by those forms and methods of church polity in which the many are controlled by the few, the people by their clergy, or the clergy by their prelates and popes. And in that case, too, (but not otherwise) does Christian "church order" require or permit regulations by which acknowledged Christians can be kept out of the church, or excluded from it, on account of non-conformity in matters of faith and practice not deemed essential to sound Christian character: or in any way required to violate the dictates of conscience, at the bidding of the church.

5. If it be true that Christianity recognizes no radical and fundamental distinction of character among men, if it does not divide the human family into the two opposite classes of "the righteous and the wicked"—and if, as a matter of fact, no such distinct and opposite classes exist; it may then comport with the spirit and scope of Christianity to throw wide open the doors of the church, for the admission of all who choose to become members, without inquiring into the evidences of their having been radically changed or regenerated by the Spirit of God; nay, without reference to any moral tests or qualifications, at all. A national church, like the church of England, may then deserve no censure for admitting the entire nation, good and bad, to her sealing sacraments and her communion; nor need she be scandalized by the secular control of the Parliament and reigning monarch, whoever or whatever they may be. So too the church—aid-parish or church-and-society arrangements by means of which, in our country, we contrive to supply the wants of church-and-state, and which are plainly founded on the same principle, may then be conceived to be in accordance with Christian parity.* In this

view, the sects that have exploded the doctrine of regeneration, as obsolete or untenable, are quite consistent in their latitudinarian usages in respect to membership; and the church-and-state or church-and-parish policy, bests them well, in case the state or parish yield them undivided and free assent.

But if the reverse of this supposition be true—if "the world lieth in wickedness"—if the people of God are "a peculiar people," regenerated by divine grace, then these, and these only, and all of these, by virtue of their regeneration and present character, are entitled to a place in the Christian church. And they are entitled to this place just so long as they continue to exhibit the good fruits of righteousness (the only evidence of their Christian character), and no longer. Otherwise there is no foundation for any distinction between the church and the world.

These illustrations may serve to elucidate our position that the doctrines, the spirit, the aims and the objects of Christianity furnish the only true key to its institutions, and especially to the appropriate usages and polity of church organizations. By ascertaining the character of the former, we decide, of necessity, the shape of the latter. With this principle, then, thus established, we proceed to a more connected survey of our subject, including the matters already discussed.

I. THE OCCASION OF FOUNDED CHURCHES.

This, as already intimated, we discover in the lapsed condition of our race. The fact of human wickedness and degradation indicates the necessity of some such measure. How, otherwise, shall reformatory means be employed? Of course, the same fact indicates

II. THE OBJECTS OF CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS.

Amid prevailing wickedness, the good should associate, and unite to do good. Their social nature, and the social character of goodness require this. They need mutual aid and counsel, exhortation and example, watch-care and prayer. As social beings, they should unite in social public worship, in honor of their Creator, and celebrate his perfections, and expound his laws, and urge on those who will hear them a conformity with his will, letting the light of their own good works shine for their guidance. In this way they may become the salt of the earth, and the light of the world. They are commanded to disciple all nations, and are cheered with the promise that the knowledge of the Lord, through their efforts, shall cover the whole earth. In union there is strength. Divine aid is promised them on condition of their union. Organization is the proper expression and natural result of such union, the necessary instrument of the labors they would perform.

Should they not have a share in the transaction of all other church business—a participation in all other church privileges—a voice in the election of deacons and admission of members? Such churches, like the "Non-Intrusionists" in the church of Scotland, (who grumble at state control, but will not relinquish state support,) must take their stand, one way or the other, before long. They must either admit the world into the church, and make no wry faces, or they must see to it that the world does not, by its patronage, control the church. If a church will honestly do its own work, (or rather its Master's,) manfully, *velut in seipso*, (its pastor choosing, as well as its deacon and member choosing,) it will secure solid respect, and may receive pecuniary aid from abroad, without degradation and pollution.

The work of Jesus Christ is the work of his churches. As he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, his churches are reformatory associations, waging an uncompromising warfare with every species of sin. As he came to preach good tidings to the poor, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim deliverance to the captives, it follows that his churches are organizations enlisted in the same work.

These churches are properly called voluntary associations, because their members come into them as equals, act there as equals, and come and work together of their own free voluntary choice. But they are not *merely* voluntary associations, in the sense that they may be used or neglected by Christians, at their caprice, or wielded for the partizan purposes of those who may organize them, or upon the various plans and usages that their own fluctuating views of expediency might suggest. These churches are Christ's churches and not the churches of their officers or founders. They are to be governed, not by sect-makers' rules, but by the great principles God has revealed, by the nature and objects of the Christian religion, and by the methods and rules designated in the Bible. God requires his people to honor the social of their nature and combine their energies in his work, by their free and hearty use of the instruments he has prepared for them.

III. THE QUALIFICATIONS OF CHURCH MEMBERS.

These are indicated, very clearly, by the particulars already considered. Churches, if designed to reclaim a revolted world, must be composed of the faithful subjects of its rightful sovereign. If designed as an asylum from the evil communications that corrupt good manners; if assistance, and counsel, and watch-care, and effectual prayers, and godly examples, are to be sought in their bosom, then their members must be men of God, of holy endeavor and of prayer. If they are to be reformatory associations, then their members must be reformers, must be reformed. As the members of the Temperance Society must not be intemperate, and as the members of anti-slavery societies must not be oppressors, so the members of Christian churches must be neither of these, nor may they be worldlings, enslaved to the vices from which the world needs to be reformed. The love of the world, the wisdom of the world, the maxims of the world; these must, of course, be renounced by those who would help to deliver others from bondage to the same tyrants. Men of honesty are needed to promote honesty—men of temperance to promote temperance—men of integrity to promote integrity—men of piety to promote piety—men of holiness to promote holiness. And for the promotion of these objects, they are bound to unite. In other words, *Christian character*, and nothing but Christian character, is the proper qualification for church membership. *Without* evidence of this qualification, no man can have any right to a place in a Christian church, whatever his other qualifications may be. *With* the evidence of this qualification, whatever his other defects and blemishes may be, he has a right to a place in the church, which no man or set of men in the world can rightfully dispute. All the disciples of Christ, and none but such, should be admitted into or retained in Christian churches.

All this seems too evident to require even a

* Churches that would recoil at the pollution of submitting to state control, in the selection of their pastors and teachers, and spurn the proposal as an insult, do not scruple to come into arrangements by which a parish, a society, or meeting of pew-holders, (including infidels, heretics of all sorts, libertines, run-sellers and slaveocrats,) can veto their choice of a pastor! In this most sacred and momentous church duty and church privilege, all who choose, and who will pay the requisite cash fee entrance, may freely participate, and thus control the church and the pulpit! Why then

statement, still less a labored proof. And the principle, if carried faithfully into practice, would suffice to correct two monstrous abuses which now mar and disorganize the church:—*first*, the regulations that are known to exclude from church membership those whose Christian character is undisputed, on account of non-conformity in matters not considered essential to true discipleship:—*second*, the non-practice of retaining persons in the churches who can not be, and are not, considered as exhibiting present evidence of Christian character—or (what amounts to the same)—retaining a connection with churches which exhibit not the activity of a divine life. Two giant errors are twin brothers, and ally cling to and sustain each other. Both founded on an utter forgetfulness or disregard of the Bible qualification for church membership—*viz*: *only* Christian discipleship.

Churches of rival sects, divided from each other only on points which they do not, at the same time, consider essential to salvation, are tempted to fortify their separate organizations by the help of members whose Christian discipleship is at least doubtful. The effect of sectarian division, however trivial, is greatly magnified and almost exclusively upon, until that which is evidently fundamental to our common Christianity (including decent morality) falls into forgetfulness, neglect and contempt. And so, the expectation of being more select in our church fellowship than Jesus Christ is in his, results in folding church connections with those whom Jesus Christ rejects; nay with pirates and thieves, whose abominations and barbarities are the derision of the civilized world! To prevent mistake, it may be noted here, the principle of receiving into church membership all who give evidence of being Christians, does by no means imply that, in any, the standard of Christian character is lowered down, nor that in seeking evidences of that character, we are to ask a cordial reception of the fundamental of religion, including those that guard the rights of God, as well as the rights of our men.

But we affirm so, that Christian character, as defined in the Bible, is the indispensable and the sole test, of Christian church membership—that Christians are to receive church connection those who give evidence that Christ has received them, judging by its fruits, and rejecting those in whom the good fruits are not found—that they be liberal where Christ is liberal, and where he is strict—*forbearing* where he is *bearing*, and uncompromising where he is *promising*. Thus the standard of church membership, instead of being depressed, would be raised.

Those who give evidence of possessing the Bible qualification, can not justly be denied a place in the church, nor rightfully received, in whom that qualification is wanting. The very fact of the existence of a test, implies that those and those only who pass it, shall be received. In all religions, this principle holds good. And the purity and character of the association define the nature of the test. If the object is spiritual or ceremonial, the test of membership may be of the same character. But if it is to be spiritual and moral, then the test

must correspond with that object. Until this matter is understood, and evidence of personal Christian character insisted on, as the sole test of church membership, no trustworthy reformation in the church will be possible. Until then, we can give no meaning or significance to church organizations, or show that the distinction between the righteous and the wicked enters into the arrangements of the religion we profess.

Equally plain is it, that the condition of *remaining* in the church is the same with the condition of *admission* into it, *viz*: evidence of Christian character, evidence consisting in present good fruits. On admission to membership, the man appeared to be a disciple of Christ, and was *therefore* admitted. But those appearances have now ceased. On what principle, then, can he be retained? If you received him upon the ground, not of his agreement with you in rituals and forms, and minor points of sectarian peculiarity, but on the high ground of his supposed Christian discipleship, how can you honor the principle upon which you admitted him, by now retaining him, when the evidences of his Christian discipleship have disappeared?—Whether you suppose him to have been once a Christian and now apostate, or whether you now discredit his former appearances of discipleship, matters not, to the present discussion. The supposition is that in either case you now see no evidences of his Christian character. What right have you then to certify the contrary, by retaining him in church membership, and thus disgrace religion, dishonor God, corrupt the church, mislead souls, lower the standard of church membership, and help deceive the man with whom you have solemnly covenanted to deal faithfully; to deceive him in a matter of infinite importance, and in a manner calculated to ensure his eternal undoing? Can you plead in excuse that it would be indelicate and arrogant to sit in judgment upon your brother? Why so, any more than in the case of the rejection of an applicant for admission into the church? Does the simple fact of admission confer on him new rights which he had not before? The right of being considered a Christian, because he is in the church? Or of a place in the church, whether he give evidence of being a Christian or no? Is the mutual promise of watch-care a mere ceremony? Or must we admit the maxim, "Once a church member always a church member"? Or while you admit no *new* member without evidence of Christian character, and scrupulously scrutinize the evidence of his regeneration, and guard the portals of the church with the utmost care, will you give men of the world to understand that if they can only once get into the church, they are, *therefore*, a privileged class, and can not be censured or excluded, so long as they can keep out of the penitentiary, and escape prosecution for petit larceny? Is the whole duty of preserving a pure church

* When a church member changes his views of the rituals or other points of sectarian disagreement, it is expected that he will change his church relations, of course. But he may cease to give evidence of Christian character, without breaking the bonds of church membership!

† Is this language too strong for the occasion? Might we not hint at facts going even beyond this? Have not church sympathy and ecclesiastical acquittal been successfully wielded, once and again, in the face of the community, to shelter even clerical delinquents, in cases where the public will always believe that the culprits deserved, and would have otherwise received, the punishments due to high crimes, from the State? And has not the court ecclesiastical, without any precedent from civil jurisprudence, given sanction to the monstrous doctrine of acquittal on the ground of *moral* (in distinction from *intellectual*) insanity?

discharged in that fifteen or twenty minutes' examination, in which the candidate for admission is questioned concerning his "Christian experience" and religious emotions? Is the whole scope of his after life and deportment to pass, *therefore*, without scrutiny, except in cases of disreputable and notorious vice?

Before the world can enjoy the benefits of a pure church, other views of this subject than those now commonly prevalent, must obtain. It must be understood that evidence of *Christian perseverance* is the only title to continued church membership on earth or in heaven—that, in order to the exclusion of members it is not necessary that they should openly renounce the first principles of religion, or avow infidel sentiments, or propagate gross heresies, or commit what the world and worldly religionists have seen fit to single out and characterize as "scandalous" or "disreputable" offenses. It is sufficient that they cease to exhibit holy activity, in the self-denying service of God and of mankind, that they cease to do the work of Jesus Christ, the work for which Christian churches were instituted and organized. If the man evidently lives not for Christ, for his poor, for his church, for the human race—if he lives to himself, is worldly, proud, avaricious, aristocratic, sensual, selfish, grasping, self-indulgent, self-willed, then he should be admonished, warned, and made the subject of special prayer. If no signs of a divine life appear, he should be told honestly that his brethren see no evidence that he is a Christian, and if unreclaimed, he should be excluded from the church, just as he would have been refused an admission, had he offered himself in that character. This will more clearly appear from what follows:—

IV. THE EXISTENCE AND MODE OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

We have seen that the fact of human depravity furnishes the occasion for instituting churches—that the divine purpose of human salvation discloses the object of their institution—that the fact of the spiritual regeneration of some men supplies the materials, and the only materials, of which Christian churches should be composed.

It follows that the Great Head of the Church, himself, in the purposes he holds, and in the agency he exerts, may be said in a most important sense, to plant, to establish, to institute and to organize the true Christian church. He does this, by designating the ends to be pursued. He does this, by prescribing, as he must needs do, (and in despite of the vain pretenses of some, that he has left it discretionary with *them*) the proper order of his own house—the methods to be employed by his servants—the relations they are to sustain to each other and to the world. He does it, by the regenerating acts of his grace, through which he introduces one and another into his spiritual kingdom, and emancipates them from their bondage to the rebellious prince of this world. In doing this, he makes them members of his holy church universal.†

* A late English writer maintains that "in the apostolic church admission was easy, but the terms of continued fellowship difficult, or difficult to pretend." He adds, "It is an equal fault for a church to have an open door, and a promiscuous assemblage like a market; or a door bolted upon an Augean stable. Morals are vitiated as fatally in the one place as in the other." [Spiritual Despotism, p. 100.]

† The word church properly means an assembly. A Christian church is a Christian assembly. The Bible speaks of all Christians as constituting one great spiritual church, or assembly. It speaks, too, of all the Christians in one place assembling together, as constituting the church or assembly of Christ, in that particular place. Thus there are *many local churches*, as well as *one universal church*.

By his providence he places some of them in *one locality* and some in *another*. By the social nature he has given them, by the united exertions he has required of them, by the mutual assistance they are bound to render each other, by the influence of his Spirit, and by the instructions of his word, he has signified to them the duty of *assembling* together, in the *local places* where they reside, of recognizing each other, of watching over each other, of dividing, in the best manner, the *work* they have to perform.

It is Jesus Christ, then, that, in this sense, has organized the local churches that he recognizes as his, as well as the church universal. No one has any right to a place in these local churches, that he has not received by his Spirit. And no one has a right to exclude from these churches or assemblies, or from their privileges and rights, any person in those places who gives evidence of spiritual renovation. No one has a right to establish any authority in or over these assemblies or churches, that Christ himself has not established. No one has a right to change the objects of pursuit or alter the laws which Christ has revealed, for the government of his assemblies or churches. They are his churches, and no man or body of men, not even the churches themselves, have a right to transform them into churches of the Circumcision or of the Uncircumcision—of this ceremony or of that ceremony—into churches of Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or any other man, or body of men, or to call them by any other name than his.

From these and similar considerations, some have concluded that it is improper to speak of the organizing of local churches, as of a work that, in any sense, can be regarded as having been performed by men. Christ, they say, and Christ alone, introduces men into his church, and he alone can exclude them from it. It is inferred that voting men *into* or *out* of the churches is an arrogant interference with the prerogatives of Christ. And the same principle, carried out, has led some to the natural conclusion that no church discipline should be exercised by Christians and churches. In other words, Christian churches, as visible, tangible, organized bodies, with lists of their members and officers, they say, ought not to exist; and bodies thus described are not true churches of Christ, but mere inventions of men.

This confusion arises from a forgetfulness of some things, sufficiently plain in themselves, if not inadvertently overlooked.

The agency of Christ and of his Spirit does not supersede the agency of Christians, but secures it. When he regenerates them, it is *they*, and not *he*, that turn from dumb idols to the living God. In regeneration, an every grace he confers upon them, they are active and not passive. When he introduces them into his church, it is they that come into it. When he enacts the laws of his house, it is they that obey them. The social nature he gave them, they actively honor and exercise. So that, in this view, the same acts may be ascribed, both to him and to them: to him as the Head, to them as the members; to him as the Sovereign, to them as the active subjects—the instruments. The churches he institutes they establish, likewise.

Christ knows, intuitively, all who are his. He looks directly into their hearts. If Christians could intuitively know each other, as they are known by Christ, they would know all to be Christians whom he knows to be Christians, and they would know all to be false professors whom he knows to be false professors. Then, they could infallibly receive all whom he receives, and reject all whom he rejects, and exclude all (and those only) whom he excludes. So that the church in *their* view, and the church in *his* view would

always be one and the same thing. Yet even then his act of admission or exclusion would not supersede, but *secure*, their act of admission and exclusion. They, as well as he, would then receive into their fellowship all Christians. And they, as well as he, would then exclude or dismiss from their fellowship all who are not Christians.

In no conceivable case, therefore, could it be true that Christ's admitting men into his church, or excluding men from it, would prevent Christian assemblies from doing the same thing. It would furnish the best reason why they should do it, and the act would be as truly theirs as it is his. In other words, their agency in the organization of churches would be as real, and as necessary as his.

As the case now is, Christians can not intuitively know who are Christians, and who are not. They can only judge of men by their apparent fruits, and they are liable to be deceived. They may be led to receive some as Christians who are not, and to judge that some are not Christians, who are. It follows that the church of Christ, in any particular place, in *his* view, may differ somewhat in its membership from the church in that place, in the view of his most discriminating disciples. But this discrepancy does not absolve them from the obligations growing out of their social nature, and their relations to each other, to the world, and to their divine Master. They must still judge the tree by its fruits. The Christian church or assembly must assemble and act, together. They can not avoid passing a judgment in their own minds, on the question, *who* give evidence of discipleship, and *who* do not. The convictions of their own minds, however liable to error, they are bound to honor, and can scarcely fail, in some way, to express. Men acting together can not help having their impressions respecting those who act, or offer to act, with them, whether they be trust-worthy fellow-laborers or no. Nor can they help deciding whether or no they have a moral right to confide in them and act with them. In short, they are not only bound but constrained to extend fellowship to those who appear to be Christians, and withhold it from those who do not.

And thus we come to the same conclusion as before. To say that Christians have nothing to do, in organizing Christian churches, because they are established by Christ, is as absurd as to say that Christians have nothing to do, in the work of reforming the world, or of working out their own salvation, because both the one and the other are works properly attributed to Christ. To say that Christians can not organize churches of Christ, is to say, in effect, that they can not be members of them, nor discharge the duties growing out of church relations. But this is not stating the truth, unless it be true that Christians can not feel and express Christian fellowship for those who appear to be Christians, and withhold it from those who do not.

For the very essence of church organization—the thing wherein it vitally consists, is the mutual recognition of Christians, by each other, the consequent recognition of the obligations growing out of their relations to each other as Christians, and the solemn covenant, expressed or implied, to discharge those obligations. There is nothing arbitrary, nothing artificial, nothing factitious or fictitious, in all this. It is the natural, nay the necessary result of Christian affection between Christians whom the providence of God locates in the neighborhood of each other. How can they help coming often together?—assembling?—expressing the confidence they repose in each other?—acting together?—bearing each other's burdens by a

* "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?"—Christ's receiving or rejecting men and angels, at the day of judgment, will not hinder his disciples from doing the same thing. It will bind them to do the same thing that he does, and for the same reason. His Spirit will constrain them to do so. And, on the same principle, they are to receive the good into their fellowship, now, and reject the bad, according to the best evidence they have, of their character. Thus it must needs be, and can not, in the nature of things, be otherwise.

† If this view of the essence of church organization be correct, what shall we say of arrangements by which the minister or church session decide, for the whole church, whom they are to receive, and whom they are to exclude from their fellowship? And when Presbyteries, Synods, etc., as courts of appeal, decide for a church, that its excommunicated member is to be received back again, without confession and repentance, how shall the church, unless convinced of its error, abide by the decision? And what good would be accomplished by its submission?

brotherly division of labor? But to do this, is to organize a local Christian church—the very thing some say can not be done, by human beings. Say what men please of the impety of voting into the church, and voting them out of it, there is sense in which no Christian, nay, no man of common sense, can help doing it, whether he will or no. Every human character is exhibited in our present instinctively form our conceptions of its nature and its faculties—whether it be God-like or fiend-like. And our conceptions, if we do not smother the hearts within us, we shall scarcely fail, in some way, to express. It might as conveniently be done, vote, as in other way: in a church or assembly or where else.

If we shall have mastered the conception of this—the living spirit—the vital essence of church organization, we need not be detained long by the mode. The latter will be but the simple expression of the former, and in the most natural and easy manner that can be conceived.

"Where two or three are gathered together in my name," said the Master, "there am I in the midst of them." He said this in treating directly on the subject now under discussion. As if he had said, "Wherever the smallest number of Christians are found, assembled, there I recognize a true church. That is the act of church organization on *his* part. What is the act of church organization on *their* part? What can it be, but their solemn and public recognition of the same fact that he had already recognized. Wherever two or three, or a greater number of disciples, recognizing each other as such, and acting together, clasp hands in the name of the Lord, and take upon themselves, freely, the obligations resting on them, in consequence of their discipleship, there you have all the elements and the essential instances of a valid and regular church organization: that Peter and Paul and James ever heard of—of the Banyan and the early English Independents or Congregationalists and Baptists ever valued or contended for.

And what more could the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury himself give us? What more have they to offer Rome or at Oxford? At Cambridge or at Andover? At Princeton or at Newton? What more at a General Conference—the General Assembly—the Synod—the Presbytery—the Consociation—the Association—or the Council bestow upon us—or describe?

If Christian principle—Christian practice—Christian character—Christian resolutions—Christian counsel and Christian effort can not give validity and authority to a Christian church, from whence shall they be derived? In what can they consist? To whom are we to look, if these do not suffice us? To whom are we to look to parchment—to historical records—to apostolical successions? Where else can we find the church of Rome and her progeny become true churches, and every Protestant church become legitimate, of course? The rush towards Rome, recently noticed, is easily accounted for by the fact that these simple station-plates concerning church organization are needed among professed Protestants, and that many of them they will appear strange sayings.

V. OF CHURCH ORDER AND FORM.

But what shape shall Christian churches, when organized, assume? Shall the local church govern itself, or be governed by an individual, or by a select body? Shall it be independent, or subject to some higher authority? Some Association or Consociation? Some Synod, or General Assembly? Some Conference, Yearly Meeting, Bishop, Cardinal or Patriarch? Some Monarch, or Legislature, or Parish?

These questions naturally arise in this place, because their predecessors have been in some measure answered beforehand, because every question that can be related to the entire subject, is answered by a reference to those acknowledged principles of Christianity which we adverted, in the outset, and have kept in view. And the settlement of each particular question, is found to do much towards deciding the next in order. Then, the occasion of organization indicates the *object*; and the object indicates the *agents* to be employed, the *materials* of which it is to be composed. And an acquaintance with the *essence* as well as the *mode* of church organization.

The thread of connection runs onward. If it be in view the reclaiming of a lapsed world, if it be to organize a church, and none other than such, are to be organized, the enterprise, if the very essence of their mission consists in the natural expression of their mutual dependence in each other, as fellow laborers, and thus

not to labor in company with each other, and if of this recognition and agreement indicated the of each and every member of the body to come agreement, in his own proper person, and thus on himself his part of the work, can there be any to the order and form the organization is to be.

What have we here, but a brotherhood of aged equals, joining hands for a common object? Can "order" mean, with such men, thus connect the preservation of the equality and the personal agency which brought them together at the first? Can "form" of organization can they seek or put does not express and guarantee this equality, and a way open for every member of the brotherhood to share in the direction and prosecution proposed work? It is the work to be done in the vineyard, we repeat it, and nothing but the that can furnish a clue to the manner and order which the work is to be performed.

Is only a part of the people of God that are bound to labor and admonish their brethren, then to this only, when ascertained, let the work be committed. All and each are required to watch over and admonish each other in love, then let each and all be united to discharge the duties required of them. Any or church may indeed require a presiding officer, a pastor, or bishop. But no intelligent or voluntary association of freedom will permit itself to be the assembly or association. Committees or servants may be needed to do certain portions of work that, in this or that particular, needs to be done which a single person or a few can best perform. And these may be called deacons or elders. But best, in Christ's house, is to be as "he that doth so is to be a servant of all."

Is only the pastor or teacher that is responsible for the purity of the church, and for the performance of labor, then let him monopolize the direction of each. But if, from the nature of the case, and the directions of Christ and his Apostles the work is "the church"—to the disciples "assembled," then let them not fail to perform, and not turn where the duties that their Master requires of them. If they can transfer their responsibilities to others, if they please, transfer the work, but not the duty. If the priest can stand in their souls' stead, by of judgment, or if he can pardon the sin of each, then, but not otherwise, let the mass of discipline to the performance of their labor. At the Ethiopian who excused himself from because he paid his priest to pray for him. But the of the Ethiopian was nothing different in from that of the Protestant church member excuses himself excused from attending to matters of discipline, because he has employed a minister to do his work for him. All ecclesiastical comes from a criminal willingness of the mass—the mass of professing disciples—to get their work—to discharge their duties by proxy—nobody else do their work for them.

Christian church or assembly can, in like manner, transfer its own moral accountability to some other body of men, but not otherwise, let them transfer some body of men the work which the Great the church has committed "to the churches." A broad defense of church Independency, or exaltation of rival theories of church polity need entered upon, in this place. Our limits forbid, ask has been abundantly and triumphantly performed. It is sufficient to refer to the Savior's of church order and discipline, in the 18th chapter of Matthew—to the apostolic directions for joining orders, by the disciples "gathered together"—(session)—and to demand, as has a thousand been done, without eliciting a reply—"What warrant is there for any other ecclesiastical order, besides that of a local church?"

At the Council once held at Jerusalem was no permanent, analogous to modern Associations, Presbyteries. It was either the Jerusalem church giving, when asked, to Christians at a distance: or promiscuous gathering of Christians doing the of its act was the special proclamation of the, who could confidently speak in the "the Holy Ghost." In either case, it furnishes a precedent for organized judicatories over the church—letter was written by "the apostles and elders assembled with one accord"—(spontaneous)—and the body, as a council, seems to have had after the letter was written. See Acts xv.

Let the reader pursue carefully the 18th of Matthew. Observe how it opens with a reproof of those who love to be "the greatest" in the church. Mark the directions given concerning those "elders" which furnish the ready pretext for extended and formidable ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Consider how little occasion there would be for such complicated courts and high dignities, if the spirit of meekness and forgiveness there enjoined should be exercised. Then notice the directions given concerning the officers that must needs come. "The private entry, first—then, if needful, its repetition, in company with one or two brethren—and finally, as a last resort, the complaint to the church—to the congregation or assembly—(not to the pastor or the church session.) Mark well the juncture (verse 17) that the decision of the church, the assembly, shall be final—that the dispute shall be prosecuted no farther—a plain prohibition of all appeals to Presbyteries, Synods or higher judicial authorities. And, as though this were not sufficient, observe the still more emphatic declaration, in the 18th and 19th verses, that all the ecclesiastical power vested in men on the earth, is vested in the assembled brotherhood—the church. And finally, in the 20th verse, in apparent anticipation of the still timorous and hesitant query whether such weighty responsibilities could indeed devolve upon a company—a mere handful, perhaps—of obscure, unlearned, and plain men—and in evident answer to the question every day heard—"How can so few and feeble a band of the faithful assume and wield church power?"—hain to the declaration, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The church that Christ recognizes, is the faithful, more or less—two or three only, it may be—but in these resides all the church authority, that is needed, all that exists, in the church. It is the authority of Jesus Christ himself.

Had it been the design of the Savior to settle the question, in favor of independent church government, and to prohibit all appeals to other tribunals, what stronger or more definite language could he have used? Or had he followed up the instructions of this chapter with an approving description of the church sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, Associations, Conventions, Conferences, Episcopacies and Hierarchies now in use, who could make out any consistency or congruity in his instructions? Finally, does this 18th chapter of Matthew, and does 1 Cor. v. contain any directions for church discipline? If they do not, what authority have we, for any church government, at all? But if they do, how can we obey those directions in any other way than by maintaining independent local church government?

If any thing may be known by Church History, inspired and uninspired, the churches of the apostolic age were independent, and the bishops were only pastors of local congregations. The large number of bishops known and enumerated, as occupying small territories, settles the question beyond dispute. Candid Episcopals, such as Scott, Newton, &c. do not contradict the fact. John Wesley, who never seceded from the church of England, and who himself wielded, in effect, episcopal power, admitted that the primitive churches were independent. The facts adduced by Lord King convinced him of this. It is true that Episcopacy was introduced soon after the apostolic age, and equally true that the germ of the Romish apostacy appeared at the same time. As to Presbyterian arrangements, as they are now maintained, no one, that we know of, claims any high antiquity for them. Some may indeed claim that the elders of the primitive churches held powers similar to those of the Presbyterian churches, though we have seen no satisfactory evidence of the fact. But no one probably will contend that the "Presbytery" mentioned by Paul was an ecclesiastical judicatory or court of appeal established over a plurality of churches—or that a plurality of such Presbyteries were amenable to a Synod—or a plurality of Synods to a General Assembly. The treatise is yet to be written that shall be devoted to the task of proving that primitive "church order" knew any thing of arrangements like these.

It is quite remarkable that an Episcopal writer, the historian of "Spiritual Despotism," has settled that point beyond dispute, by the early facts of church history.

Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, in his Essay, devotes much space to the task of proving that the primitive churches had ruling Elders, Pastors or Bishops—and a plurality of them in each church, some of them preachers and others not. But we do not find his Bible proofs that they monopolized the work of church discipline. He also dwells on the advantages of Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, as

So often have these considerations been urged, and the proofs of primitive church independency produced, that candid and intelligent Presbyterian and Episcopalian writers have for the most part, ceased to urge any arguments to the contrary. They have, accordingly, abandoned the defense (whether of Episcopacy or Presbyterianism) on the grounds of divine institution, of apostolic precept or of primitive example. The argument upon which both Episcopacy and Presbyterianism now rest, may be briefly stated as follows:

The New Testament, it is said, has laid down no definite formula of church organization and order. It has only inculcated certain fundamental principles of church government, discipline and order, and left it discretionary with Christians, in the wise application of these revealed principles, to establish such forms of church government as they thought best. Accordingly (it is sometimes added) the Christians of one age or nation may establish one form of church government, and those of another age or nation may establish another. One uniform mode of church government may not be adapted to all Christians, and therefore the matter was left discretionary and open.

From the argument as thus stated, Presbyterians infer their right to establish Presbyterian arrangements, and Episcopals infer their right to establish Episcopal arrangements.

On these statements of the foundations of church organization and order, we can not forbear making a few remarks.

1. The great mass of Christians, in no age or nation, have ever established a due Presbyterianism or Episcopacy. The whole brotherhood have never been consulted in the matter. Episcopal and Presbyterian powers have always been assumed by the few over the many, without any distinct proposal of the matter, and without asking the people whether they would prefer such arrangements or no. In most cases, they have been gradually and stealthily introduced, that they have grown into precedent, before the people were distinctly aware of their existence. Enthusiastic excesses, on the one hand and stupid worldliness on the other, have facilitated ecclesiastical usurpations, in the first place, and perpetuated them afterwards, because, under their influence, people readily permit others to discharge responsibilities pertaining to themselves, and thus surrender implicitly to usurpers, their inalienable rights:—not by any deliberate act, but by the absence of reflection—the neglect of definite action. In this way Episcopal and Presbyterian usages have been established and perpetuated. One generation has been subjected to the domination to which their fathers had been induced to submit, for precedent soon becomes law, and such forms of polity never contain any provisions for their own subversion by the people. They always speak authoritatively against innovation and change. What had the Episcopal Methodists, for instance, to do, as a body, with establishing the complicated polity of the Methodist Episcopal church? And what can the mass of Methodists now do, towards changing or modifying the polity under which they find themselves placed? Or how can the common people connected with the Presbyterian church, reform or annul their Presbyterian polity, without meeting the charge of "disorganization" or "schism"? Such arrangements, therefore, in reality, are not founded upon any assumed right of Christians to establish whatever ecclesiastical forms they think best.

2. It is not true, as assumed in the statement, that the principles of church polity and discipline contained in the New Testament could be revealed without revealing the form they were to assume. Every principle of government, whether ecclesiastical or civil, has its appropriate form of expression, and to depart from the form (in other words, from the practice of the principle) is to sacrifice the principle itself. What should we think of the democratic principles of the founder of a government, who should claim that those principles could be expressed and maintained under the form of an aristocracy, or of a monarchy, as well as under the form of a democracy? Equally unintelligible is the proposition that the revealed principles of church order can be equally expressed and maintained under the different forms of Independency, Presbyterianism and Episcopacy. And the preceding discussion has shown that the great principles of Christianity settle every question of church polity that can be raised.

3. Yet it is true that all forms of church polity other than that of strict Congregational Independency, are founded on precisely the same principle, and the question between them is mere matter of expediency and not courts of appeal, but offers no proof of apostolic precept or of primitive example in their favor.

of principle. So that if Christ left it discretionary with his people whether they would establish Congregationalism or Presbyterianism, he must have left it discretionary whether they would establish Presbyterianism, Episcopacy or Papacy; and they have the same right to establish the one as the other. The assumption that Christ left the forms of church government discretionary with his disciples, goes the whole length of this, and there is no way of escaping the conclusion unless it can be shown that the fundamental principle of Papacy is opposite to that of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. But this can not be done, as we shall soon see. For,

4. In the nature of the case, there are but two sets of principles, on the subject of church polity, that can be conceived.

In the first class of principles, we find such as these—individual responsibility—human equality—inalienable human rights. In the second, we have the opposite of all this. We have the principle of caste—the principle that the many must be subjected to the few—the people controlled by their superiors, the laity, for example, by the clergy—the principle that church members may transfer their church duties to others, to a few in the church, or over the church—the principle that the local assembly or church may transfer its responsibilities to some other man or body of men. [Whether those men shall be called a Yearly Meeting, a Conference, an Association, a Conventions, a Presbytery, a Synod, a General Assembly, a Diocesan Bishop, a Cardinal or a Pope, can not alter the principle.] Very manifestly, this first class of principles can be expressed or maintained only by strict local church independency; the second class are implied and exemplified in all other forms of church polity overdevised or conceived. The only point where a radical difference or opposition of principle can be detected is the point that separates strict independency from all other forms.

5. If forms of church polity may be established at the discretion either of the people or of the clergy, then, in point of legitimate and binding authority, the Romish hierarchy, including the Papacy, rests on the same foundation with Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. The right to establish the one is the same as the right to establish the other.

6. If the "discretionary" right releases us from the authoritative claims of the Papacy—so it does likewise from the claims of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism—and all other kinds of church government, leaving us under no obligations to maintain any, unless we think proper. So that this assumption of discretionary right to institute whatever forms of church organization we please, amounts, in effect, to a denial of any divinely instituted church government, at all.

For, to say that church government is a divine institution, and yet affirm that divine revelation has not defined church government, but left it discretionary with us whether we will have Congregationalism or Papacy, is to say what men of reflection will never believe. It is to affirm, in words, that of which no clear or consistent conceptions can be formed.

Jesus Christ has either instituted church organizations, or he has not. If he has, then we are able to ascertain, with precision, what it is that he has instituted, and we have no right to substitute our inventions for his institutions. If he has not, then we have no right to give to our own "discretionary" contrivances the authority and force of divinely appointed institutions, and to insist that all Christians are bound to submit to them. To talk of positive institutions of religion, enjoined as divine, in the Bible, the shape, form and complexion of which (where fundamental principles are involved) are left wholly, or chiefly, to human discretion, so that the institution may be one thing to-day and another to-morrow, one thing in this latitude, and another thing in another, sometimes based on this set of moral principles, and sometimes on the opposite, is to talk self-contradiction and absurdity. What would be thought of religious teachers who should insist that though God had instituted the family relation, yet he had never determined whether the family comprehended a single household or a whole nation, whether the government should be vested in the parents or the children, the precedence with the father or the mother, the jurisdiction within the local family or in a delegation of ten thousand families assembling annually in some metropolis; whether all or a part of the children born into the family shall belong to it, or whether dutiful children shall be disowned for the peculiarity of their gait, or the hue of their hair? What if they should maintain that in all these respects the matter was left "discretionary," and that one method was as legitimate as the other? Who does not see that the very vitals of the institution itself are involved in these particu-

lars? Were it only a question of the phraseology of the marriage contract or the church creed—of the nuptial ceremony or the church rite—the plea of "discretionary" powers might be in place. Not so, when the very essence of the institution is involved.

THE NO-CHURCH THEORY—ITS ORIGIN.

The novel notion of "no church" organization, no church government, and no church discipline, is the natural and necessary result of the discretionary assumption now under review, a dogma which has been spreading in the churches for the last half century, till a very large portion even of Congregational ministers, so-called, have acted upon it, connecting themselves alternately, and at convenience, with Presbyterian and Congregational arrangements, and half transforming Congregationalism itself into Presbyterianism. Practices like these must, of course, go on the assumption that church organization and church order are proper matters of human discretion, and not of divine institution.

Whenever and wherever you hear it affirmed that Christ and his apostles did not institute any particular form of church government, but left it discretionary with Christians to institute such arrangements as they pleased—there you hear promulgated the first principle of "no church government" and disorganization. All the rest follows, of course, and a child can scarcely fail to draw the conclusions to which our "no church" neighbors have arrived. These mistaken men, whose disorganizing doctrines have created so much alarm, always begin their lectures with the affirmation that Jesus Christ and his apostles instituted no form or mode of church organization. Only grant them this, and you grant them, in effect, all they desire. But this has been granted, nay affirmed, by three-fourths of all the Doctors of Divinity in the land! These have been sowing the seeds of "no church organization" all their days, and are now frightened out of their senses at the sight of their own crop—their own progeny. And wherein do they differ? Not in their principles, surely; but only in their application of them. The Doctors, claiming the right to frame, at their "discretion," such forms of church polity as they think proper, insist, nevertheless, that the church organizations resting on this basis shall be honored as divine institutions, and that those who will not sustain them stand justly chargeable with refusing to acknowledge Christ before men, and should be regarded as having no claim to the communion of saints, and the fellowship of Christians! Instead of this, their disciples, (of the "no-church-government" school,) while, with their teachers they equally deny that Christ established any ecclesiastical polity, and while they therefore maintain that Christians are at liberty to enter into such voluntary associations as they please, deny that such conventional human arrangements should be authoritatively imposed, as by divine authority, upon the consciences of Christians, but that they should be free to enter into them or not, as they please, and without any imputation of disobedience to the commands of Christ. Their rejection of church discipline follows, of course, for if Christ has prescribed no forms of church government, then his ministers, say they, have no right to enjoin any.

Which of the two most consistently carry out the principle of "discretionary" church polity, it cannot be needful to inquire. Nor can we be at a loss for the true remedy of the "no-church" malady that has made its appearance. The "disorganizers" can be confuted in no way but by confuting the Doctors whose errors they have imbibed. Church institutions, to be maintained, must be understood, and, to be understood, must be defined.—Point-no-point and Church-no-church belong to the category of shadows; and glimmers and shadows always vanish at day-break.

OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE.

The form of church government, it may be said, does not, of necessity, determine the limit of its powers, or the subjects and methods of its discipline. But in the preceding discussion we have virtually anticipated nearly all that needs here to be said. The principles we have followed, and the divine directions to which we have referred, leave little room for mistake. Individuality is not to be merged in the corporation—nor liberty used as a cloak for licentiousness.—Things vital are not to be confounded with things incidental, nor first principles with "doubtful disputations." Christian character should be the basis of the organization—the test of admission. And nothing but the wreck of it should be ground of exclusion. Yet frank and brotherly admonition, whether of the many to the few, or the few or the individual to the many, should have free course, and take the wide range of human duty and delinquency. Free discussion, free inquiry and free speech, should be invio-

lably maintained, and nothing in the church creed or polity should be held inaccessible to scrutiny and reformation and progress. Should be the motto both of the individual and in the assembly—the church.

If the view that has been taken be correct, the restoration of "church order" is a work of no small magnitude. Much that is maintained, under the name "church order" will be found to be the essence of disorder and confusion. There is nothing more disastrous than usurpation and interloper.

We may see some of the causes of that indifference, hostility to liberty, equality and inalienable human rights that have been manifested in the high places of church. The interests and the principles of humanity have been too little understood and regarded, in polity of the church itself. Before the church can come the champion of the world's freedom, she must self learn to stand fast in the liberty wherewith she maketh his people free. The forms of church polity farthest removed from primitive freedom and independency, have been most efficient in the support of slavery. And the churches once based on principles have become crippled, polluted and precisely at those points, and through those means which have marked their approximation to the ecclesiastical usurpations around them. The Protestant Episcopal church in America contains a few friends of freedom, but probably none who expect, in this particularly sympathetic and assistance of their church. The Unionism of the Methodist Episcopal church was created by her Episcopacy; and that of the Presbyterian church by her Presbyterianism. Congregationalism poisoned by its intimacy with Presbyterianism. The Baptist churches found, in substance, a "General Assembly"—a "Conference"—in their Triennial convention. Neither Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists could have been seduced into an alliance with the monster of slavery, had they had no ecclesiastical connections besides those of the church. It was for the sake of preserving their denominational arrangements, their artificial unauthorized ecclesiastical machinery, that they needed the spirit of Christianity itself. While even these situations themselves may (by perversion) be perverted to the service of oppression, unauthorized and usurpations, of course, will.

Christian Investigator

Whitesboro, April, 1843.

Our readers will see that our "Receipts" small, this time; scarcely enough, (even including sums designed for "Editor's Support,") to pay the maker and printer for this number. But the first since publishing the last number, has been short, and shall endeavor to issue the May number in due time, trusting that our good friends will give us all their power.

RECEIPTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Of T Hall Lockport 50c; S Flagler do 50c; brandt do 50c; H Norton do 50c; W H Cl Whitesboro 50c; S W Stewart Clinton 50c; E W Hutton 1 00; EP Healy Dryden 50c; O M do 50c; Mrs Foster do 5 copies 2 00; A Sims 50c; Mrs L B Page do 50c; E Ballard do 50c; Smith Trumansburg 50c; D E Sedgwick do 50c; Trimby do 50c; H Lambert do 50c; J C G do 50c; Miss Emily Miller Enfield 50c; W Elder S Kimball Ludlowville 50c; A Corwell do 50c; Lord do 50c; E Thwing Springfield Mass 50c; niels do 50c; F Searle do 50c; J Wood Jaso M P H Prescott W Exeter 50c; Papers sold 2; Halsey Ithaca 50c; O Fitch Newfield 50c; J L Larned's Corvers 50c; M Crawford do 50c; F Fretown Mass 50c. Amount \$7

RECEIVED ON "PLAN FOR EDITOR'S SUPPORT."

Of S W Stewart Clinton 5 00; T Beebe H 1 00; W J Savage do 3 00; W H Olin W 1 00; Z Brackett Brockton's Bridge 2 00; J H 5 00; H Reed do 1 00; Amount \$

B. W. GREEN, PRINTER.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series, Vol. I—No. 4,
Whole Number, 12.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO Co., N. Y., MAY, 1843,

WILLIAM GOODALE, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

[NEW SERIES.]

Twelve numbers in a volume. To be published monthly,
or as often as practicable.

TERMS.

Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50
cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
forward the money without expense to the publisher,
shall have one copy for his services;—

Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies
for his services;—

Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies
for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate
from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen,	\$0 50
Twenty-eight papers for	1 00
Sixty papers for	2 00
One hundred papers for	3 00

Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters an-
closing money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY—PASTORAL OFFICE—CHURCH OFFICERS.

The preceding lecture was occupied with a consideration of Church Organization, Church Order, Church Government, and Church Discipline. That discussion would be incomplete without a more distinct inquiry concerning Church Officers, and particularly the Pastoral Office, the functions of religious teachers, and the claims of the Christian ministry at large. As our views of church offices and of the ministry are, of necessity, modified by our views of the church, so our views of the church must needs be modified by our views of the ministry. Or, if our views of the one be inconsistent with our views of the other, confusion and conflict must be the result; until a practical relinquishment of some part of our theory, restores self-consistency and harmony. In vain would be our efforts to organize and maintain church arrangements which should exclude the principle of caste, which should prevent the subjection of the many to the few, and the merging of individual responsibility in habits of passive submission to the church, if, at the same time, our notions of the Christian ministry or of the pastoral office are such that, after all, we conceive of the ministry as rightfully constituting a distinct grade or caste, not subject, like other members, to the discipline of the church, (if considered members at all,) but holding, with a few other officials, the entire power of the church in their own hands. The theory and usages of strict local church independency, as commonly understood in our times, instead of guarding the rights of the mass of church members, might and favor with the ambitious pastor, and en-
throned him as the village Pope, if he could only inspire the people of his charge with such sentiments of veneration for the priesthood or the pastoral office as should, in effect, transform the pastor himself into the independent church,

whose decisions could not be reversed by any presbytery or consociation, sitting as a court of appeal. As a matter of fact, there are clergymen whose zeal for local independency and the absence of presbyterian or synodical supervision admits of this easy solution. And hence it comes to pass that arguments in favor of presbyterian arrangements seldom fail to include the alleged necessity of providing some refuge for the people, from the domination of their pastors. And churches and individuals, have, not unfrequently, exchanged their congregationalism for consociationism or presbyterianism, on this express ground. Such facts plainly indicate the necessity of inquiring into the rightful prerogatives of the pastors, and of the ministry at large.

Existing controversies between the friends of Christian freedom and the conservators of high church power, are found to hinge, mainly, upon the claims of the clergy, and other officers of the church. These controversies have given occasion for some to question or deny the utility and divine institution of a Christian ministry and of organized Christian churches.

From various causes, the almost idolatrous veneration for ministers, formerly cherished, is giving place to an impatience of their pretensions, bordering, too often, on contempt for their labors, inasmuch that the preaching of the gospel is in danger of being undervalued, if not laid aside. The charge of clerical usurpation is often coupled with the seemingly paradoxical charge of clerical servility and sycophancy to the populace and to patrons. The all-along difficult problem of reconciling ministerial independence, on the one hand, with the independence and elective voice of the people in the designation of their pastors, on the other, is becoming still more complex and difficult; nay, both are practically sinking into unreal pretensions, or hurtful perversions. With the increasing cry of destitution, of moral wastes, and of spiritual harvests suffering for want of reapers, we have likewise an equally stunning complaint of the inadequate or unstable support of ministers, and of supernumerary or unemployed pastors and teachers. At a time when the popular sentiment and feeling, every where, is becoming more and more impatient of clerical control, it is manifest that clerical claims are growing more and more arrogant, from the high places of Oxford and of the church of England, down to the humblest congregational meeting-house in America. From a prelatial archbishop of Canterbury, who claims a princely revenue from those who will not hear him preach, down to a disorganizing and professedly anti-clerical Stephen S. Foster, who nevertheless claims the ultra-clerical right of preaching to the people whether they will

Rev. Dr. Miller, in his treatise, dwells eloquently and largely upon the dangerous power wielded by the local pastor, to the oppression of the church member, unless the pastor be held in check by the apprehension that his doings may be reversed by a court of appeal. The idea that the pastor should be a member of the local church and subject to its discipline, does not seem to have occurred to the Doctor.

hear him or no, there is to be witnessed an unceasing and widely extended struggle of preachers for clerical power, accompanied by a corresponding decline of the moral and spiritual influence of the preachers. For men do not easily yield to the persuasions of those who would either compel them to pay without hearing, or to hear against their consent. The scoffers in the bar-room, who deny that their Maker can qualify and thus commission a portion of their fellow-men to reprove their vices with messages from his own lips, are met, or rather reinforced by clergymen in conclave, who equally deny that any "efficacy" or "validity" can pertain to the preaching of ministers of the gospel, however gifted by high heaven, unless some clerical body has likewise condescended to confer upon them the additional qualification of its own indispensable sanction! And thus the ministerial dignity and the power so much desired, are sought from the commission of the association, the presbytery or the Bishop, rather than from the soul-refreshing breath and anointing finger of the Highest!

The struggle for clerical supremacy over the people, is not more eager, more disorderly, more mischievous, more corrupting, or more successful than the counter struggle of powerful laymen, and sometimes of whole congregations and churches, to break down the manly and holy independence of the gospel minister, and render the teacher and pastor the sycophant and the tool of his patron or patrons. Sometimes the one struggle may seem to hold the other in check. But for the most part, and in the end, the two evils aggravate and fortify each other. They commingle and alternate, if they do not become one. The pastor who plays the despot, and forbids free discussion and the advocacy of human rights in the church, commonly does so, because he is at the bidding of some purse-bloated layman, or aristocratic clique, or possibly because the corrupt and pro-slavery majority have suspended his living upon his obsequiousness to their prejudices and their contempt of the crushed. To the young minister or newly installed pastor, the problem seems often to be, whether he shall become the chieftain or the serf—the tyrant or the menial—and it is well if he does not become both.—Both indeed, he must almost of necessity become, if he becomes either.

Such jarring and discordant notes of complaint—such an evidently lapsed and disjointed state of things, calls loudly for a remedy;—and how can it be obtained without probing the sore to the bottom, without cauterizing, or amputating, if need be, the diseased portions or the monstrous growths that may be found.—And how shall this be done without a reference to the original model—without recalling to mind the just proportions and the healthful functions of the several organs, in the days of primitive vigor and youth? Or how, in other words, without a reference to the fundamental doctrines, the living spirit, the ultimate objects, the final aims, and the authentic records of our

heaven-descended Christianity, shall we decide upon the proper position and claims of that Christian ministry and of those church officers ordained of heaven to be among the appropriate and fit instruments of the **WORK TO BE DONE?** What we said in this direction, and as applied to the church, in the preceding lecture, is equally important to be understood, and borne in mind here, in speaking of the ministry and of the officers in the church. The minister and the ministry, the officers and the office must be in keeping with the truths and the spirit of the religion to be exemplified and taught.

Our efforts and prayers for a renovated **WORLD**, through the instrumentality of a redeemed and reformed **CHURCH**, must include equal efforts and prayers for that **RESTORED CHRISTIAN MINISTRY**, in its primitive simplicity and power, for the want of which, (to so great an extent,) the church languishes, and the earth groans. Not without a spiritually baptised ministry shall we have a truly revived church or an evangelized world. Such a ministry we can not expect to have, until the *true idea*—the almost *lost conception* of a Christian ministry is regained.—And in order to this, what vast accumulations of human tradition and worldly wisdom must first be removed! And who shall touch a spade or a barrow to this mound of idolized rubbish, without rousing the fury of the worshipers?

SCRIPTURE FACTS—ANCIENT USAGES.

To reason, *a priori*, from the well known and undisputed principles, and spirit, and aims of our religion, however sound and undeniable the induction, would avail us little, with many readers, if our conclusions should not square with the *usages* they see around them. May we, then, in the first place, adventure a statement of plain *Scripture facts*? To do this, in our own words, referring the reader to the chapters and verses of his own bible, would avail us little more, we fear, in many cases, than a course of logical argument. For how should the lecture writer, (it might be asked,) discover in the sacred volume, what nobody else, not even the most learned and studious, had ever before seen?

Happily, the needful work, in this direction, is done up to our hands, by orthodox authors, in good repute among the prominent clergy of our times.

PREACHERS—TESTIMONY OF BUCK AND OF ROBINSON.

The "Theological Dictionary" of "the late Rev. Charles Buck," is a standard work on both sides of the Atlantic, and has gone through several London and American editions, with general clerical favor. Such a work will not be suspected of disseminating heretical or disorganizing views of the Christian ministry and its rightful claims. Under the article "PREACHING," which he defines as "the discoursing publicly on any religious subject," Mr. Buck introduces "with few alterations," a dissertation on the subject, by Mr. Robinson, who, he says, "prefixed it to his second volume of *Claudio's Essay*." Mr. Watson, (of the Methodist Episcopal church,) in his theological dictionary, makes use of the same dissertation, though with some important omissions, and the recently compiled "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge" contains the article as presented by Mr. Buck. Let us see, then, how such a writer understands the *facts of Scripture*, in relation

to teachers of religion—public religious preachers.

"From the sacred records we learn that when men began to associate for the purpose of worshipping the Deity, Enoch prophesied. Jude, 14, 15. * * * * * From the days of Enoch to the time of Moses, each patriarch worshiped God with his family, probably several assembled at new moons, and alternately instructed the whole company. Noah, it is said was a preacher of righteousness. 2 Peter, ii. 5.—1 Peter, iii. 19, 20. Abraham commanded his household after him to keep the way of the Lord, and to do justice and judgment. Gen. xviii. 19. And Jacob, when his house lapsed into idolatry, remonstrated against it, and exhorted all that were with him to put away strange gods and go up with him to Bethel.—Gen. x. Gen. xxv. 2, 3. Melchizedec, also, we may consider as the father, the prince and the priest of his people, publishing the glad tidings of peace and salvation. Gen. xxi. Hob. vii.

"Moses was a most eminent prophet and preacher, raised up by the authority of God, and by whom, it is said, came the law. John, i. 17. * * * * * How he and Aaron sermonized, we may see by several parts of his writings. The first discourse was heard with profound reverence and attention, the last was both uttered and received in raptures. Ex. iv. 31: Deut. xxxiii. 7, 8. *Public preaching does not appear, under this economy, to have attached to the priesthood; priests were not officially preachers,* and we have innumerable instances of discourses delivered in religious assemblies, by men of other tribes besides that of Levi.* Psalm lxxviii. 21. (The Lord gave the word; great was the company of those that published it.) Joshua was an Ephraimite, but being full of the spirit of wisdom, he gathered the tribes to Shiloh, and harangued the people of God. Deut. xxxiv. 9. Joshua xxxiv. Solomon was a prince of the house of Judah, Amos a herdsman of Tekon, yet both were preachers, and one, at least, was a prophet. 1 Kings ii. Amos vii. 14, 15.—When the ignorant notions of pagans, the vices of their practice, and the idolatry of their pretended worship, were, in some sad periods, incorporated into the Jewish religion, by the princes of that nation, the prophets and all the seers protested against the apostasy, and they were persecuted for so doing. Shimeiah preached to Rehoboam, the princes and all the people, at Jerusalem. 2 Chron. xii. 5. Azariah and Hanani preached to Asa and his army. 2 Chron. xv. 1, &c., xvi. 7. Micajah to Ahab. Some of them opened schools, or houses of instruction, and there, to their disciples, they taught the pure religion of Moses.—At Naioth, in the suburbs of Ramah, there was one, where Samuel dwelt, there was another at Bethel, and a third at Jericho, to which Elijah and Elisha often resorted. Thither the people went, on Sabbath days, and at new moons, and received public lessons of piety and morality.—1 Sam. xix. 18. 2 Kings ii. 3, 5. 2 Kings iv. 2, 3. Through all this period there was a dismal confusion of the useful ordinance of religious preaching. Sometimes they had no

*This language of our author may, perhaps, be thought to need some modification:—the priests were not exclusively preachers, though they may have been "officially" so. It is written—"The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." [Mal. ii. 7].—Editor.

open vision, and the word of the Lord was precious or scarce, the people heard it only now and then. At other times they were left without a teaching priest, and without law. And, at other seasons, again, itinerants, both princes, priests, and Levites, were sent through all the country, to carry the book of the law, and to preach in the cities. In a word, preaching flourished when true religion grew, and when the last was decayed, the first was suppressed. *Moses had not appropriated preaching to any order of men; persons, places, times, and manners were discretionary.* Many of the discourses were preached in camps and courts, in streets, schools, cities, and villages; sometimes with great composure and coolness, at other times with vehement action, and rapturous energy; sometimes in a plain, blunt style, at other times in all the magnificent pomp of Eastern anagory. On some occasions, the preachers appeared in public with visible signs, with implements of war, yokes of slavery, or something adapted to their subject. They gave lectures on these, held them up to view, girded them on, or broke them in pieces, rent their garments, rolled in the dust, and endeavored, by all the methods they could devise, agreeably to the customs of their country, to impress the minds of their auditors with the nature and importance of their doctrines."

[The author notices, likewise, the false prophets, and preachers who humored the vices of the princes and people, and assured them of peace and safety in their sins. Then, after some account of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, &c., before the captivity, he thus proceeds]:—

"When the seventy years of the captivity were expired, the good prophets and preachers, Zephaniah, Joshua, Haggai, and others, having confidence in the word of God, and aspiring after their natural, civil, and religious rights, endeavored, by all means, to extricate themselves and their countrymen from that mortifying state in which the crimes of their ancestors had brought them. They wept, fasted, prayed, preached, prophesied, and at length prevailed. The chief instruments were Nehemiah and Ezra, the first was governor,* and reformed their civil state, the last was a scribe of the law of the God of Heaven, addressed himself to ecclesiastical matters, which he rendered the noblest service to his country, and to all posterity."

[We have not room to copy our author's splendid description of the preaching of Ezra and of its remarkable effects. Whoever would regain and fasten upon the true idea of *Bible preaching*, should not only read but study the article of Mr. Robinson entire. Passing his account of the preaching of John the Baptist, of Christ, of his disciples, and of the apostles, we select a few further extracts.]

"The apostles being dead, every thing came to pass as they had foretold. The whole Christian system underwent a miserable change; preaching shared the fate of other institutions, and this glory of the primitive church was greatly degenerated. * * * * * For some time preaching was common to bishops, presbyters, deacons, and private brethren, in

*A specimen of this governor's preaching may be seen in the book of Nehemiah, chapter v. Some preaching among us, would, doubtless, be much disgusted with a political sermon to princes and people, from the error of a state—though God might "think upon him good."—Editor.

primitive church; in process, it was restricted to the Bishop, and to such as he should appoint. They called the appointment ordination; and at last, attached I know not what ideas of mystery and influence to the word, and to the domination of the Bishop who pronounced it. * * * The first preachers differed much in pulpit action, the greater part used very moderate and sober gestures. They delivered their sermons all extempore, while there were notaries who took down what they said. * * * They did not preach by the clock, (so to speak,) but were short or long, as they saw occasion, though an hour was about the usual time.—Sermons were generally both preached and heard standing, but sometimes both speaker and auditors sat, especially the aged and infirm."

Thus much, in the form of testimony, in respect to ancient usages, from Mr. Robinson and Mr. Buck. It may be well to add some further account of the first Christian preachers and pastors from other witnesses equally in good repute with the religious public.

PASTORS, &c.—TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR.

This is the name of the reputed and popular author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm"—"Spiritual Despotism," &c. He is an English writer, and a member and defender of the national church establishment, though he would wish to see some of its gross abuses, (as he considers them,) reformed. His works have been received with favor by the religious journalists of this country, and from no quarter do we hear him charged with the spirit of radicalism or heresy, of disorder or schism. Yet his book on "spiritual despotism," contains concessions and statements quite remarkable, as coming from such a source; and it is particularly rich in its references to historical facts. These we might use, (and perhaps shall,) as authority for statements, on many important questions, where our own assertions or opinions, to the same import, would startle and alarm even some of our own friends. In this place we shall only introduce a few sentences.

They, (the deacons of the churches, in the time of Justin Martyr,) might, however, on occasions of necessity, administer baptism; indeed we find this rite to have been performed sometimes by persons altogether secular, and even by military men; (see, among other evidences, the *Mosaics* collected by Ciampini.)—"Spiritual Despotism," page 324. "The deacons being sometimes called clergy, and sometimes not."—[ib.] * * * That Philip, one of the seven, (if the same Philip,) is found preaching the word, does not make him other than a layman, for it is manifest that believers at large, as well as the deacons, used the liberty of preaching and teaching."—[ib. page 328]

SECULAR PASTORS—TESTIMONY OF NEANDER AND OF SCHMUCKER.

And who is Neander? The Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, N. J., in his "Essay on the nature and duty of the office of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian Church," takes occasion to quote NEANDER, and says of him, (page 47,) "the celebrated Augustus Neander, Professor in the University of Berlin, is generally considered as, perhaps, more pro-

foundly skilled in Christian antiquities than any other man now living."

The Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Prof. in the Theo. Sem. of Gen. Synod of the Church, Gettysburg, Pa., in his "Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches, with a plan for Catholic Union on Apostolical Principles," (a work favorably noticed by our principal religious editors, and recommended by many learned ministers,) gives his own views of the pastoral and ministerial office, as exercised among the first Christians. After making his own statements, he subjoins those of Neander, and we will, therefore, quote them both in connection; premising that the object of Prof. Schmucker, was to suggest a remedy for that "source of sectarian discord, to be noticed 'in the conflict of pecuniary interest between neighboring ministers and churches.'"—[page 82, second edition.] For this purpose he refers to the primitive churches and their pastors, as furnishing models upon which modern usages should, in some measure, be shaped.

"From this difficulty, [i. e., "conflicting pecuniary interests,"] the primitive church was almost entirely exempt. In the earlier ages, it was customary to appoint, that is, ordain, several elders, or, as we now term them, ministers, in every church, who divided the labor between them, and generally continued to prosecute their secular business, thus, in a great measure, supporting themselves, whilst it was customary, from the beginning, to provide for those who went abroad as missionaries, and traveled from place to place.—[Fuch's Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen, vol. i, p. 72-3.] The only fund of the church was that which arose from the voluntary offerings of the members, on each Lord's Day. This fund, however, was considerable, &c., &c."

[Having next quoted several ancient documents, showing when, why, how, and by whom the contrary usages still current among us, were first introduced, "in the third century," and after the spirit and purity of primitive Christianity had sensibly declined, Prof. Schmucker then proceeds:]—

"In accordance with these original documents, is the opinion of Dr. Neander, who is confessedly the most learned writer of the present age, on the ancient history of the church."

"It is almost certain, says he, [Neander,] that, in the beginning, those who held offices in the church, continued to pursue their secular business, and thereby supported their families, as they had previously done. The congregations, which consisted chiefly of the poor, were scarcely able to provide for the support of their ministers, (presbyters,) and deacons, especially as, at that time, many other demands were made on the congregational treasury, such as the support of the destitute widows, of the poor, of the sick, and of orphans. * * * *"

The apostle Paul does, indeed, declare, that the missionaries, who went abroad to publish the Gospel, are entitled to a support from those for whose spiritual benefit they labor, but we can not hence infer the same in regard to the officers of individual congregations. The former could not well unite their secular profession with their spiritual calling, although to the self-denial of Paul, even this was possible. Nor was there any thing offensive in such a union, according to the primitive views of the Christians, for they were convinced that every earthly calling also could be sanctified by the Christian design

for which it is pursued, and they know that even an apostle followed a secular business, whilst engaged in publishing the Gospel."— * * * * The writer traces the history of innovations on these usages, until "ministers were now urged to abstain from worldly business, and in the third century, they were absolutely prohibited from all such employments, even from the duties of a guardian." Thus far, the testimony of Neander.

"Such then,"—resumes Prof. Schmucker—"are the undoubted facts of the case. In the beginning, there was not, there could not be any conflict of pecuniary interest between adjoining ministers and congregations."—[p. 80.]

In further use of these facts, Prof. Schmucker adverts to the great enterprise of "the conversion of the world."—[page 139.] He inquires "Why is it, then, that after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, so little is done?" "Is there any defect in the instrumentality appointed by God? That system admits of extension to an indefinite degree, of extension adequate to the wants of the world." "Here, then is, at present, the grand difficulty. The want of ministers is now the fundamental obstacle to the spread of the Gospel over the earth."— * * * * "Let, then, the followers of the Saviour go to work with the full conviction that the duty enjoined upon them is practicable." * * * "In reality, the true difficulty, first and last, has been want of piety and zeal in the churches."—[pages 142-3.]

He calculates that "25,000 laborers for the heathen world, to be sent from the present Christian churches," with collateral help, "would be amply sufficient, by the divine blessing, to preach the Gospel to every creature—"

* * * "Especially, if, like the proto-missionaries of the Saviour, many of them should travel from place to place, remaining only long enough in each, to form a congregation of believers, and appointing, from their number, the most pious, talented and faithful, as pastors of the flock, pursue their course. This method was found adequate in the apostolic age, and might now be pursued, (as it is in part,) with the greater propriety, as the missionary would leave the written word in every church thus formed. Is it objected by any, that these teachers would be ignorant of the history of the church and other important matters? We hesitate not, in reply, to express our solemn and deliberate conviction, that it would be better for the heathen world never to hear of Augustine, and Luther, and Calvin, and Zuingli, and Arminius, and Wesley, than to be rent into such a multitude of contending sects, and embittered by bigoted disputes, as the protestant church generally has been. A Christianity built upon the Bible, and the Bible alone, like that of the earlier Christians, and the modern Moravians, will suffice for the salvation of any nation. But the well educated missionaries themselves would be possessed of all the collateral science requisite to illustrate and defend the sacred volume, and could communicate it, whilst institutions for Christian science and learning could be gradually established in all nations, for the publication of the scriptures and the gradual elevation of ministerial education, among the natives."

* Nor is it necessary that all the missionaries sent out should receive a classical education. Of those destined for uncivilized countries, such as Africa, whilst some should be thoroughly ed-

* The disciples that were "scattered abroad," by persecution, "went every where, preaching the word."—Acts viii.—Ed.

uated, the major part would be quite as efficient—after four or five years' instruction in Christian doctrine and duty, some of the physical sciences, especially medical botany, agriculture, or some suitable trade—in pastoral duties, and the language of their destination. If such a ministry is successful in our own country, as it is in the case of our Moravian and Methodist brethren, much more would it be adequate to the wants of many portions of the missionary field."—[pages 144-5.]

"And how long would it require, until the church could furnish these 25,000 missionaries? Not so long as we are apt to imagine, if the protestant churches would come up to the standard of duty, attainable, and certainly obtainable. The apostles found "in every city," in the churches established by them, (averaging, probably, at that time, not fifty, unto members,) materials for "appointing elders," or preachers. Hence we may justly infer, that every church, on an average, does contain at least several persons whose duty it is to devote themselves to this work, and if a proper standard of piety were maintained, and suitable effort made to direct them, they could now be found, as well as in the apostolic age."—[page 146.]

A very reasonable conclusion, one would think, unless persons and communities educated in the midst of our nineteenth century civilization and Christianity, are far, far behind those brought up and trained in ancient Judaism and heathenism!

Our primary object in citing Neander and Schmucker was, to avail ourselves of their high authority, and their reliable testimony to the Bible facts and the ancient usages of the church in relation to preachers and pastors. Our readers see what those facts and usages are, and they see, likewise, that the author last mentioned, not only gives his testimony to the facts, but is desirous that, under existing circumstances, at least, the ancient usages of the church should be, in a measure, restored—that, for the double object of removing that "source of pecuniary discord to be noticed in the conflict of interests between neighboring ministers and churches," and for sparing a large portion of our well educated ministers for the foreign missionary field, he would have the churches content themselves, to a great extent, with *pastors chosen from among the present laity, with their present literary qualifications—sustaining themselves chiefly by their own manual labor—their present secular avocations*; that he would have the major part of the foreign missionaries taken from the same class, and the newly gathered churches, on missionary ground, supplied with their pastors, in the first instance, chiefly in the same way.

Suppose now that, for the reasons stated by Prof. Schmucker—for the promotion of a true Christian union—for the removal of one of the grounds of sectarian rivalry and conflicting pecuniary interests in all our villages—for the purpose of sending a pure Bible Christianity speedily to the heathen, and for the additional, yet closely connected, object of establishing in our own land, Christian churches and Christian institutions devoted actively to the claims of the crushed poor, and uncontaminated with the abominations and cruelties of American oppression—in a word, for the purpose of restoring and propagating primitive Christianity at home and abroad—suppose (we say) a brotherhood of Christians, in different parts of the land,

should conclude to attempt the work that Prof. Schmucker (in the particulars he has specified) recommends. Suppose, having organized churches on the open and liberal plan of receiving all whom they can conscientiously recognize as Christians, they should choose pastors from among their own number, from those who are now accounted "laymen," and who in many cases should continue to follow their "secular" callings? What would be thought and said, of such a movement, if it should happen to be made? Should we hear a cry of innovation and disorder?—of the invasion of the rights of the ministry? Of the irregularity of lay preaching? Of the incompetency of such pastors? Of the want of "authority" and "validity" in their official acts? Of their want of a "regular education" and "induction" into the clerical caste?

From whom should we hear this? From those who have recommended the "Appeal" of Prof. Schmucker, from which the preceding extracts have been taken? No doubt a book may be recommended, in the main, by those who do not agree with all the author's advances. And in this case, we notice a commendable caution, not to say non-committal, in some of the recommendations before us. Yet if the book, in their view, contained fundamental heresies, or disorganizing proposals, or assaults on a "regularly educated" and inducted ministry, or palpably incorrect statements of primitive usages and biblical facts, we should hardly expect to see it recommended, and without any allusion to its errors, by such names as are found appended to recommendations of this work.†

* The question of lay or clerical ordination is not, perhaps, disposed of, by our citations from Schmucker and Neander; but how much would it lessen the apprehended clamor, if an adequate number of abolition ministers, duly inducted, should join in the supposed enterprise, and "ordain" the requisite pastors chosen by and among the people, for the purpose?

† Among these we notice Rev. Prof. E. B. Edwards, Theo. Sem. Andover, and Rev. Dr. Cogswell, Sec. of the Amer. Education Society, as editors of the Am. Quarterly Register.—Editor of Boston Recorder—Editor of Lutheran Observer (Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, Baltimore), Rev. Drs. Knox, Absalom Peters, Wm. Patton, Thos. Skinner and Henry White, New York city; Rev. Dr. S. H. Cox, Brooklyn, Rev. Dr. S. H. Tyng, (Episcopal) Philadelphia; Rev. Prof. James Eliot, Brown University, Rev. Dr. Hill, Alexandria, Rev. Dr. Enoch Pond, Prof. Thos. Bangor, Rev. Dr. Snell, Brookfield, Mass., Rev. Dr. Porter, Catskill—Rev. Messrs. Josiah Edwards, D. D., Leonard Woods, D. D., and Prof. Moses Stuart, Dr. Ralph Emerson, and Edwards A. Park, Andover. Rev. Dr. A. Wyllie, Pres. of Indiana College, Rev. Dr. Wm. Jenks, Boston, Rev. Pres. Rauch, of Marshall College, Rev. Dr. C. L. Krauth, Pres. Pennsylvania College, Rev. Pharellus Church, Rochester, N. Y., etc. etc. etc.

The American Quarterly Register says: "We were struck with its candor, honesty, thorough and learned research."—The Boston Recorder says: "It is characterized by sound practical good sense, extensive knowledge of Church History," "excellent spirit and incontrovertible arguments." The Lutheran Observer says: "It should be in every family in our country, ministers of the gospel and church officers especially."—Dr. Jenks, Peters, Patton, Skinner, White, etc. say: "We regard the general principles of the Appeal as scriptural and correct," "without pledging ourselves for every sentiment it contains." "We doubt not that the publication will exert a salutary influence," etc. Dr. Tyng says: "Its general principles are faultless." Prof. Eliot antithetically says that it "will be republished in England." Dr. Hill says: "Go on, my brother." Dr. Pond says: "I find little or nothing in it to except against, but much to approve. It is learned, Scriptural and (substantially) feasible. I hope you will publish a new edition," etc. Dr. Cox says: "It is a good sign of the times, and of the probable return to us of

NON-PREACHING BISHOPS—TESTIMONY OF DR. MILLER AND OTHERS.

We have already mentioned the "Essay," by Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, of Princeton, "on the nature and duty of the office of Ruling Elder in the Presbyterian church." It is an elaborate work, and quite remarkable for the extent and variety of its citations to prove the antiquity of the usages which the learned author is intent to maintain. The office of "Ruling Elder," the Doctor evidently regards as comprising much of the pith and core of Presbyterian church order, and if he could but make out the antiquity, and especially the Scripture authority of this, he might afford to leave (as he seems to have done, and as he must needs do) the defense of permanent organized judicatories over the local churches, such as modern Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies, to be made out by considerations of convenience and expediency, rather than by Scripture precept or primitive precedent. To the one point of the Eldership, therefore, the antiquarian researches of Dr. Miller are mainly directed. And Elders in the primitive churches he could, of course, find. But who were the Elders, and what was their office? Were they identical with the Elders in the modern Presbyterian churches? Were their office and their position the same? Or were they the same lay Pastors, the secular Bishops and Ministers, that Prof. Schmucker and Dr. Neander have described?

We mistake the matter, if Dr. Miller has not proved much more than he intended, while failing to prove what he undertook. Let him be consoled, if it should turn out to be the fact. Great men have often done more—and more good, too—than they anticipated. Columbus only sought a new route to India, but discovered a new world. If Dr. Miller has not reached his Presbyterian Eldership in the apostolic age, he may have discovered (to others if not to himself) the primitive "CHRISTIAN MINISTRY"—the New Testament "PASTORAL OFFICE." And he who shall have done that, in the present crisis, can not have lived in vain. Let us hear him.

"It is plain that all Bishops [in the primitive churches] were Scriptural Elders, and that all Elders, whether both teachers and rulers, or rulers only, provided they were placed over a parish, as inspectors or overseers,* were Scrip-

torial Christians, that such a scheme meets with favor, and is entertained by many." Drs. Edwards and Woods, with the Andover professors, say: "It will tend to enlarge and liberalize the hearts of good men."

Such is the general character, then, in the view of these learned gentlemen, of the work from which we have made these important extracts. And we notice, in their recommendations, no exceptions to the particular views and statements we have quoted. If they contain gross mistakes and dangerous errors, these numerous and elevated watchmen on our walls have failed to give the alarm. If we err in receiving the testimony of Schmucker and Neander, their endorsers must share in the blame.

Prof. Schmucker's "Plan" of Christian union may be defective (as we think it is) in attempting a union of the sects, instead of their abolition by a union of Christians—also in expecting a Christian union without a more thorough divorce of Christians from the usurpations of the Man of Sin, from the Anti-Christ that is to be destroyed. But this defect does not diminish the value of his testimony to the ancient usages of the church, or of his recommendation of their adoption.

* Query. Were there any other Elders? Were there officers connected with no association, and having no charge? Preachers there might be, who were not pastors nor elders.—Exton.

and Bishops." "I have no doubt but this is the fact. When, therefore, the Apostle Paul, in writing to the church at Philippi addresses the Bishops and Deacons, and when in his conference with the Elders of the church at Ephesus at Miletus he speaks of them all, equally, as overseers, or, as it is in the original, Bishops, of that church, I take it for granted he speaks of the rulers, as well as the teachers, in both instances. In a word, I suppose that in every truly primitive and apostolic church, there was a bench of elders or overseers, who presided over all the spiritual interests of the congregation, that generally a small part only of these, perhaps only one, statedly preached, that the rest, though probably ordained in the same manner with their colleagues, very rarely, if ever, taught publicly, but were employed as inspectors and rulers, and, it may be, also, in visiting, catechising and instructing from house to house."—p. 68.

"There is abundant evidence that every class of Elders, as well those who commonly styled as rulers only, as those who both ruled and taught, bore the name of Bishops, inspectors or overseers, during the apostolic age, and for a long time afterwards."—p. 70.

"We find moreover, the same chiefest of the apostles (Paul) giving the title of Bishop and Elder, without discrimination, to all the church members directed to be ordained in Ephesus and elsewhere, as the Epistles to Timothy and Titus plainly evince. In those pure and simple times no difficulty arose from this general application of a plain and expressive title. For more than one hundred years after the apostolic age, this title continued to be frequently applied in the same manner, as the writings of Clement Romanus, Hermes, Irenæus and others, amply testify. We find them not only speaking of the Elders as bearing rule in the church, but also calling the same men, alternately, Bishops and Elders, as was evidently so in apostolic times. In process of time, however, this title, which was originally considered expressive of duty and labor, rather than honor, became gradually appropriated to the principal elder, who usually presided in preaching and ordering the public service. Not only so, but as a worldly and ambitious spirit gained ground, he who bore this title began to advance peculiar claims, first, those of stated *chairman, President or Moderator*, and finally those of a *new order or grade of office*."

A fair account of the origin of usages and of the pastoral office, now almost universally prevalent! But let us hear Dr. Miller further.]

Shortly after the apostolic age, several ecclesiastical offices, it is confessed, on all hands, were either invented or modified, so as to suit declining spirituality of the times."—p. 76.

It deserves inquiry whether the views which Dr. Miller himself holds; in regard to plenary powers of the Bishops, Pastors or others, over the church—the brotherhood—be derived from these "modified" conceptions of offices, rather than from the sacred usages, or the genius of Christianity itself. Authorities for clothing the Eldership with power of discipline in the church, are written who lived during or since the degenerate times when these "modifications" were introduced. Their opinions are not to be confound-

ed with their testimony. Nor is it to be wondered at, that partially correct views and statements of the offices and of the terms used to designate them, should remain and continue to be witnessed, long after such "modifications" of them should have been made.]

FURTHER TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR—(OFFICIAL TITLES.)

Just on this point, namely the meaning and application of official titles in the New Testament church, having heard the testimony of our champion of Princeton Presbyterianism, let us cite again to the stand, our popular Episcopal expositor, Mr. Taylor.

"The apostles evidently employ terms of office rather in the power of their abstract meaning, than as the fixed and conventional designation of established functionaries. The apostles call themselves Presbyters and Deacons too. Our Lord is declared to be both Bishop and Deacon.* Presbyters are bishops, and bishops are teachers and helpers; and a primate is exhorted, in one place, to do the work of an Evangelist, and in another, fully to discharge the office of a deacon. * * * The liquid or convertible state in which we find the designation of office in the New Testament, indicates clearly the yet undefined condition of the functionaries to which such titles are, in that promiscuous manner, applied. * * * No writer, of the age of Cyprian uses the words Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon, so indeterminate or abstractedly as do the apostles."—*Spiritual Despotism*, pp. 129, 130.

Whether this view of indeterminateness be fully admitted or not, the facts that such a statement could be plausibly made, and that a zealous Episcopalian has made it, are sufficient to corroborate the statement of Dr. Miller that no marked distinction between the titles of Bishop, Elder, Presbyter or Pastor, is observable in the apostolic records.

TESTIMONY OF "THE FATHERS"—ORIENTAL CHURCHES, &c.

In support of this statement, and of the corresponding usages of the primitive church, Dr. Miller adduces, through the 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of his book, a formidable array of learned authorities, from the times of the apostles down to the present period. Among the early Christian fathers and their documents he quotes Clemens Romanus—Ignatius—Polycarp—Cyprian—Origen—Gesta Purgationis, &c.—Optatus—Augustine—Apostolical Constitutions—Isidore, and Gregory. He cites also the testimony of Buchanan concerning the Syrian Christians.—Also, of the Waldenses, Albigenses, the Bohemian churches, &c. to the same point.

TESTIMONY OF THE REFORMERS.

In his sixth chapter, Dr. Miller brings forward the testimony of the Protestant Reformers—Zuingli, Oecolampadius, Bucor, Peter Martyr, John A. Lasco, Whitgift, Dean Nowell, Ursinus, the Confession of Saxony, Szegeuden, Magdeburg Centuriators, Junius, Zan-

* The words minister, servant and deacon probably meant, originally, very nearly the same thing. Hence some infer that Phoebe, who is called a servant of the church, was a deaconess. And Webster's Dictionary gives, among the meanings of the word deacon,—"In Scotland, an overseer of the poor, and the master of an incorporated company." So little may we infer from mere names of offices.—EDITOR.

chini, Pareanus, Piscator, Cartwright, Greenham, Estius, Whitaker, and the Reformed Churches generally.

Calvin's testimony is thus quoted.—"In calling those who preside over the churches by the appellation of Bishops, Elders and Pastors, WITHOUT ANY DISTINCTION. I have followed the usages of the Scriptures, which apply all these terms to express the same meaning."—*Inst.*, book IV. Chap. III.

Here then, we see Calvin's authority—and Dr. Miller's too—for discarding the official distinction between ministers of the gospel, or preachers, acting as pastors, and other bishops—bishops who do not preach—bishops, sometimes, especially among Presbyterians, called elders—bishops commonly accounted laymen!

TESTIMONY OF THE MODERNS.

More marvelous than all the rest, Dr. Miller boldly claims for the support of his radical doctrine of pastors or bishops from among those commonly classed as laymen, a long list of prominent names from among modern divines, some of whose writings he quotes—Owen, Baxter, the English Puritans, New England Pilgrims, Goodwin, Hooker, Cotton, Davenport, Thorndike, Cotton Mather, Edwards, Kromayer, Baldwin, Snycer, Whitby, Watts, Doddridge, Nonnder, Dwight. All these, according to Dr. Miller, may fairly be claimed as in favor of elders in the churches, (and on the ground of primitive precedent)—a plurality of elders in each church—elders in addition to the preaching pastor—elders who are equally pastors with the preacher, though they pursue secular callings, and are now commonly called laymen!

RADICALISM OF DR. MILLER—LAITY AND CLERGY.

Are these things so? And if so, what is the bottom line of the matter? Are these lay elders (as they are commonly regarded) to be considered upon an equality with preaching pastors or bishops? Shall they claim a rank with them? Do they belong to the clergy? Or is the distinction between clergy and laity to be thrown aside?

Dr. Miller could not have been unaware that his doctrine, fully developed, as it was, in his volume, must bring up such questions as these. He was not. Nor did he shrink from meeting these questions, as became an elaborate inquirer and expositor. Be this said, to his honor. And let us see his solution of the problem.

"If this view (says Dr. Miller) of the nature and importance of the office before us" (that of elder) "be admitted, the question very naturally arises whether it be proper to call this class of elders" [i. e. those who do not preach] "lay elders, or whether they have not such a strictly ecclesiastical character, as should prevent the use of that language in speaking of them?—This is one of the points in the present discussion, concerning which the writer of this Essay frankly confesses that he has, in some measure, altered his opinion. Once he was disposed to confer the epithet clerical to teaching elders, and to designate those who ruled only, and did not teach, as lay elders. But more mature inquiry and reflection have led him first to doubt the correctness of this opinion, and finally to persuade him that, so far as the distinction of clergy and laity is proper at all, it ought not to be made the point of distinction between these two classes of elders, and that when we speak of the one as clergymen and the other as laymen, we are apt to convey an idea altogether erroneous, if not seriously mischievous."—

"Some judicious and pious men have indeed expressed serious doubts whether the terms clergy and laity ought ever to have been introduced into our theologi-

cal nomenclature. But it is not easy to see any solid reason for this doubt. Is it wise to contend about terms, when the things intended to be expressed by them are fully understood and generally admitted? The only question then, of real importance, to be decided here, is this—Does the New Testament draw any distinction line between those who hold spiritual offices in the church, and those who do not? Does it represent the functions pertaining to those offices as confined to them, or as common to all Christians?—p. 202, etc.

[After framing an argument in favor of the distinction described, and in favor of the clerical character of all the officers of the church, Dr. Miller proceeds:]

"The author of this Essay has no zeal either for retaining or using the terms *clergy* or *clergyman*. So far as the former term has been heretofore used, or may now be intended to convey the idea of a 'privileged order,' in the church, a dignified body, lifted up in rank and claim, above the mass of the church members, in a word, as designating a set of men claiming to be vicars of Christ, keepers of the human conscience, and the only channels of grace, he disclaims and abhors it. He is a believer in no such meaning or men. But so far as it is intended to designate those who are clothed with ecclesiastical office, etc. etc. etc. the writer is of opinion that that or some other equivalent term ought to be used, etc. etc. etc. But he protests against the continued use of the term *Lay Elders*, as really adapted to make an erroneous impression. Let the class of officers in question be called *Ruling Elders*."—pp. 208, 209.

Our author had previously said [p. 208]:

"Whether therefore we refer to the early usage, or to strict philological import, ruling elders are as truly entitled to the name of *clergy*, in the only legitimate sense of that term, that is, they are as truly *ecclesiastical officers*, as those who labor in word and doctrine."

Nothing can be more manifest than that a practical adoption of Dr. Miller's views on this point would work one of the most radical revolutions yet known in modern church history. He may exalt as he pleases the dignity of church officers, he may extend as far as he can in the present state of society the scope of their powers, he may insist upon (and defend, as far as he is able) the transfer of church authority to a select few, and their exclusive right to teach divine truth—he will find nevertheless that the attempt to draw up the lay elders (so-called) to the grade now commonly claimed for the clergy, if it results in any thing, will result to reducing the clergy to the level of the lay elders. Place them on the same level, and the charm will be broken. For men do not abjectly bow down to a priesthood who, like themselves, labor, working with their own hands, and attend to what are called secular affairs.

OFFICIAL POWERS.

The search after "Scripture Facts and Ancient Usages" on which we are now embarked, would be incomplete without a more distinct attention to the particular just now hinted at. We naturally inquire after the proper business, just claims, legitimate powers and appropriate station of the elders, pastors, presbyters, bishops—preachers or otherwise—and whether called clergymen, laymen, or neither) of whom we have been speaking. What are the facts, and what were the usages of the apostolic age in these respects?

Dr. Miller, with many if not most of the venerable writers quoted by him, very evidently holds the common views of Presbyterians and Episcopalians on this subject. Their theory vests the government of the churches in the officers, (however elected or installed), and not in the brotherhood as a body. Church discipline, with them, is the work of the officers and not of the mass of the members.* But, as already noticed,

* Dr. Miller expressly says: "To the church session it belongs to bind and to loose—to admit to the communion of the church."—page 196. But Christ says

their biblical references on this point are altogether unsatisfactory, if not totally wanting. And yet it is pleasant to notice that Dr. Miller, whose candor and sound learning, as evinced in this Essay, so often get the better of his pre-conceived theories, has not wholly failed, even on this point, to lay down principles and make statements that go far to neutralize, if not overturn, the theoretical doctrines he has advanced. We have already seen him yielding or nearly yielding the point, on the pregnant question of clerical caste. In another place, he gives a very rational account of the duties to be performed by the "ruling elders" who do not publicly and statedly preach. He assigns to them

"A constant and faithful inspection of the members and families in the church, that the negligent be admonished, the wanderers reclaimed, differences reconciled, etc. etc."—In addition to the labors of the pulpit, he says, every church needs "teaching [query—preaching?] from house to house, visiting the sick, conversing with serious inquirers, catechizing children, and learning, as far as possible the character and state of every member, even to the poorest and most obscure of the flock." And one reason given for this is, "that none ought to be admitted to the communion of the church, without a careful examination in reference to their knowledge, orthodoxy, good moral character and piety—*that none ought to be permitted to remain in the bosom of the church, without maintaining, in some tolerable degree, the character proper for professing Christians.*"—p. 173.

This, by the bye, is the same "disorganizing" and "radical" doctrine, for which a portion of the "fanatical abolitionists" are beginning to contend, and on account of which Presbyterian editors have raised the alarm that "the plow-share of division" is about to be "driven through the churches"! But has not Dr. Miller here given a pretty full account of the duties of elders, pastors, bishops, presbyters, of Christian churches? Would not these duties be sufficient to occupy them, without assuming to be the church, and to "lord it over God's heritage"? Could not this work be done by them, according to their ability and opportunity, without claiming to monopolize the work, to shut other brethren out of the field? Could they not do it, and then, having reported their doings to the church, and communicated the information they had gathered, allow the brethren "assembled together" to act as they might find occasion, in matters of discipline, according to apostolic direction?—1 Cor. v.—We apprehend that so long as these offices are "considered expressive of duty and labor," there will be little occasion to caution the officers against setting up exclusive claims either in the matter of public preaching or of pastoral visitation; it is only when the "honors" and the perquisites of the office come to be regarded as desirable, and a "worldly and ambitious spirit" gains ground, that "certain peculiar claims" are set up. The facts of church history, according to Dr. Miller, assure us of this. And if, as he observes, the single pastor and teacher can not do all the preaching and visiting desirable, is it quite certain that the entire board of elders would, in all cases, do so much that nothing more could be found to be done? And if any member sees a work before him unaccomplished, may unattempted, must he be chosen an elder before he can attempt it?

Some further light on this subject of official power, may be gathered, we think, from another paragraph of our author.

"Tyrants in civil government have taught and acted upon the principle that the great end of all political establishments, is the exaltation of the few, at the expense of the many. And it is deeply to be deplored

this of the church. Is, then, the session the church? Or can Dr. Miller find a "Thus saith the Lord" for his assertion? If not, it can not "rest on divine authority"—as he has admitted.

that the same principle has been apparently adopted by bodies calling themselves churches of Christ. Nothing can be more opposite than this to the spirit and the law of the Redeemer. The 'authority' which the apostle claims as existing, and to be exercised in the church, he represents (2 Cor. x. B) as given 'for edification and not destruction.' " "Not for the purpose of creating and pampering classes of 'privileged orders' to 'lord it over God's heritage.' Not to build up a system of polity which may minister to the pride of an ambitious priesthood; not to form a body, under the title of *CLERGY*, with separate interests from the laity of the church. All this is as wicked as it is unreasonable. No office, no power is appointed by Jesus Christ in his church, but that which is necessary to the instruction, the purity and the happiness of the whole body. All legitimate government, here as well as elsewhere, is to be considered as a means, not as an end, and as no further resting on divine authority, than we can say, in support of its claims and its acts, 'Thus saith the Lord,' than 'it is adapted to build up the great family of those who profess true religion, in knowledge, peace and holiness, unto salvation.'"—pp. 25, 26.

Excellent sentiments these? How shall they be appropriately embodied and exemplified? Can it be done by Episcopal or Presbyterian arrangements? Has it been? Our author more than hints at, may strongly reprove gross violations of the principles here inculcated. Who were the delinquents? How, and by what instruments did they prosper?

Let existing forms of church polity, and particularly the Episcopal and the Presbyterian, be judged by Dr. Miller's rule. Where is there a "Thus saith the Lord" for the high powers, the exclusive rights, which their bishops, presbyters, pastors, elders, boldly lay claim? Can it be said that they do "elevate the few at the expense of the many?" That they do not create and pamper "classes of privileged orders?" That they do not "form a body, under title of *clergy*, with separate interests from the laity of the church?" Do not even Congregational arrangements (so called) embody, in these particulars, much what Dr. Miller condemns as "unreasonable and wicked?" Let observation and common sense judge.

We were searching after some reliable account of the powers and functions of church officers—especially of pastors, presbyters, elders, bishops, in the episcopal churches, and of the origin of their pre-claims. And to this point we cite once more Episcopal authority.

CLERICAL POWER—TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR.

In his treatise on "Spiritual Despotism," Mr. Taylor takes frequent occasion to notice the extravagant claims of the clergy, which he traces in a variety of particulars. We have already cited his testimony to the fact that the primitive pastors or bishops did monopolize either preaching or the administration of the sacraments, that "believers at large used the liberty of preaching and teaching"—that baptism was sometimes administered by "persons altogether lay." Of the introduction of other usages, and setting up of exclusive claims by the clergy, long after the death of the apostles, our author speaks:

"Those great and consolatory truths on which the progress was laid by Paul, John, Peter and James—of rational import, of elevating influence, though denied or forgotten, had sunk into a secondary position in favor of notions which attributed unutterable and a mysterious efficacy to the Christian sacraments. Here we trace the first footmarks of clerical domination. The administration of the sacraments was intrusted to a privileged order of priests; and these insisted upon as of vital energy; it was upon testing, handling, the material elements, or upon

* Of course the pastors (who probably had the right to speak), did not assume the prerogative, of forbidding their brethren to speak.

being duly touched and handled by the dispensers of the mysteries, that eternal life depended! Not to be washed in the laver of regeneration, not to eat of the living flesh, not to drink the blood, not to be anointed with the oil of remission was to perish everlastingly! Salvation and perdition turned, not upon the condition of the heart in God's sight, but upon having a share in the consecrated fluid or solid matter which the priest might bestow, or might refuse!—pp. 149, 150.

But what if—to this exclusive right of administering the sacraments—the clergy add the exclusive right of religious teaching—the exclusive right of ordaining preachers, i. e. of deciding who shall and who shall not preach—the exclusive right of settling the belief, the creed and the polity of the church—the exclusive right “to bind and to loose—to admit to the communion of the church” or to exclude from it, (according to the theory of Dr. Miller,) how much freedom or security from spiritual despotism will the mass of the membership enjoy, then?

In tracing “the first steps” of “spiritual despotism,” our author remarks as follows:—

“With the early defenders of ecclesiastical power, those, we mean, who belong to the pristine era now under review, the unity of the church meant that artificial concentration of actual influence which converged upon Carthage, upon Antioch, upon Alexandria, or upon Rome. It was not the consent of all believers, but the sense of Dionysius, of Cyprian or of Cornelius. The communion of saints was not the affectionate correspondence and intercourse of all who held to the Head, and loved each other as members of Christ, but rather the visible fact of ecclesiastical submission to this or to that metropolitan or patriarch. The form was taken for the substance; and those, in many cases, were treated as aliens or enemies, whose only crime was the calling in question some arbitrary determination of a self-constituted and irresponsible authority.”—pp. 168, 169.

With a change of the terms “metropolitan or patriarch” to General Conference, General Assembly, or Association, (almost as purely clerical as Dionysius or Cyprian,) wherein or how much does our Protestant Christianity differ in this respect from that of incipient Romanism? Let us glance at another feature of the portrait by the same pencil.

“The plth and power of ‘spiritual despotism’ lies in the hold which the spiritual despot has upon the spiritual apprehensions—the superstitious fears—the delusive hopes—the bigoted attachments—the abused credulity—of the deceived victim. The spiritual despot does not, of necessity, wield secular power, or employ physical inflictions. So far from this, the spiritual despotism of the Romish clergy and of the Pope rose to a very high pitch, not only without the aid but in defiance of the persecutions of the secular power, wielded by the pagan emperors. It was their constant exposure to martyrdom, their heroic and saint-like courage, their reputedly vicarious sufferings, that first invested the priesthood with their illimitable power over the mass of their disciples, long before the union of church and state under Constantine. That event for a time held the spiritual despotism of the Pope and priesthood in check, by bringing the church members into a cordial and confiding submission to the rival and conflicting supremacy of the new Christian monarch of the empire. The race, not to say the contest, between church power and state power was protracted through many generations, until at length, the spiritual despotism of the Pope and priesthood reduced the state despotism of emperors and kings to abject submission and servile subservience. Monarchs held the stirrups of the Pope, and literally permitted him to put his foot upon their necks, in token of their implicit obedience. A large portion of Italy, by means of the Pope’s spiritual power, became subject, directly, to his secular sway. Thus does a spiritual despotism exceed the mere physical, as it must needs do, because man’s spiritual nature is the superior part of him, and whether debased or otherwise, controls all there is of him. For the above facts in detail, the reader is referred to the book on ‘Spiritual Despotism’ above quoted, or to church history at large. The Catholics in America and in Ireland are not the only living and visible monuments of a spiritual despotism unconnected with the secular arm, or with physical force.

“We should not fail to mention the important influence which the custom of holding provincial and general councils had, in effecting the general position of the clergy and laity. • • • The first and most marked result of that practice of transferring every considerable controversy, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical, from the church where it originated to a Convention of bishops, was of course at once to cut off the people from all control over such discussions, and virtually to deny them the right of entertaining a free opinion on the subject of debate. • • • If there had been no other cause at work to give rise to spiritual despotism, this alone would have been enough; we must assign the commencement of its operation to as early a period as the middle of the second century. There can be no recency, no liberty, and scarcely any purity or vitality in a church which says to the laity in the mass—‘You have nothing to do with theology but to receive what we teach you; and nothing to do with rules of discipline or laws of administration but to yield them obedience.’”—pp. 154, 155.

“When the bishops returned from these aristocratic conventions to their sees, bearing with them authoritative determinations of religious controversies, together with general rules of conduct, or canons, and special decisions concerning individuals, what was likely to happen? Let us suppose that the clergy, as well as the people, obsequiously bowed to the wisdom or the will of their superiors. This acquiescence, in most cases, could take place only because clergy as well as laity had a ready been so disciplined in servile and silent submission, that they knew no other law and no other rule of right than the word of their spiritual masters. Despotism must almost have reached its height where the decrees of synods met with no resistance. • • • The synodic system then, such as prevailed both in the east and in the west, is justly named as a principal cause or means of the Spiritual Despotism which so early grasped the Christian world.”—pp. 161, 162.

“In every age, it has been by gathering themselves into clusters, apart from the people, by sitting in conclave, with the doors barred against the laity, and by concerting measures, not in the church, but in chambers and closets, that ministers of religion have converted the gospel into a system of tyranny and an engine of cruelty. The history of spiritual despotism hinges upon this division of the elements of church power. An impious and fatal divorce of what God has joined—a divorce craftily effected by the clergy, was the principal means of establishing all corruptions and all usurpations.”—p. 123.

Statements like these, and from such a source, can scarcely fail to suggest instructive hints, not only upon the nature and extent of official and clerical power, (the topic now in hand) but upon the varied forms, Presbyterian, Episcopal, or by clerical Associations, in which that power is embodied, and by means of which it is augmented, preserved, and transmitted. Can any thing prevent the state of things our author has described, where any ecclesiastical or clerical bodies, distinct from the local churches, are known or recognized? Does not the very existence of such bodies constitute the very evil of which he complains?

Let us now attend to our author’s testimony concerning the state and usages of the apostolic churches, before these abuses had sprung up.

“Christianity, assuredly, is neither despotic in its spirit, nor could it generate despotism, in any case, if allowed to retain that rudiment which, in the primitive churches, operated as a natural counterpoise to clerical authority. This counterpoise was the participation of the people in church deliberations, and church acts; and especially the scope allowed to popular agency in every primitive exercise of discipline.”—p. 122.

“As a matter of history, the fact of the concurrence of the mass of the church in deliberations and decisions stands on the face of the apostolic writings. The multitude came together and took their part in the most important consultations. • • • Public business was indeed arranged, propounded and carried through by public persons; but still it was carried as public business. The machination in closets of interests that ought to be openly discussed is treason against the community, not was any such secret management admitted even by the divinely commissioned apostles.”

“But the tenor and terms of the apostolic epistles afford the most satisfactory evidence on the point of the liberal and open constitution of the first churches. These epistles, fraught with various and specific advice on ques-

tions of discipline and government, are addressed comprehensively and directly to the mass of believers; not to the people through the medium of their rulers. The people are indeed mentioned, but this mention of them distinctly implies that the writer in each instance had his eye immediately fixed upon the people. Were then the people—the believers at large, the mere subjects of church power? Did they constitute an inert mass, upon which sacerdotal functions were to be exercised? Common sense is insulted by any such supposition; historic evidence is outraged by affirming it to have been the fact. The church, with its teachers and its elders, was one living body, various in its functions, but all of energy and action. The course recommended on various occasions by St. Paul, and the public measures which he advises to be pursued, were plainly supposed to issue from the breadth of the church, and not to be promulgated from the closet of an oligarchy.”—pp. 124, 125.

“The account of the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.) should be adverted to, as proof of that open and popular constitution of the apostolic societies, apart from which it can never be safe to grant to the clergy the independence and the high prerogative that may justly be claimed for them. ‘Then it seemed good to the apostles and to the presbyters with the whole congregation, to send men’ &c. The decrees decided upon in that council were sent forth as determined ‘by the apostles and presbyters,’ yet with the knowledge and consent of the multitude.”—p. 126.

And how much does this fall short of democratic or Congregational church action? What would become of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism—what of Dr. Miller’s “binding and loosing” church session, if these apostolic church usages should be restored?

We here close, for the present, our citation of witnesses to attest for us what are the facts of Scripture, and the ancient usages of the church. Be it noted that our witnesses are mostly men who differ from us on many important points of church order, and particularly on that vital point, the exclusive clerical ordination of ministers. Our witnesses are defenders of Episcopacy, Presbyterian and other high clerical claims and arrangements. Yet concessions like those we have quoted may be abundantly gleaned from their writings. Great weight should be given to the testimony of men, when they give evidence so little calculated to support their own cherished theories and arrangements.

Having heard so many “radical” things from authorities in such high repute among our “conservative” neighbors, we might, if our limits would permit, adventure, perhaps, to open our own Bibles and examine for ourselves. Our readers, we trust, will not fall to do so. And should they find, by the sacred records, that the ancient usages and habits of God’s people, and of the faithful messengers of his truth, were such as have been described by Robinson and Taylor, by Schmucker and Neander, by Dr. Miller, the Christian Fathers, the Protestant Reformers and others, they will be led to compare those ancient usages and habits with those that now prevail, and from which no one can diverge, without incurring the charges of “innovation,” “disorder” and “disorganization.”

Especially will they feel at liberty to inquire after the divine warrant or Bible precedent for a ministerial or clerical caste; the exclusive claims of any organized body of men, designated or selected by human discretion, to the monopoly of public religious teaching—the exclusive claims of such a body to nominate or ordain their successors, to elevate men to the ministry and depose them from it—to hold, in distinction from those who are called laymen, the pastoral office in the churches—to administer the ordinances—to mould the shape of church polity at their discretion—to administer, either alone or in company with a select few, the discipline—committed

• The Presbyterian church session of Dr. Miller?—Ed.

† Mr. Buck, Mr. Robinson, and Neander, perhaps, are exceptions to this statement.

to "the churches"—the disciples "gathered together."—to decide, authoritatively, for the religious public, what church organizations are, or are not "valid," especially taking care to deny "validity" and "clarity" to all churches, church action and ministerial labor that have not been duly "authorized" by a clerical body.

To these topics, among others, the advocates of Christian freedom will, of course, direct their attention, if they contemplate seriously, any effective efforts for a reformation in the churches.

SPECIMEN OF THE OPPOSITION.

Being unexpectedly called upon for "more copy," to fill out the present number, while in the midst of the confusion incident to a removal, it has occurred to us that the following letter, lately received from a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in this State, might not be altogether uninteresting to our readers. Our narrow limits will not often permit us to present the views of our opponents in their own language, and if this specimen should do them injustice, it is because we have not, just now, a better or another at hand. We will not hold them all responsible for the language, the temper and the ethics of this letter, though we do not distinctly see what sober arguments, temperately and candidly urged, would avail much, on that side of the question. Of this, however, we must not pre-judge. But here is the letter:

C—, April 16, 1843.

MR. GOODALL:

Sir—The second number of your Church Slanderer, alias Christian Investigator, came to hand yesterday. I am sorry to be obliged to say that in my opinion it is one of the most scurrilous periodicals of the ultra age in which we live.

It is perfectly astonishing to me that a gentleman of your pretensions should be found practicing such imposition upon your patrons. We look upon you as endeavoring to palm off upon us a most mischievous production, instead of the useful information which you professed to wish to publish when you obtained our subscriptions. (1)

I recollect distinctly that your cordjator declared on two different occasions that the object of the proposed paper was to enlarge upon and give a more extended circulation to the topic presented in your interesting lectures. And you know very well that the topics on which you dwell, (in both your lectures) were the pecuniary injury sustained by the northern States, in consequence of the slavery of the South; and from that you argued the fitness and necessity of political action in order to extirpate the great evil of American slavery, &c. &c. (2)

You will please stop the flight of your paper to my peaceful dwelling. And I hope you will have many such qualifications before your next number is sent abroad. We have enough of such wholesale slander of the church in circulation, both by infidels and fanatics, without prying for the circulation of more. I shall feel it to be my solemn duty to oppose the circulation of such abominable trash within the limits of my labors, and this I shall do both in the desk and out of it. Query.—Is not the church as pure and good as she was when she drew you as a brand from the burning, and when through her instrumentality you were raised from the filth of sin to the enjoyment of pardon? (3) And had you retained the spirit and character received through her agency, you would not have been found in the ranks of her most inveterate enemies.

Yours in pity, J. R.

* This word we have ventured to supply, as there was an omission in the letter.—Ed.

NOTES.

(1.) As the gentleman paid us no advance money, as we have received no complaints or orders of discontinuance from those who did, or from any others, except the gentleman himself, and as some of them, at least, have remitted us substantial proofs that even "the second number" of our paper has not frightened them, we shall be pardoned for giving a somewhat limited construction to the term "we," by which the gentleman assumes to

speak in the name of his flock and his neighbors. Perhaps he will not think any expression or act of his lay brethren to be valid, without his sanction, but we assure him we have no conscientious qualms in appropriating whatever remittances may be made by them without his leave, or against his veto. Fresh proof, no doubt, of our "infidelity," or "fanaticism."

(2.) We happen to have in preservation and before us, the outline of those "interesting lectures" of which the gentleman then, as now, spoke so commendably. The motto was "Righteousness exalteth a nation." That wide separation between political and religious or moral action, upon which the gentleman now bases his charges of "imposition," was, according to our best ability, exploded and exposed. For this purpose the universal laws and government of God were insisted on—the laws of commerce, the laws of political economy, were declared to be God's laws, and identical or coincident with the law of love, the law of rectitude—of integrity. This was illustrated, and the righteous penalty of these laws noticed, in the cases of the distiller—of the distresses in England in general, consequent on the English oppression of Ireland, and of the English operatives. Then the same was noticed in the pecuniary embarrassments of "the Northern States, in consequence of the slavery of the South," and the necessity of both political and ecclesiastical action insisted on, "to extirpate the great evil, &c." The question was distinctly started—"Whose business is it to teach these divine laws?" And one distinct head, (the third,) of the lecture, was; to prove that the ministry and the church, with the Bible in their hands, were bound to be the expositors of those laws. Under the fourth head it was argued that Religion and Politics could not be separated, nor the State saved without the purification of the church, that the cry of "dirty waters of politics"—"spirituality of Christians endangered"—and that the promulgation of these divine laws would "divide the churches," or "destroy ministerial influence," were declared to be the plies of atheists and worldliness. Finally, as a fifth head of the lecture, it was insisted that "the honor and preservation of the church required of her, that, in her teachings and in her discipline she should honor and maintain these divine laws." It was also stated that in the Christian Investigator the church question would be promiscuously discussed.

But in hearing all this, as it would now seem, the clerical gentleman was only interested in the "pecuniary injury sustained by the northern States;" all the movement that he wished to patronize was "political action." As a minister of Christ, he would have the church left to wallow in the sin which he saw was sinking the state, or the penalty of which, at least, was draining northern pockets. Had we confined our arguments to the money question; we should neither have been ranked with infidels or fanatics, nor thus mildly charged with slandering the church.

(3) Our obnoxious "second number," we had supposed, contained a sufficient answer to this objection. The church we first joined was an antislavery church, by profession; and to some extent by action. It then circulated Wesley's Thoughts on Slavery as a pamphlet tract, and made it the business of its ministers to circulate anti-slavery petitions. But she does not do so now. "J. R." has probably heard of such a church. Perhaps too, he thinks that church can not possibly "fall from grace." And yet he evidently takes it for granted that the same church is assailed whenever any one insists on the "duty of secession from a corrupt church"—a pro-slavery church. To propagate this doctrine is to be a "church slanderer." But we should feel that we slandered the church of Christ, if we should maintain the opposite sentiment.

Perhaps our correspondent will find further proofs of our sanctimony when we tell him that we hold our feet to God and his Truth paramount to our adhesion to the organized church or sect that may have been provisionally instrumental of our spiritual welfare. We support it in the Spirit of God, and not this Methodist church or the Presbyterian church, that converts men, which they are truly converted—that they are converted to Him, and not to them. And we would as soon "sacrifice to our act, and burn incense to our drag," as to set up the claims of the outward organization above those of the living spirit of holiness and righteousness.

Of such letters as the one under review, we have received, probably, a number of reams, during our sixteen years' editorial labor in the cause of Temperance and the cause of Emancipation; a small part only of which have been preserved. Not a few of them, ten or fifteen years old, have lately passed, afresh, under our eye, in the process of diminishing the weight and bulk of our remaining epistolary treasures, in anticipation of our removal. They have helped swell the wheelbarrow loads of old manuscript and newspapers, destined for the paper-maker, and exchanged with the shopmen for articles more desirable in our "peaceful dwelling," and lightening our transportation bills, by a few hundred pounds weight. Sad proofs of opposition to needed reforms.

Christian Investigator.

Honeoye, May, 1843.

REMOVAL.

Letters and exchange papers for the Christian Investigator, and its editor and publisher, should hereafter be directed to Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y.

This number, though dated at Honeoye, goes to press early, at Whitesboro, in anticipation of our intended removal to the former place, but will not, (probably,) be distributed to subscribers, until after our arrival at our new station.

It will be seen by our list of receipts that we have to draw largely from the fund designed for our personal and family support, to pay the paper, maker and printer, for which the receipts from "subscribers" are so inadequate. We mail, regularly, about 1300 copies of each number, and reserve about 700 more, for sale, and for occasional distribution. To the few, who have thus far, enabled us to supply so many, our thanks, on behalf of the common cause, are especially due. The example of our Whitesboro and Honeoye friends, we hope and trust, will excite others to similar exertions. Resolutions are now needed to help us issue the June number.

Post Masters will always frank remittances, direct to the publisher, if requested to do so. Payments, (if more convenient,) may be made W. J. Savage, or G. P. Hough, Whitesboro.

RECEIPTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

On "PLAN for Editor's Support"—Of F M Hopkins Trenton 1 00; W J Savage Whitesboro 3 00; R Hough do 20 00; S P Hough do 5 00; B Green 15 00; H Elmer 5 00; W K Tibbitts do 5 00; S W Green do 3 00; Saml Camp do 1 00; O D B Miller Cedarz. 1 00; C Calkins Peterboro 1 00; S W Stewart Clinton 5 00; Dr Daniel Mann Barton 5 00; J S Peck W Bloomfield 1 00; A Griewold Brothel's Bridge 2 00; J M Barber Litchfield 1 00; D Thomas N Y Mills 1 00; S Wells Vernon Center 1 20; Amount \$75 20.

From Subscribers.—Of J M Morse N Y Mills 50c; G Peacock do 60c; J Lighbody do 50c; R Wilcox Jr Whitesboro 50c; R Roberts do 30c; H Terry Canandaigua 1 00; R Whitcomb Jr Barreard Mass 1 00; papers sold 1 31; Philo Baldwin Sennett 1 00; J Ward Vernon Center 50c; S W Green Whitesboro 50c; S H Allyn Sandwich Mass 50c; J F Clark do 50c; Amount \$9 71.

G. W. GREEN, PRINTER.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. I—No. 5,
WHOLE NUMBER, 13.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JUNE, 1843.

WILLIAM GODDELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, [NEW SERIES.]

Twelve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly,
or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers,
50 cents, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward
the money without exposure to the publisher, shall have one copy
for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have
two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers,
shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the
set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, 65 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

PRELIMINARY SUGGESTIONS.

Before resuming the investigations commenced in the
preceding numbers, it may be well, for the benefit of
some of our new patrons and readers, to throw out a
few hints, by way of a reply to an objection, which, if
admitted to have weight, would cut short our inquiries
in this direction, altogether, and require of us an apology
for having introduced the topics with which our columns
are, at present, occupied.

It may be asked whether, as abolitionists, we do not
travel out of our proper department of labor, in devoting
so much time and space to a discussion of church gov-
ernment, church order, church discipline, church offi-
cers, ministerial duties, and clerical claims. Why, it
may be asked, should the Anti-Slavery cause be embar-
rassed by the introduction of such extraneous topics,
upon which abolitionists are not agreed? And why
should the cause be prejudiced by becoming identified
with the unpopular opinions of some of its advocates, on
other subjects?

We answer, 1. That the Christian Investigator is
not the organ of any of the anti-slavery societies, nor
sustained by their funds, nor is the Editor in their em-
ploy. No Society or Executive Committee has any con-
trol over his labors, nor are they or the anti-slavery
public responsible for his views or his course.

This was distinctly stated at the commencement of his
present enterprise, and the Christian Investigator
was started for the express object of having an untram-
melled press, in which he could take the broad ground of
our common Christianity, examine reformatory efforts,
(that had been pursued in an isolated manner) in their
connection with the general interests of religion and the
position of the Church and Ministry; and do this with
a freedom which would be considered incompatible with
a strictly anti-slavery periodical. Nothing, therefore, that
concerns Christianity or human nature is out of place in
our columns; and those who formerly complained that
the Editor was a man of "one idea," will probably have
an opportunity, if they desire it, to complain because he
is not really so.

2. We answer, in the second place, that while we feel
perfectly at liberty to discuss other subjects than anti-
slavery, (and church government and clerical claims
among the rest,) yet, as a matter of fact, there is nothing
that stands more in the way of reformatory efforts in gen-
eral, and of the anti-slavery cause in particular, than the
wrong views now extensively prevalent concerning the
ministry, church officers, and church organizations.—
Through these views, as we believe, it comes to pass that

(to use the words of an eminent clergyman,* in re-
spect to the Temperance cause,) "a state of things had
grown up in the church which rendered its united and effi-
cient action in the cause morally impossible," so that it be-
came necessary to form a society out of the church, though
composed, to a great extent, of those who were professed
friends of religion, to do what should have been done in
it," while "the church stood in the way of the progress
of the cause, and still stands in the way." We believe,
with the same distinguished writer, that "the same re-
marks may be made of any and of every other cause of
reformation. In every thing affecting purity of morals,
charity of life, observance of the Sabbath, the cause of
human liberty, the freedom of those held in bondage, the
church holds an almost, if not quite, a controlling power."
[How that power had, in one instance, been used,
the writer had already stated.]

We believe, too, (though the writer just quoted may
perhaps dissent from us in this) that this state of things
in the church and ministry can never be changed with-
out the prevalence of more just and scriptural concep-
tions of church organizations, church officers, and the
Christian ministry, than now commonly obtain. Hold-
ing these views, we should be as reverent to humanity
and the slave, as to Christianity and the church, if we
should shrink from the discussions requisite to the need-
ed reform.

How comes it to pass, that, to so great an extent, the
church and pulpits are closed to the claims of human
liberty, even in the "free north"? Is, as one of the
Missionaries at the Sandwich Islands, expresses it, the
Prudential Committee of the American Board may be
considered "pro-slavery men, not merely because they
stand aloof from the work, [i. e. of abolition] but because
their rules, laws, regulations, &c., made for missionaries
to obey, are pro-slavery in their spirit and application,"
have not abolitionists connected with the American
churches, equal cause to complain of the same despotic
course, on the part of the same sort of men, at the head
of our ecclesiastical affairs? What if it shall appear, on
inquiry, that the commonly prevalent claims of official
and clerical and church power, are quite as "pro-slavery"
as the laws by which the foreign missionaries of the
American Board are controlled?

If abolitionists are to escape from the thralldom of a
pro-slavery clergy and church, they must organize Chris-
tian churches, must they not? on the principles and usages
of primitive Christian freedom. And how, without
discussion, shall they be united in this great work?

Slavery has poisoned the church and the ministry,
as well as the state and the statesmen. It must be as-
sailed to attempt a reformation in the church, without a
rational discussion of the principles of church order, as to
attempt a reformation in the state, without discussing the
foundation principles of civil government. And we
might as well be asked to labor for the abolition of slavery
without the one as the other. Practical, honest, consist-
ent, intelligent, active abolition, can no more be kept
out of ecclesiastical than it can be kept out of politics. The
church, as well as the state, shelters slavery; nay, it has
been shown in the pamphlet of James G. Birney, that
"the American churches are [emphatically] the bulwarks
of American slavery." Other churches than these, the
American people must have, or their liberties are wreck-
ed. Other churches they will have, and are even now

* Rev. Albert Barnes.

† Letter of Rev. Lorin Andrews to Lewis Tappan, in the
Anti-Slavery Reporter, Extra, for May, 1843.

beginning to organize. Is it of no importance that they
should be organized, at length, upon the true principles
of Christian freedom? Are there not, already, some
movements for organizing an Anti-Slavery Church, of
extended ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in which the unscriptu-
ral and anti-republican feature of clerical control over
the people is attempted to be retained? Why should
not the Christian Investigator probe the subject to the
bottom? If so, amongst the professed friends of Chris-
tian freedom will shrink from the inquiry? And why
should they?

We rejoice to know that some—that many, among the
"regularly ordained ministers" in the Anti-Slavery ranks,
do not shrink from it, and that at least some of them
heartily concur in the views we have thus far expressed.
We might name some of the most enterprising and dis-
tinguished among them, who have recently contributed of their
scanty means to help circulate copies of our last number,
in which the investigation of clerical claims is commen-
ced. Under these circumstances, we feel doubly en-
couraged to persevere.

LECTURE V.

MINISTERIAL AND PASTORAL OFFICE—PRIMI-
TIVE MODEL—HISTORY OF INNOVATIONS—
AND THE RISE OF DESPOTIC POWER.

Our last lecture was almost wholly occupied
with such accounts of the pastoral office, the
Christian ministry, and preaching, in ancient
times, as might be gleaned from learned writers
of the present age, in high repute among the pro-
minent clergy of the day—writers connected with
Presbyterian and Episcopal, as well as Congre-
gational arrangements, writers for the most part
clergymen themselves, and citing the most emi-
nent ecclesiastical historians to corroborate their
statements.

From their testimony we learned that neither
in patriarchal times, under the Mosaic or Leviti-
cal economy, during the period of the Hebrew
Prophets, or Christian Apostles, was public reli-
gious teaching ever appropriated exclusively to
any particular order of men. Many other impor-
tant things we learned from them, but before we
proceed to recapitulate and arrange the items of
their testimony, it may be well for us, at length,
by way of specimen, to indulge in a glimpse of
ancient usages for ourselves. And we may as
well select a scene which may serve to throw ad-
ditional light on that pregnant question of official
and clerical power with which we were occupied
toward the close of our last.

APOSTOLICAL ORDER.

Let us venture then, to open our own Bibles,
and with their help, look into a worshipping as-
sembly, in Paul's day, and see how the church
as it was arranged—by whom it was conducted—
and how order was preserved. For clerical
and official power, in our day, has much to do,
and takes a wide scope, in these matters.

By referring to 1 Corinthians, xiv., we shall
find that when the disciples at Corinth came to-
gether, every one had a *word*—a doctrine—a
tongue—a revelation—and interpretation. Each,
in his turn, was accustomed to edify the whole
body. And instead of forbidding this, or directing
that the pastor or pastors should monopolize the
time, or exercise a controlling supervision, the
Apostle was only desirous that they should speak
one at a time, instead of speaking, confusedly to-
gether—that if any spoke in an unknown tongue,
some one should interpret. "For," says he, "ye

may all prophesy, (or preach) one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted; and the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets"—or, (as Dr. Coit* hath it, in a note, by way of paraphrase, in his Paragraph Bible) "Prophet should, in turn, give place to prophet." It seems not to have occurred to the Apostle to say—(as modern usagers, even among professed Congregationalists, might have suggested)—the spirits of the laity should be subject to the clergy or the pastor?

Nor does it appear that the 'open constitution' and 'free discussion' habits of the Apostolic churches, in this respect, were regarded as any marked innovation upon the usages previously existing among the professed people of God. It is quite remarkable that under the reign of lordly, Chief Priests, Scribes, and rulers of the synagogues, Grand Sanhedrim and all, the places of public worship throughout the Jewish nation, and wherever the synagogues of the dispersed among the Gentiles, Greek or Roman, were to be found, there were found the arenas of free communication of Hebrew with Hebrew. And not only the synagogue, but the sacred Temple at Jerusalem, was open, even to the despised carpenter's son, to the fishermen of Galilee, to the sect every where spoken against! Yes! even when conspiring to put the leader of the rising heresy to death, the ruling ecclesiasties, amidst all their perplexities and contrivances to silence him without making an uproar among the people, never bethought themselves of the priestly or clerical monopoly of public preaching! We hear nothing in this connection of the sanctity of the temple, of its altars, or of its pulpit, (if it had any) or of the awful desecration of permitting a layman, an unlicensed and unordained carpenter's son, to preach there! Among all the charges brought against him, or his disciples, this heinous offense is never once mentioned! Plain proof that the charge would have had no weight with the people—that the practice was no outrage upon their custom. Had modern notions prevailed then—had the officers of the Jewish Church wielded the power, and held the monopoly of modern church officers, how easily the matter might have been managed! Where were the "Trustees" of temple and synagogue, all this time? Why did they not withhold the keys? or shut the disturbers out of the house? Why did not the priests—so ready to confront the Savior on every debatable point, dispute his right to speak there? And why did they not forbid the people to hear? Even after the crucifixion of the Savior, the disciples still taught in the temple, and in the synagogues, Sabbath after Sabbath. No form of persecution (occasional and temporary riots excepted) ever took the direction of driving them out of the houses of worship; and no record is left of any attempt to shut them out, or silence them, on the ground of the irregularity or unlawfulness of lay preaching. Such a climax of spiritual despotism, the Jewish Church, deeply corrupted as it was, by its ambitious and tyrannical priesthood, never reached, nor is there reason to think that "the common people" would have tolerated such insufferably arrogant claims.

Let us condense and arrange the facts ascertained, in connection with the principles involved. We venture to maintain,
1. That all the preachers of living truth, deserving the name, from the days of Enoch to the present time, have been such, not because authorized and commissioned by any man or body of men, but because qualified and thus commissioned by the most high God.

2. That no man, or body of men, whether priest or layman, in any age or nation, has been divinely instructed or authorized to de-

side authoritatively, who shall preach or who shall not preach; to instate men into the ministry or to depose them from it.

3. That God's ministers or preachers, have never been divinely commanded or authorized to form themselves into an organized body, apart from the rest of their brethren, either for the purpose of admitting men into the ministry, or dismissing them from it, or superintending the churches, or of combining ministerial influence or councils.

4. That, as a historical fact, there is no evidence that any body of men, in the patriarchal ages, under the Mosaic economy, or in the Christian Churches, until after the death of the Apostles, ever advanced any such claims, or ever organized themselves together, for any such purposes: That neither Enoch nor Noah, Job or Melchizedec, Abraham or Jacob, Moses or Aaron, Solomon or Amos, Nehemiah or Malachi, John the Baptist or Stephen, Philip, Peter, or Paul, were ever licensed or ordained to preach, by any such ecclesiastical body, or ever became members of any such organization, or exercised the functions of making preachers or of unmaking them.

(The Levitical or Aaronic Priesthood furnishes no exception to this statement, because, in the first place, the priesthood were not exclusively preachers, even if officially so (which has been questioned) and did not designate who should or who should not preach; because, in the second place, the priesthood did not designate who should be priests.† God chose to provide that hereditary descent should settle that matter rather than put the weapon of despotism and the bait of corruption into the hands of the purest ecclesiastical body on earth. His priests and his preachers God will designate, in some way, himself, and he permits no body of men to take the work of appointment out of his hands.

The election and induction of Timothy into an office in an assembly or church, (by whomsoever it may have been done) or the miraculous commendation to him, of certain peculiar gifts, by the laying on of their hands, were transactions wholly distinct from making him a preacher, which he might have been, and doubtless was, before he was elected a church officer, and before the miraculous reception of special powers: so that not even an exception to the general rule of common precedent, can be fairly inferred from this instance.)

5. That God qualifies and thus commissions his own ministers or preachers—not by miraculous gifts—not by the power of working miracles, or of foretelling (as a Balaam could do) specific future events—not by the "plenary inspiration," needful for the writers of the sacred canon; (that is, those things are not vital or essential, to the preaching of the gospel, as they were in former ages, and are not now to be expected, or reckoned among the marks of a true preacher)—not by constituting them infallible guides or authoritative directors: but by their natural & acquired gifts and endowments—by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost—by the instructions of the scriptures—by the teachings of the Spirit—by the Christian graces, holy aims, lofty exaltations, and self-denying labors—the disinterested love, faith, hope, patience, prayer, meekness, meekness, boldness, fidelity, perseverance, and good fruits, which manifest their character—by their enlarged and discriminating views of divine truth—by their watchfulness and spiritual discernment of the signs of the times—by their godly example, dis-

† Were it otherwise, the example of the Jewish Priesthood could furnish no sound precedent for institution by the Christian Church, who are the successors, not of the Priests but of the Apostles. The Priests were the ministers of the Law, the Apostles the ministers of the Gospel. The Priests were the ministers of the Law, the Apostles the ministers of the Gospel. The Priests were the ministers of the Law, the Apostles the ministers of the Gospel.

creet conversation, aptness to teach, brotherly love of all men, and filial veneration and obedience towards God, which make them strong, in the Lord, mighty in the scriptures, able to unfold the principles, enforce the duties, and urge the sanctions of religion, rightly dividing the word of truth, and giving to each a portion in due season.

6. That the possession of these qualifications, is, of itself, the highest divine commission of which we can form any conception—that without these, in some good measure, no man can have a right to preach the gospel, by whatsoever ecclesiastical body he may have been "licensed and ordained," and that with them, he can have no right to refrain from preaching, (as divine Providence may give opportunity, and indicate the duty of doing) whoever may forbid, or decline to "license" or "ordain."

7. That in the qualifications which constitute the true Christian preacher or minister, in the reception of these qualifications from the appointing finger of God, in the inalienable possession of them, by his high authority and free gift—in the imperative duty and consequent right to exercise these powers for the glory of God and the benefit of the human race, whoever may forbid or oppose—in turn, the high dignity and independence of the Christian Ministry are wrapped up—and not in the decisions of Synods—the parchments, and the diplomas of erring, fallible men. This, the true Christian minister will appreciate and understand.

That Christian preachers, like all other Christians, should be members of the local Christian assemblies or churches where they reside, taking their equal share of the responsibilities of the brotherhood, and alike subject, with other Christians, to the salutary watch, care, admonition, and discipline of the entire body.

8. That their right to preach to those who may assemble to hear them, is the right of a man and a Christian—and that this right cannot conflict with the equal right of other men and Christians, to hear or not to hear them, as they may choose—though true Christians will delight in clear and faithful expositions of divine truth and duty.

9. That Ministers or Preachers, as members of Christian Churches, have no peculiar claim to hold office in the churches to which they may belong, any further than as their qualifications (of which their equal brethren must be judges) may render it proper that they should be elected to the offices which they can best fill. But the mere fact of being a preacher of the gospel does not constitute a man a church officer, until he is elected by the church to that office. A preacher who is elected, a deacon or a bishop, (an elder) who is elected, a preacher makes him neither the one nor the other—nor is it necessary to either of these offices that the incumbent should stately or publicly preach.

10. That Christian assemblies, or churches, like other organized bodies, communities, societies, or associations, should appoint the officers necessary to the preservation of due order, and the proper transaction of the society's business, that these officers may be few or many, according to the numbers of the members, the work to be performed, and the number of persons suitably qualified to do specially set apart to the work: the significance of the office consisting in the work to be done.

11. That those who hold offices in a society or church, must, of necessity, be members of that society or church: That for a man to be Pastor of a church of which he is not a member, is as absurd as to be deacon, or class-leader, or steward of a church or society of which he has never joined—as absurd as for a man to be a President or Treasurer or Committee man in a Temperance Society to which he does not belong!

To be thus elected or chosen, is the same thing as to be appointed or ordained.

13. That in the Primitive churches the principal officers were the Bishops or Overseers or Superintendents,* sometimes called Presbyters, Pastors, or Elders, there was in all meaning one and the same thing. That they had also their Deacons whose chief business is understood to have been the distribution of supplies furnished by the church to the poor. That there were also Preachers in most or all of these churches, one of whom, for his superior qualifications, by common consent or election, performed the work and thus held the office of Teacher. That the Teacher was, perhaps, commonly elected a Bishop (Pastor, Presbyter, or Elder) in company and on an equality with other Bishops (or Elders, or Pastors, or Presbyters) who were not specially Teachers.

14. That the Teachers did not, however, monopolize the work, or claim the exclusive right of preaching in the churches, or of designating who might and who might not preach: That the difference between official Teachers, or between preachers of the gospel, (specially so called) and other church members or Christians, is not that Teachers and Preachers have a right to do what which none others may perform or attempt; but that their superior qualifications render it their duty to devote a greater portion of their time to the work—the work of the official Teacher being stated, and that of the other church members occasional.

15. That whenever Pastors or Teachers are necessarily employed, large portions of their time, in the service of the church, and in accordance with their wishes, they are entitled to an equitable pecuniary allowance from their brethren, according to their several ability—and, if practicable—a comfortable support.

16. That the abundant labors of an able teacher are desirable in a church, but that, in no case, should the purity of the church be compromised, or the sake of supporting a teacher, or pastor, in the primitive churches, during their poorest and most efficient period, their pastors and teachers are chiefly sustained by the labor of their own hands.

17. That the Bible and common sense warrant such distinction between sacred and secular vocations as to render it improper or degrading for a teacher of religion or a pastor of a church to engage in any lawful business or labor, but no man who despises any useful work, however humble, understands the genius of the gospel, or is prepared to exemplify or expound its holy doctrines. That on many accounts, (besides the tactics of independent self-support) it is highly important and desirable that every preacher and pastor should spend a considerable portion of his time in manual labor.

18. That although Christian congregations, in churches can no more make or unmake Christian teachers than Prelates, Bishops, Clergy, or Synods can, and have no right to decide authoritatively, who shall preach and who shall not preach, they have a right to choose or elect their Teachers, as well as their own Pastors, and Deacons, and they have no warrant from Christ or scripture precedent, to put the privilege of duty of choice out of their own hands, or to leave the choice of a teacher or pastor to depend on the circumstance that the candidate has been approved by any other body of men. Any church has a right to elect any one of their own

number as a Teacher, whom they think qualified, and their choice and the public annunciation of it, is all the ordination, license, or installation which the nature of the case admits or demands, or of which the Bible furnishes a precedent. And the best state of the churches would be that in which each church should naturally find its teachers in its own body. If Paul evidently thought that the mass of the Hebrew converts to whom he was writing, "ought to be teachers," (though recently emerged from Judaism) is it not a shame that large and respectable churches, in the nineteenth century, must needs look abroad, at a great distance, for a want of even one?

19. Churches, too, like all other bodies, and like all individuals, have a right to give "letters of commendation," as Paul calls them, to any preacher whom they may approve, and who may desire it at their hands. When preachers travel abroad, where they are not known, such recommendations are very proper and useful. The churches, of which they are members, are the most appropriate bodies to give them. Any person in good report, and known among the churches, may properly do the same thing. But no organized body, distinct from the churches, for the very object of writing Letters of commendation, and claiming a monopoly of the work, and exclusive right to the prerogative, is quite another thing.

20. That neither preachers, pastors, or any other church officers or organized body or caste of men, in apostolic times, exercised or claimed the exclusive right to baptize persons, or to "administer" (as it is now called) the ordinance of the Supper, nor was the power of acting for, and instead of the church, committed to their hands. Church business, including the reception, the admission, the discipline, the exclusion of church members, the election or ordination of ministers, and giving Letters of commendation to preachers or others, was transacted in and by the public assembly, the congregation, the church, the mass of the brotherhood; the officers assisting, participating, and executing the wishes of the whole, as to other deliberative bodies, not doing all, in conclusion, by themselves. Free discussion and free speech were invariably maintained.

To those who may be startled with the apparent boldness and novelty of the preceding propositions, we would recommend a careful study of the historical statements copied into our last Lecture from writers who will not be suspected of a desire to introduce disorganizing innovations and radical or ultra reforms. Another train of reflections may likewise serve to modify, in some measure, their surprise and alarm.

SPIRIT, DOCTRINES, AND AIMS OF CHRISTIANITY.

How do the propositions just stated, agree with these? Or, suppose we should reverse them all, how would they bear the comparison then? Try it, reader, at your leisure, and see! Suppose we had said that the right to preach the gospel was suspended, not upon the qualifications of the preacher, but upon his parchments? Or, that the parchments, or the hand of the priest, that wrote them, conferred the qualifications? or that a select few held, exclusively, the right of judging? Suppose we had affirmed that Enock and Noah, and Solomon, and Ezekiel, and Jonah, and Elijah, were first licensed by a Synod, a Presbytery, or a Conference—that John the Baptist was ordained by the Grand Sanhedrim—that Stephen and Paul awaited "holy orders," at the hands of St. Peter—before they adventured to preach? Suppose we should have maintained that there was "no validity" or efficacy in the preaching of John Bunyan, because he was not ordained by the clergy; or that, with the word of God burning like fire in his bones, he had no right to utter the messages committed to him until his persecutors

could be induced to lay their priestly hands approvingly upon his head? Suppose we should have scouted the "secularized" bishops of the first century, in their long and turreted robes, and endorsed the exclusive pretensions of the self-created monopolists of spiritual teaching in the nineteenth—suppose we had said that a church has no right to the teaching of the man of their choice, one of their own number, born and brought up among them, with whose habits and character they are familiar, whose good deeds and holy conversation are known and read of all men, and to whose instrumentality, under God, one half of their number are indebted for their spiritual life—until or unless some clerical body, convened perhaps at a distance, and composed chiefly of strangers to the candidate, shall have been induced, on a fifteen or twenty minutes' examination, to decide in his favor? Suppose we had maintained that all the churches in a given region of country, or sustaining certain artificial relations to each other, were bound to receive and honor as a true minister of God, the man commonly believed to have been guilty of high crimes, because some ecclesiastical body of which he may have been a member, and with which the churches were artificially connected, had thought proper, on some grounds, (the plea, perhaps, of "morality," not mental, "insanity," to acquit him, to the astonishment of most others, acquainted with the facts of the case)? Were these our positions, how would our theory of the Christian Ministry accord with fundamental Christian principles and Christian ethics? With the foundation principle of equal rights—with the doctrine of individual responsibility—with the nature of true virtue—with the sovereignty of Jesus Christ in the church—with the purity and spirituality of his kingdom—with the moral nature and the social wants of man—with the plan and methods of human redemption—with the changeless distinction between right and wrong and between the righteous and the wicked—with the solemn account and the final awards to which, as individuals, and without substitutes, we are all hastening, and from which no artificial arrangements can release us?

Or how could we honor the free salvation of the gospel, or adhere to the great principles of divine truth and duty to which we have already referred, were we to suspend the enjoyment of religious privileges and the observance of Christian institutions upon the gracious condescension and good pleasure of a self-constituted and unauthorized hierarchy or clerical caste, who might bestow or withhold them at their option, and who should assume, in connection with a few officials, to manage all the affairs of the church by themselves, inasmuch that professors of religion, in the mass, should come to be regarded as distinguished mainly by their habit of suffering the most important duties of life to be discharged by proxy?

INNOVATIONS AND DISORDERS, THEIR ORIGIN AND PROGRESS.

If, in this and the preceding lectures, we have correctly defined the order of the church and of the ministry, as established by Jesus Christ, as maintained by the apostles, and as described in the Scriptures, it will be easy to detect and expose the innovations and disorders that have since been introduced and that now prevail. All usages that do not accord with the original model, the primitive practice, the Scripture narrative, must be innovation and disorder, of course, notwithstanding the lapse of time since they were introduced, and the high authorities by which they have been supported. Innovation does not cease to be innovation, because it is more than sixteen centuries old; nor does disorder cease to be disorder, because its "mystery of iniquity began to work" before the apostles had finished their epistles, nor because it was not eradicated by Luther.

* This allusion will be understood in the region of New York.

* Perhaps our English word President, as used in the voluntary associations of the day, comes as near as any word can do, to the sense of the ancient word bishop. It does not appear, however, that the primitive bishops presided so formally or authoritatively, as our modern Presidents of deliberative bodies and laymen of Synods, which would error too much for such. Several Presidents were appointed, with equal business involving many cases, like that of most merchants, would commonly be inconsistent with the best discharge of a stated teaching office. But several, even of eight, sided the table between them, as Prof. Schmuckler was done by the primitive bishops.

ORIGIN OF INNOVATIONS.

God made man upright, but he sought out many inventions. The Church and the Ministry too, as Christ instituted them, were pure and simple—we find them corrupt and complex only where man's polluting and disturbing wisdom—which God accounts folly—has debased and murred them.

What we call Nature and Nature's laws, are only the uniform efficiency of the Divine Will, and the ascertained rules of its operation. So it is in the physical world—so also in the moral. Had man contented himself with a loving harmony with these laws, without attempting any lawless innovations, no disturbance or disorder could have occurred. But he must needs be wiser than his God; he must trust in his own and the Tempter's calculations of ADVANTAGE—of EXPEDIENCE, rather than in his Maker's revelation of the TRUE and the RIGHT. He must be scientific, when all he had to do was to be obedient; scientific, too, by a transgression of the laws upon a conformity with which all real knowledge depends! And so his tree of science became the tree of the knowledge of evil, as contrasted with good—the good lost, the evil procured.

THE SECOND APOSTASY.

The Gospel is God's remedy for these disorders. The Church and Ministry, as Christ left them, were the visible incarnation of that Gospel—breathing his own Spirit, speaking his words, doing his work. Pure and simple as Nature itself—in other words, as the Divine Will—the Gospel revealed to the meek and humble, all that man needed. It opened again the portals of Eden. The flaming sword was withdrawn, and man entered. The Tempter came also among them. A second time, man's uprightness was subverted by Satanic intentions. God's ways were accounted too simple. They gave too little scope for human sagacity, human contrivance, "discretionary" arrangements. Something more perfect, more efficient, more striking, more imposing, more magnificent, must be introduced. Warily and stealthily, at the first, lest honest Fidelity should take the alarm; then boldly, and yet more boldly, till at length the Man of Sin exalts himself above all that is called God, and worshipped.

GROWTH AND ELEMENTS OF DESPOTISM.

The historical records of which we caught a few glimpses in our last lecture, show us plainly enough in what way these changes were effected—these innovations introduced. The simple memorials and symbols used by the first Christians, were substituted for the spiritual things signified, or imagined to be the magic spells and incantations for obtaining them.

Instead of the honest-hearted elder from his work-bench or farm-yard, sitting as a brother among brethren at the table of their common Lord—instead of a simple and unostentatious repast on each returning first day of the week—there came at length the lily-fingered priest in regal vestments, elevated apart from the flock of his charge, and graciously dispensing or withholding, at his pleasure, with awful majesty, with imposing pomp, at distant and stately intervals, as the special boon of some privileged and holy power, the rites of mystery now confided in, as the key to unlock heavenly felicities. Instead of the free assembly in the upper room, or by the river-side, where all spake in turn, some with psalm, some with exhortation, some with revelation, some with prophecy, where all might preach in turn, that all might be edified, the chiefest apostle listening to the babe in Christ, as well as the young convert to the aged apostle, behold! the magnificent cathedral—the mute, the awe-struck, the prostrate multitude—and listen to the privileged voice of the "ordained," the "consecrated," the "anointed" one, the sole dispenser of the word of life, the authorized and authoritative revelator of divine truth, from whose doctrine no

man may dissent, whose smile is the consummation of hope, whose frown the decretal of despair.

Instead of the living, the assembled local church, with its individual, and thinking, and speaking, and voting, and acting members—a church composed of the members—a church whose faith, and character, and will were the faith, character, and will of the free and accountable agents, whose convening together furnished the definition and the etymology of the term "Assembly" or "Church"—a church charged, by apostolic epistle, with the high duties of Church discipline, and clothed by the Savior (though two or three only in number) with the sole right to bind and to loose—a Church whose members were to "be ware of false prophets"—to mark the wolf in sheep's clothing, to judge the tree by its fruits—to receive no corrupt teachers into their houses, or bid them God speed—to try those who say they are apostles and are not, and decide them to be liars—instead of such a church, thus constituted, thus commissioned, and thus acting, what was witnessed?

First, the Elders (the Pastors, or Presbyters, or Bishops) of the local Church, sitting together in convolve, apart from the church, affecting to be the Church, and acting as "an oligarchy," a *Church Session*, without the concurrent voice of the brotherhood—for, shortly after the apostolic age, several ecclesiastical officers, it is confessed on all hands," (says Dr. Miller, of Princeton,) "were either invented or modified so as to suit the declining spirituality of the times." [Essay on Ruling Elders, &c., p. 70.]

Next came the Provincial or General Councils and Synods, the clerical associations, in which the Elders or Pastors virtually "decided every considerable controversy, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical," and "cut off the people from all control over such discussions." [Spiritual Despotism, p. 154,] thus saying, in effect, to "the laity in mass, 'You have nothing to do with theology but to receive what we teach you; and nothing to do with rules of discipline or laws of administration, but to yield them obedience.'—Ib., p. 155.

Add to this the then existing fact that the people had ceased to exercise the right and discharge the duty of trying those who falsely say they are prophets, and treating them as liars—that they had surrendered to the clergy, as a body, the right of saying who their religious teachers should be—and we may well say, with our Episcopal historian—"Under such a state of things we find the very essence of spiritual despotism, whether or not it be fully expanded." This is true testimony; and however clergymen may be interested to wrangle with each other who among them shall be greatest—whether "ministerial parity" or Diocesan Episcopacy, or Prelatical Hierarchy, or Papal Supremacy shall or shall not be added to the height of the existing structure—it is manifest that the mass of the laity have little occasion to meddle with the controversy, or to list an aspiration for the issue, unless it be that the pinnacle may be so "fully expanded" as to topple the whole Babel of abomination to its downfall.

A FLAIN CASE.

For what can be more manifest than that a self-constituted clergy—a clergy-making and clergy-deposing clergy—a clergy, holding the exclusive right of religious teaching—with a controlling power over the construction of creeds and church rules, and over all judicial and ecclesiastical decisions—holding also the exclusive right to administer the ordinances commonly deemed requisite to orderly church-membership, if not (under the teaching that dwells on their dignity and importance) absolutely essential to salvation must of necessity, and (whatever amount of true piety they may possess) in the very facts that have been

* See Mat. xiii. 12—20; 1 John x. 11; Rev. ii. 7; in connection with Rev. i. 4, where it will be seen that the seven churches of Asia, through their ministers, and not the ministers alone, were addressed.

† See the Episcopal historian of "Spiritual Despotism," quoted in our last lecture.

specified, comprise within itself all the essential elements of a despotic spiritual power! What could the mass of a conflicting and religious laity have left to them, if neither "the sealing ordinances," the preached word, an authorized system of faith, a church polity, or the door of admission into, or exclusion from, the visible church militant, could be found (under God) in the bosom of the church itself, the assembled brotherhood of the faithful; and could be found no where but in the conclave of an oligarchy whose members, so far from being a portion of the church and elected freely from among them, were not church members at all, in the same sense with the laymen, but constituted by themselves a distinct grade or caste? How could it then be said of members of the Church, the brotherhood, that the word of life was nigh them, even in their mouths and in their hearts? If they coveted the benefits wrapped up in the Christian religion, if they gave credence to existing institutions as the trust-worthy exponents of the nature of that religion, and of the medium of its spiritual supplies, how could they fail to bow down submissively to the right reverend dispensers of what they stood in such perishing need of possessing? How could they fail to venerate the privileged caste in whom exclusively the sacred treasure resided? To what purpose could they re-examine their doctrines? On what platform should they stand to "be ware of false prophets?" To try the claims of pretended apostles, and detect and repudiate their impositions? How? When, as an organized corps, their "apostles" and "prophets" had taken the whole work of decision into their hands—had authoritatively declared who are and who are not legitimate teachers of divine truth—at least leaving the laity nothing but a selection of the specimens to be furnished them by the caste?

The struggle against spiritual subjugation, with such a people, must imply either a struggle for a better conception of gospel institutions, and possession of them, or (what is more common) a struggle after some supposed better philosophy that should release them from the claims of the Christian religion altogether! Hence it happens that our Christendom, as we call it, presents, from age to age, the sorry spectacle of a baptized laity perpetually busied and perplexed with a balanced attitude between a Christianity that they feel to be despotic, and a skepticism that pretends to offer them freedom! Can we wonder that the graphic delineator of "Spiritual Despotism," though himself a communicant of the Church of England, should have detected the elements of it despotism in arrangements and usages like these? If even in a part of these arrangements as exist in the second and third centuries, an Episcopal antiquarian of Church usages found ample ground from which to trace the growth of the Romish usurpation, shall we be thought radicals or alarmists because in the same arrangements in our day, coupled with one more* of striking significance, which our author leaves out of the account

* It is remarkable that the writer alluded to, leaves the active clerical domination of the laity out of his estimate of early elements of despotic power in the clergy. This power had conceded to them as their rightful claim. As an upholder of the Episcopacy, he must needs concede there something of a pretensions, and what other item could have been better? And he seems to have been puzzled, too, with the fact of elders, apostles, evangelists, and teachers, before the founding of the Christian Church, who (according to Congregationalists as he understood them) must first have ordained the priest unless their ordination was from among themselves. The preachers, as wholly distinct from Church Officers, were priests, because qualified and thus commissioned of high hear that there could be a valid preacher, or a regular Ministry out the anointing finger of man, either Bishop or brother was a conception that does not appear to have found a place in his mind, perhaps not with the zealous "Independents" with whom he was contending. Unless this distinction between preachers and Church Officers be admitted, and the commission of the priest be recognized in his God-given qualifications and his pre-eminence, not in the appointment of his fellow-men—the claims of clerical ordination—co-ordinate if not exclusive becomes more than plausible, because, in the nature of the well as in actual Church history, there must often be persons to call men to repentance, before there is a church broken to "ordain" their preachers.

we discover the germ of the same evils he describes?

PROTESTANT REFORMATION—WHAT?

But it may be asked, what have we to do with the elements of spiritual despotism visible in the first, second and third centuries? Do we not inhabit the nineteenth? And did not the Protestant Reformation remove all just grounds of complaint, three centuries ago?

Let us inquire. Let us understand what the Protestant Reformation did, in its day, and what it left unaccomplished, nay, unattempted. Let us ask how the current of ecclesiastical affairs has been setting, since the time of Luther, and what is our present latitude and departure. Let us open our eyes and look about us. Let us see, for ourselves, wherein and how much, we differ from the Christians of the early centuries, when the assumptions of the anti-Christian apostasy were plainly visible.

WHY NEEDED?

To gain a right understanding of this point, we quote again the learned Episcopal writer to whom we have so often referred.

"It might tend, not a little, to dispel some delusive impressions, common to the Protestant world, if a phrase could be found which, while characteristic of the superstitious and despotic system that, from the second and third centuries supervened and displaced Christianity, should clearly separate it from its accidental connection with Papacy, and the Romish hierarchical tyranny. The Popes accepted, and turned to their particular advantage, this vast and refined system of error and oppression, but the system itself has deep roots; is more recalcitrant, more intellectual, and is more ancient than the usurpation of the bishops of Rome. Nor is this all: for the spiritual essence of Popery has outlived the overthrow of the Papal domination, or the proper power of Rome, and (which is a significant truth) it may survive the total dispersion of that hierarchy of which the Pope is the head and organ. There is, then, some substantial and practical importance to an inquiry concerning those theoretic axioms to which the Papacy gave visible and audible expression. What were the grasping principles that imparted strength and vitality to Popery and which, without supposing any thing chimerical, may start forth afresh, and rule the world again, when Popery shall be found no where but on the page of history."—*Spiritual Despotism*, p. 222.

And this is our author's introduction to that view of the elements of spiritual despotism which we have already presented, both in his language and in our own.

ITS DEFECTS.

And has the Protestant Reformation broken up, or waged an effective warfare with these despotic elements? Let us listen to our own Episcopal witness again. We will not indeed endorse, to the full extent, all his statements under his head. We are willing to award a higher praise to the Protestant Reformers than our learned historian has done. But let us give him a hearing, and ponder the known facts of history.

"Of their notions of church power and church polity, it must be said that they were, in almost every sense, and in an extreme degree, confused and erroneous. The Reformers brought into play, principles from which, in the end, the liberties we now enjoy, naturally resulted: but we owe them few thanks in this behalf; they intended no such thing as that spiritual despotism, in its substance, should be dissipated, they meant indeed to shift it from its old bottom, get to build it up anew, and, as they thought, upon a better model. The ecclesiastical consequences of the Reformation have an analogy with what has frequently followed civil contests, be-

tween rival pretenders to a crown, when the one party and generally the assendant party, having called to its aid the middle classes, and having, as a bribe, conceded large privileges to them, popular rights and liberties have been permanently secured. Nothing else could happen but that the Reformation should, in the end, bring about the establishment of religious liberty, yet such was not either its purport, or its design."—*Page 263-4.*

Whatever qualification may be made of this language, three things are at least evident, viz: first, that there is some degree of historical as well as philosophical truth in the statement; second, that Ecclesiasties, since the Reformation, have had less occasion than during the struggle, to appeal to the "middle classes," and that as a matter of fact, to a great extent, the natural results are to be witnessed; third, that the sentiment of our author, that follows, is trust-worthy and significant, namely:

"Whatever we hold as an inheritance from ancestors of the sixteenth century, whether it has come to us directly or obliquely, should now be calmly considered and reformed."—*Ib.* p. 265.

We cannot spare room to follow our philosophical historian of the church, through all the mazes of ecclesiastical management during and after the grand Lutheran struggle, which his pages unfold. The following paragraphs, by way of specimen, must suffice.

"In all the Protestant countries, and especially in England, the people at large, and the native secular clergy" at the era of the Reformation, lost a protector and found a Despot, in the sovereign. Heretofore, the Kings of England, for their own sakes, and for the public good, had mediated with Rome; they had resisted encroachments, and had stood as the guardians of the realm, repelling and excluding so much of the spiritual despotism of the Papacy as could be resisted without openly renouncing allegiance to St. Peter's representative."—*Ib.* page 266.

It is no secret that monarchs of all grades and characters, from the Elector of Saxony, to Henry the Eighth, (the latter of whom wished to throw off Papal domination, because he could not obtain the Papal consent to his wicked divorce) were the patrons of the Reformers, for their own personal or political ends—that the struggle was not unfrequently transferred from the ecclesiastical Diet to the military camp. And it can scarcely be supposed that a church reformation of the purest and most spiritual character could naturally, much less necessarily, result from the strife.† Other disorders, along with sectarian divisions, were inevitable. Servility to the reigning monarch, (including, perhaps, as in the case of Henry VIII. a connivance at his vices) could scarcely fail to be the result. Hear our witness again:

"Besides, at the era of the Reformation, princes had been long long to suspect, to condemn, to hate, and to oppose the clergy. Eminently learned, holy and sincere, as were many of the reforming ministers, they belonged to a class that, for three centuries, had been, every day, more and more, the objects of aversion, or contempt. These ministers now approached to the throne, entreating protection and aid, and the peculiar difficulties of their position led them to offer an incense to the monarch which maddened his brain.† The mischiefs of this ad-

† The Secular Clergy of the Romish Church are those who have charge of parishes. The regular clergy belong to monasteries.

† Professor Rehmeyer, in treating of the origin of the Protestant Divisions, says:

"The Protestant Church struggled into existence amid circumstances of excitement, oppression, and agitation, both civil and ecclesiastical. This state of things was highly unpropitious, alike to the formation of perfect views of church polity, and their introduction into practice. The Reformation itself, could not have been effected, unless aided by the civil arm, which protected its agents from Papal vengeance. A total exclusion of the civil authorities from ecclesiastical action, would probably have blasted the Reformation in the bud, even if the views of the earlier Reformers had led them to desire such exclusion. Owing partly to these circumstances, and partly to the remains of Papal bigotry still adhering to them, the Protestants in different countries successively assumed organizations not only entirely separate, as in some respects they might properly be, but having little reference to the church as a whole, and calculated to exalt into the back ground the fundamental unity that actually exists between them."—*Fraternal Appeal*, page 66.

† This picture has its counterpart in the servility of our American Clergy, for several years past, to the rampant infidelity of our leading politicians, by whom, until within a few years, and

lation continued to afflict the country [England] a hundred and seventy years; and it still bears upon the church with various disadvantages. To the present day the English establishment has not received it off from the humiliations that resulted from the surrender; it had first made of its independence to the civil magistrate."—*Page 270.*

Our best consolation here, is, that the secular tyranny may have held the spiritual despotism in check. The Oxford Tract writers would be willing, nay eager, no doubt, to throw off the "humiliation" of subservience to Queen Victoria, the constituted head of the "Anglican Church," if they could but galvanize back again into life the spiritual sway of the age of Cyrrian, as a substitute for the secular arm.

But the strongest fact in proof of the defective character of the Lutheran or Protestant Reformation, as a REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH, and in the all-important matter now under discussion, namely, the restoration of religious freedom, is to be found in the outstanding and palpable fact, that the Protestant Reformers became persecutors themselves—that in this bad work, the clergy and the monarchs, rivals as they were, found it not difficult to unite—the clergy commonly leading the way. Not Protestants merely, but dissenters from the established Episcopacy, must share in this censure. This western England of ours furnished its share of these disgraceful scenes. And though the onward march of human affairs has accumulated a heap of odium upon these bloody persecutions, inasmuch that they are no longer practicable, in the old form, yet recent and passing events show plainly enough that the temper is rather smothered than cured.

The glaring inconsistency and aggravated guilt of these Protestant persecutions, amid the light which their own struggles against Papal persecutions had shed on their path, is thus noticed by the author already quoted:

"The [Romish] Church being infallible, never incurred the hazard of inflicting its chastisements upon the innocent, and being supernaturally empowered to maintain and defend the truth, had nothing to think of, but faithfully and effectively to perform its duty. On the contrary, the Reformers, by renouncing infallibility, and by disclaiming miraculous attestations of their ministry, left themselves open to the heaviest possible imputation of arrogance, and of cruelty, while they employed the sword and brand against their opponents."—*Spiritual Despotism*, p. 264.

ITS TRUE VALUE.

The most then that we can make of the Protestant Reformation, may be briefly summed up in these truthful words of the same writer:

"The Lutheran Reformation was a glorious beginning that waits for its consummation. Had it indeed been complete and consistent in principle and practice, it would have been universal in its actual spread. The PAPACY LIVES, and it must live, UNTIL PROTESTANTISM SHALL BE REFORMED."—*Ib.* p. 218.

This retrospective estimate contrasts strikingly with the too common and shallow policy of preferring half-way reformations, because, it is alleged, so few can be induced to adopt thorough and radical measures! All history gives the lie to the assumption. It is a libel on human nature, on truth, and on God. The secret of success, with the first Christians, lay much in the manifest wholeness, consistency, symmetry, sincerity, and efficiency of their movements—the full competency of the remedy to the virulence and magnitude of the evil to be removed—the fact that so far as faithfully applied, the promised effect was produced. For the want of these qualities, the Protestant Reformation was, to a great extent, a palpable failure. The Lutherans, technically so called, on the continent of Europe, are confessedly removed but a little from the Romanists. So of the "high church" Episcopalians in Eng-

up to the commencement of the Anti-Slavery agitation, the clergy were so unceremoniously and unapologetically derided and denounced. The truce between the clergy and their former assailants is among the most pregnant signs of the times.

* Perhaps a more significant and comprehensive "phrase" to express the requisite idea, could not easily be found than that of clerical supremacy or clerical caste. And yet the Society of Friends, with all their anti-clerical antipathies, appear to have clergy in their Yearly Meeting Clerks, and self-installed associates of an accredited supernatural inspiration, in the presence of whom the masses must be silent, and by whom in the transaction of business, "the weight of the meeting" is mysteriously ascertained, and authoritatively announced, without the sanction—or the hazard to spiritual "unity"—of an appeal from the democratic vote.

† Let us rather say the Reformers did not establish religious liberty, because their education had given them no conception of the thing.

land and elsewhere. And accordingly the impression made by them on the surrounding Romanism is but faint and indistinct. Men do not readily see why such an should have been made on such slight grounds; and partizan or unworthy ends are therefore supposed to lie at the bottom.

SUCCESSORS OF THE REFORMERS.

If such were the defects of the Protestant Reformation at the outset, the next question is, how far, if at all, it had been improved since that period. The writer just quoted evidently thinks that little, if any, progress has been made—that much, at all events, remains to be done. Against his own and other Episcopal communions he could have had no prejudice to mislead him; though the boasts of non-conformity and dissentarianism might possibly have escaped his vision. What, then, are the facts?

DEGENERACY INSTEAD OF PROGRESS.

The admiration with which Luther and his coadjutors are now regarded is among the evidences of a general decline in Christian heroism and manly enterprise, since their day.* Where shall we look, among their successors, for a Wickliffe or a Knox? Should we be building the tombs of those prophets, and seeking for precious reliques of their persons, or planning ourselves upon our erudition in an acquaintance with their writings or sayings, were we sensible that we walked in the midst of a brighter light than that which shone on their path? that living and active minds, of a higher and purer cast than theirs were walking our steps and holding forth in our pulpits? If such men are to be found now, it must be some obscure corner that they inhabit, or else we must be strangely blind to their worth! Among our "fanatics," must we search for them, or for any of their kin. Our prudent and conservative ones, our accomplished and our learned, the very men who claim it as their glory that they are the successors of the Protestant Reformers and that they tread cautiously and undeviatingly in their footprints, give evidence enough, in that very fact, that they are altogether a different and an inferior race of men! *They are not men of progress.* *Theirs* are not the port, nor the spirit, nor the maxims, nor the manliness, nor the intrepidity, nor the moral courage, of the Protestant Reformers. They sympathize not in the aims, or the aspirations, or the endeavors of the Lutheran period. They work not the work, they breathe not the spirit, of such an age. Living in the midst of the most monstrous abuses that ever demanded reform, wielding their cultivated powers and holding their high stations, at a time when the exigencies of the race, and the interests of divine truth, demand of them a holier spirit, and a purer work than that of the Protestant Reformers, an age in which greater facilities both for inquiry and for labor, are provided, to their hands, their strength, by their own estimate, is to sit still, doing nothing themselves, except it be to prevent the doing of any thing by others.

CHURCHES OF THE REFORMERS.

Of the Lutheran and contemporary communions, originating in the period of the Reformation, of the church planted by Calvin at Geneva, of the Swiss, the German, the Norwegian, the Swedish, and other European continental churches, our American theologians and Journalists have chanted their *Jeremiads* and opitaphed their *Ichabods*.—"The glory," they assure us, "is departed." The idolized ritual, the revered priest, the outward

form, for the most part, they tell us, is substituted for the living spirit, the intelligent, spiritual worship. Leagued with the state, supported and controlled by the reigning monarch, by most of whom all other religions are virtually excluded, and innovations in the establishment prohibited, a night almost as dense and quite as hopeless as Romanism itself, reigns over the mass of the people.

Of the twin sister of these, the church of England, what shall we say? She, whose dutiful son, the splendid writer just quoted, so eloquently and confidently summoned, as but yesterday, to shake herself from the dust of her "humiliations" to secular power, and lead on the march of modern Christianity in the glorious work of completing the Protestant Reformation, of reforming the Reformed churches, of dealing the death-blow to the "spiritual despotism" that for sixteen centuries had held sway! Alas! scarce had the writer's ink dried on his sheets, when lo! the response of his beloved church to his entreaty is heard from the high places at Oxford! The "tracts for the times" tell us of other things than a defective partial Protestantism to be completed, a half way reformation to be more thoroughly reformed! Instead of this, the innovations even of the Lutheran age are deplored—the name of Protestant protested against—the English, the Greek, and the Romish communions are to be placed upon a common and fraternal basis—ancient superstitions are to be revived and restored! Thus much for the churches planted in the Lutheran age.

CHURCHES OF THE DISSENTERS.

To the churches of the English dissenters then, and to their American progeny, must we look for the progress of Christian liberty and purity, so far as Church arrangements are concerned, since the times of the early Reformers, if such progress has been made. Upon so complex a problem we cannot now enter at large. A few items however, may be noted. Much that has been said of the Lutheran Reformers may apply to the early English Dissenters. Flagrant abuses, intolerable usurpations, were the occasions, to a great extent, of the secessions. Disgust with frivolous observances, unscriptural rites, relics of ancient superstitions, rigid set forms, the power of the Bishops over the inferior clergy, the worldly ambition of the state church, its decline from vital godliness—the, in turn, or intermingled, came in for their share. The Dissenting Preachers were, in many cases, the restorers of a purer worship—the expositors of a more spiritual religion—the assertors of a higher freedom—the promulgators of a simpler faith—the heralds of individual responsibility—the preachers of a personal religion. In all this, we read indications of progress. But there is another side to the picture. The same want of consistency and of completeness that marred and crippled the Lutheran Reformers, were equally fatal to the Dissenters. Subjected, as they were, to persecution, they failed, for the most part, to learn the rights of human nature, to refrain from being persecutors, themselves, whenever they could lay hold of the power. Equally ready were they, with the churches planted in the Lutheran age, to connect themselves with the state, and to wield the secular arm for their own emolument and for the prostration of their rivals.

BRA OF SECT MAKING.

The history of dissent from the National Establishment of the early Reformers, especially of English dissenters, is the history of that prolific and dogmatic sect-making by which our modern Christianity is so hideously disfigured, so barbarously distorted; so unmercifully mangled. The grand ambition of the dissenting Reformer has too often been, or seemed to be, the creation and control of a new and powerful sect. Not only the Protestant world, but the brotherhood of Dissent-

ers from Api-copney, has thus been split into rival factions and clans. The life-giving truths of religion, as well as the minutiae of its rituals, of its worship, and of its economy, with the subtleties of the schools, have been torn asunder into the banners of as many contending communions or churches as could be fabricated out of the interminable variations and combinations or distortions of these materials. Not a stitch in the hem of the Savior's garment—so to speak—has been left unattempted or untortured in the strife. Christians, agreed in all that they themselves account vital in religion, find themselves still separated hopelessly from each other by the adamantine bars authoritatively put up by the founders of their respective sects on the other side of the Atlantic, two hundred years ago!

DESOTISM NOT OVERTHROWN.

With few exceptions, the effort of the Dissenters, like those of the earlier Reformers, has been to shift, to transfer, to re-model, rather than to annihilate or overthrow the elements of despotic spiritual power in the churches. "Ministerial party"—rather than the equality of a common brotherhood—the equal rights of the Pastors and of the Clergy, rather than the equal rights of Max, has been the beau ideal and the pole-star of the Apostles of Dissent. The mystic efficacy of the rituals, or "ordinances," the monopoly of their administration by the clergy—their exclusive right to the function of religious teaching—the authoritativeness of their messages—the inviolability of the clerical estate—their commanding influence in first moulding and ever afterwards administering the church polity of the sect—and finally, their right to nominate their own associates and successors in the ministry, and to degrade them at their pleasure—these grand elements in the rising spiritual despotism of the second and third centuries—these, the stepping stones of the Papacy; rather, the vital principles of which the Pope himself was but the incident—these, that survived, with so little damage, the shocks of the Lutheran contest—will be found, we apprehend, to have suffered but occasional fractures, or incidental, "wee-and-ten" by the frictions of English dissent, including their shipment to America and service on our own soil. Congregationalists and Baptists, with perhaps some other sects, may claim to have furnished exceptions to some parts of this statement; and their early records will go far to justify their pretensions. But where are they now? Do their present usages honor their professed principles, or correspond with the practices of their founders? Do they remember even, that the right, not to say the exclusive claim of ministerial ordination by the masses, by the brotherhood, by the laity, was one of the distinctive glories of their sect? Do they know that the very bone of the controversy which gave rise to the English Independents, as a sect, was this, chiefly, to wit, whether the prerogative of electing, that is, ordaining the Pastors, should be recognized as residing in the congregated brotherhood, and not in the Clergy? That, in fact, the first Congregational Pastors, were commonly plain men, selected from among the laity—the flocks? That the administration of the "ordinances," so called, were, for a time, at least, in "lay" hands? And that public speaking, as in primitive times, was not monopolized by the elected or ordained Teacher? These facts they may find hinted at, in the clerical accounts of "disorders" among the early Independents, and in the commendations awarded to certain clergymen, for reforming these disorders, and placing the Congregational policy on a more reputable footing, to "render it less odious to their adversaries," by whom they were subjected to persecution!†

* The following, from a Discourse by Rev. J. Blanchard, of Cincinnati, not only corroborates this statement, but shows that it is a commonly understood and admitted truth.

Coleridge has said: "It is a profound question to answer, why it is that, since the middle of the 18th century, the Reformation (from Popery) has not advanced one step in Europe!"

Now it seems to me that this "profound question" is solved by the single fact, that Luther concluded for the truth; but his followers fought for Lutherism; he for principle; they for the sect formed upon it.

† Among the Congregationalists and Baptists, the power of ordination lies with the suffrage of the people.—Buck's Theological Dictionary, article "Ordination."

† See Buck's Theological Dictionary—article "Independents," also article "Brownists."

DECLINE OF THE DISSENTERS.

And this suggests the general remark that the churches founded by the English dissenters, like those founded by the sixteenth century Reformers, have suffered, to a wide extent, and in many essential particulars, a deteriorating and degenerating process. Some of the grosser errors of their founders they may have corrected. Their persecuting temper may have been mollified by the progress, to some extent, in this respect, of the present age. But along with the errors of their founders, their manly virtues and their earnest sincerity, are also become obsolete. Draw a parallel, at your leisure, between the present churches and ministry of New England and their Puritan Fathers—between the Presbyterians of both hemispheres, and those of the age of Baxter—between the heads of the Baptists in America, and such men as John Bunyan—between the Methodists of the General Conference and John Wesley—between the professed disciples and eulogists of Whitfield, Edwards and Tennant; and the men whose mantles they seem anxious to wear—between the Quakers of the modern Yearly Meeting, and those of the times of George Fox. Does not the contrast appear evident and striking? Are not the present sects, the mere skeletons and spectres of their predecessors? In earnestness, in honesty, and integrity, how do they compare? Is not the present, to a great extent, the mere imitation of the past? An imitation, too, in outward appearances, chiefly? If the shape of the hat and coat makes the "Friend"—if the tone of the voice, or if the class meeting and the Love Feast make the Methodist—if immersion make the Baptist—if the elongated phiz or stately gait, or form of worship or polity, make the Puritan or Presbyterian, then might the Friends, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Puritans, the Presbyterians of a by-gone age, could they rise from their graves, discover and recognize somewhat of their successors, in the communions bearing their names. But if he names the significant of things lying deeper beneath the surface than this, the Foxes, and Wesleys, and Baxters, and Bunyans, and Robinsons, of former days, would need the candle of a Discerner, at noon-day, to search after their men.

This transformation is frequently noticed by the Editor of the London Nonconformist, a writer, by the by, who has the rare merit of that straight forward honesty and earnestness, the scarcity of which no so eloquently deploras. In a recent number he says:

"When Protestant Non-Conformity came out of the al of perfection, and promised to sit quietly under persecution, Protestant Non-Conformity began to be comfortable, and in due course, aspired to be genteel. Now, the gentility is to be in unison with the tastes and habits of modern civilization—gentility in this country is sympathy with aristocracy. It is reverence not for virtue, but for rank, not for worth, but for wealth. And such gentility could exist with nothing stronger than passive non-conformity. Active non-conformity, accordingly, went out of fashion—and it was only natural that a desire of respectability which whipped it out of doors could justify itself by religious plumes. It did so. It announced the battled one as a political traitor."—*Non-Conformist*, March 1, 1843.

Similar causes have wrought similar transformations in America. The want of an order of nobility, (as Gov. McDuffie observed; long since) is supplied here by the "peculiar institution" of the South. Sympathy with this, at the North, from aristocracy of Fashion and Wealth, and all is fanned to a flame and transfused through every vein and artery of American society by that creature of "modern feudalism" with which the overly and other novelists of the mother country so amply supply us, have rendered us quite as venish in our aspirations after fictitious gentility as our brethren on the other side of the water. Honest, honest, veritable, working, every-day religion, is equally out of fashion; equally proscribed from the arena of political life. And the stately, pliant religion that shrinks from the battlefield of humanity and of Christian freedom, that

sits passive and quiet amid the ravages of aristocratic cruelty and sin, is equally ingenious and plausible in all the pleas which the spurious spiritualism of a fictitious literature and a fictitious pietism could suggest.

Very evidently the defective and faulty reformations of the English dissenters are not likely to be corrected and carried forward, in such an age, and under influences like these, by the conservatism of the existing sects of dissenters, intent as they are, upon the preservation of the mere outside shell, and almost utterly incapable, as they capariously seem to be of entering into the living spirit of Christian reform by which, to a certain extent, and according to the light they enjoyed, their almost idolized predecessors were doubtless animated and impelled. So far from making progress, reforming abuses, and completing what the founders of their sect left unfinished, their present journalists are evidently expending their strength in anxious & agonizing efforts to keep the people under their supervision, and especially their educated clergy, from running back again into Episcopacy and Romanism. In vain do they put forth efforts so evidently sectarian, while the latent and unpurged despotisms of their own polity betray the hollowness of their pretensions. In America, as in England, the ranks of the Dissenting Churches and ministry suffer from constant defections to Episcopacy and Romanism.

PERENNIAL CAUSE OF DEFEAT.

On a review of this branch of our inquiry, we cannot but be impressed with the fact that reformatory movements in the church hitherto, whether of the Lutheran or of the subsequent periods, have with scarce an exception, contemplated the great body of men, and the great brotherhood of Christians as an inert mass, a passive subject, to be operated upon by their superiors—by the clergy—by the sect-makers—in some cases, perhaps, by the claimants of a supernatural inspiration to which the common Christian might not aspire, and to which he must implicitly bow down. Of this latter class, if we mistake not, have been some who, along with their outcry against a learned and privileged caste or clergy, have made professions which the truly learned among the clergy have had too much modesty and good sense to affect. When, in some instances, the ignorant and the impudent have exalted those qualities into qualifications to preach; and have claimed the veneration due to heaven-inspired seers, the re-action in favor of an "educated" and "duly authorized" clergy has strengthened, more than, perhaps, any thing else, the claims of a self-created clerical caste. But in the one case, as truly as in the other, little progress has been made, in bringing out and bringing forward into activity, the intelligence and the common sense of the great mass of the Christian brotherhood. The polity, the usages, the doctrines, the discipline, of almost, if not all, the existing sects, have been either shaped in the first place, or modified afterwards by the patriarch of the sect, by the clergy, or by the select few. The subsequent administration commonly falls into a few hands. To the mass of the people, investigation is heresy, and progress is excision. And the law of the sect, like that of the Medes and Persians, (except by stealthy and unperceived innovation) changes not. Little scope here, for Christian conscientiousness, Christian willingness, individual responsibility, intelligent and free inquiry, Christian progress, *unalienable human rights*. Little prospect that churches thus constituted, will ever disenthral an enslaved world, or train to habits of self-denial, and holy heroisms, and scrutinizing disformation, the mass of the membership themselves.

SYMPTOMS OF CHANGE.

And yet we are not left without hope. There is an under-current at work. Sabbath Schools, Bible Classes, voluntary associations, popular reformations, discussions, lyceums, benevolent enterprises—these are among the indications of a ri-

pening era, in which, not brans or commons, not bishops or clergy, but the common brotherhood—the Man—the Christian, shall come upon the stage—shall claim inherent rights—shall live, move, breathe, think, speak, devise, and act as the human individual, God-gifted, and God-governed, is constitutionally bound to do. When that era shall have expanded itself, the outside crust that now holds it, brittle as it is with age and rottenness, will crack and rattle off like the shell of the crystal—like a covering of thin plaster.

That a generation so boastful of its superior intelligence as that which bestrides the pinnacle of this nineteenth century of ours, should at the same time, plume itself upon its undeviating and idolatrous attachment to literary and ecclesiastical arrangements and institutions shaped in the dim twilight of what it now denominates "the dark ages"—is a phenomenon which might excite merriment or wonder, did we not know that a generation of boasters is never a generation of thinkers, still less of doers; that the idolaters of the dead never rise to the level of the objects of their adoration. Happily for our 19th century, its master spirits, its truly working men have other work to do than ride on the top of it, and trumpet its intellectual and moral elevation. They have more productive though homelier exercise elsewhere. And some of them are becoming so funnical and impolitic as to question whether it be wise to "obey their dead fathers instead of their living God"—whether the forms of church polity inherited from the Protestant Dissenters, the Lutheran Reformers, or the Second Century Fathers, are to be preferred to the directions of Jesus Christ, the usages of the Apostles, and the spirit and aims of the religion they profess.

* Pierpont.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, JUNE, 1843.

DIRECTION.

Please be particular, in directing letters and papers for the "Christian Investigator," or its Editor and Publisher, to direct to HONEOYE, ONTARIO COUNTY, N. Y. Unless the name of the County be written, there will be danger that the letters or papers will be forwarded to another place of nearly the same name, (Honeoye Falls) in Monroe County. Mistakes of the kind sometimes occur.

OUR EARLY PATRONS.

We have continued to send our New Series to all who made us any payments, more or less, on the former plan of publication, though the conditions of that series did not strictly require us to do so. Those who received the seven numbers of that series, and who paid us only fifty cents, will please take notice that, with the five numbers of the New Series, they have now had twelve numbers in all, being the subscription value of their money, so that another advance payment would be quite "in order" at the present time, if they wish a continuance of the paper.

THE RIGHT OF LAY ORDINATION.

"Besides, there is something very absurd in the supposition that ordained ministers have the sole right of ordaining others. Upon this supposition, let a particular church be ever so pure and orthodox, and choose an able and orthodox preacher to settle with them, they cannot have him for their pastor unless ministers are pleased to ordain him. This throws all the churches into the hands of ministers; and can we suppose that Christ meant to deprive churches of their inherent right to choose and install their own officers? What would have become of the dissenters in England if they had no right to choose and install their own ministers? What would have become of the churches in New England if they had not the right of choosing and installing their own

ministers? They would not have had one regular gospel minister to this day. And on this ground the high church clergy, such as Bishop Hobart, of New York, maintain that there is not one regular Congregational minister in this country, who has a right to ordain others, or to administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper. The truth is, ministers have no exclusive right to ordain others. The right of ordination is primarily and solely in the hands of the church. And when ministers do ordain, it is because they are invited and appointed by the church to do it. Thus the church has a right, after it is formed by confederation, to organize itself by choosing and installing such officers as Christ has appointed; and these are Bishops and Deacons, and no others. —Dr. EMMONS' SERMONS, Vol. V. p. 419.

THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

"This is the duty of every man, because God has appointed none to judge for him in respect to his religious opinions. It is true, God has appointed teachers, but not judges. The preachers of the gospel are to explain and inculcate the doctrines of it, and place them in as clear, plain and convincing light as they can. But, after all they have done to exhibit and support the truth, the hearers are to judge for themselves whether these things they have heard be the truth. They have the same sure word of inspiration to assist them in determining what is truth that their teachers have, and they are obliged to consult it. Teachers, indeed, have often been disposed to assume the power and authority of dictating. — And the Christian Church has suffered great injury for ages, from the bigotry and usurpation of those who have sustained the office of sacred guides. But it was not so from the beginning. The apostles and primitive preachers of the gospel disclaimed all dominion over men's faith, and professed to be only helpers in promoting their knowledge and holiness. And none who sustain the office of the ministry have any right to impose their own opinion upon their hearers, by virtue of their sacred office. The Pope and all his hierarchy are usurpers, whose pretensions to supreme power and infallibility in the church are to be treated with disdain, as vile impositions. The people are their own proper judges of religious truth and error, and of ecclesiastical power. Christian churches have a right to form their own creeds and exercise their own discipline, independently of any superior ecclesiastical power on earth. As God has appointed none to judge and dictate for them, in these serious concerns; so that they are under indispensable obligations to exercise their own private judgment." —Dr. EMMONS' SERMONS, Vol. IV. p. 25-36.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church [New School] has lately held another session, after a recess of three years. To this session, thousands of Presbyterian Abolitionists, including scores of ministers, had been looking for some definite action, not only concerning, but against slavery. This, the New York Evangelist had led them to expect. But the session is over, and here is the result:

"Whereas, there is, in this Assembly, great diversity of opinion as to the proper and best mode of action on the subject of slavery; and whereas, in such circumstances, any expression of sentiment would carry with it but little weight, as it would be passed with a small majority, and whereas, the Assembly of 1839, with great unanimity, referred this whole subject to the lower judicatories, to take such order as, in their judgment, might be adapted to remove the evil—

Resolved, That the Assembly do not think it for the edification of the church, for this body to take any action on this subject."

This, the New York Evangelist considers an advance upon any former action of that body. To do not readily see how doing nothing can be

called an advance (unless it be claimed that its former action was directly in favor of slavery) and the Assembly evidently thought itself declining to "take any action."

The Editors of the Evangelist are charmed with the kindness and Christian spirit of the discussion. A specimen, we select from their own Report of it.

Rev. Dr. Hill, of Va. said:—"The Abolitionists had made their [the slaves'] servitude harder." "If I could tell you some of the dirty tricks which these abolitionists have played among us, you would not wonder. Some of them have been LYNCHED, and they were SEVEN BROTHERS!"

What a season of brotherly love must it have been when professed abolitionists in the Assembly, sat under a sacramental sermon from this same Rev. evangelist of LYNCH LAW, and came around the table of communion with him! Did the glorified spirit of the martyred Lovejoy commune with them! Did Isaiah look down, and call it "an acceptable sacrifice to the Lord?" Is THIS "preserving the peace of the church?"

It was distinctly threatened by Southern members that they would secede—not merely if the proposed Anti-Slavery action was had—but if the members of the Assembly and their constituents did not cease to annoy them with such remonstrances, and the above vote of the Assembly that followed, was evidently in view and in consequence of that threat. Is this the spirit of Christian brotherhood? Or is it rank conspiracy with the Arch Enemy and open apostasy from the known and recognized principles of eternal truth?

"Dr. Beecher said he should vote for Dr. Dickinson's substitute," though a different result was desirable, and, as he felt, due to the cause of Truth and Justice, and the Character of the Presbyterian Church!"

And so 'TRUTH,' 'JUSTICE,' and 'CHARACTER,' were deliberately and avowedly sacrificed for the sake of going with the majority—for the sake of maintaining harmony in an ecclesiastical body! The atheistic tendency of such unscriptural clerical combinations is strikingly developed in all this? But will the man that could unblushingly avow such recreancy to his own conscientious convictions, ever stand up in a Christian pulpit again, and profess to believe in a God, and a day of Judgment? Or, who that truly knows in his heart, what the fear of the Lord is, will dare to retain an ecclesiastical connection with the New School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, after this?

THE JESUITS—A PICTURE TO BE STUDIED.

The extract which follows, presents a picture of the Jesuits near the beginning of their career. The intelligent reader who marks its distinctive features, and looks with open eye on passing events, will be able to trace the resemblance between the Jesuitism of a former age, and that of the present:

"Having phased from India to Japan, and speedily succeeded in converting many in that island, still farther confirmed, and glorying in his success, he aimed at the conversion of China; and having embarked for that country with this design, he died in sight of its shores. Rich, his disciple, who had accompanied him in this expedition, pressed forward into the country, and made himself so acceptable to the Chinese nobility by his mathematical abilities, that he was permitted to teach them the Gospel. In China the Jesuits did not hesitate to ally themselves with Christianity, in order to put down the prejudices of the people and gain them as converts; and, as a safe method of avoiding guilt in the commission of this crime, they taught their disciples to hide

This was the resolution that prevailed (as above published) instead of the Antislavery Resolutions introduced by Rev. President Kellogg, of Illinois.

under their clothes an image of Jesus Christ, to which, by a mental reservation, they were to direct those public adorations which they were professedly rendering to their idol, Cachim-Cham, and their Kenui-Picum. In Malabar, the dung of a cow is held sacred, and the person of the acceptable worshipper must invariably be rubbed with it. The females, too, must wear round their necks the image of their god, Pilear. The Bramins claim a divine descent, and are so strictly attached to the system of castes, that they consider it an abomination to hold equal communion with the common people; while all are so attached to the splendors of a ceremonial religion, as to relish no such humiliating doctrines as the Bible teachers. To Christianize them, the Jesuits taught only the glorification of Christ—concealing his sufferings as too humiliating to the prejudices of their hearers. They permitted their reverence for cow-dung, and even blessed it in their presence. They allowed the women to wear their idol, provided that a crucifix was cut on it, though so slight as to be undiscernible; and they yielded to the pride of the Bramins, and even assumed their dress and character; and refused to heal the sick, except when they were brought out into the open air to them. In the Ohio, they permitted their converts the exterior observance of Mohammedanism, provided they maintained faith in Christ in their hearts, and even administered the sacraments there to several females who lived in that criminal dissimulation. Thus proceeding on the diabolical maxim that the intention sanctifies the act, and that it matters not what we do in the conduct of life, provided that the heart cherishes a good purpose." —Secret Institutes of the Jesuits, pp. 218-219.

Was the missionary policy of the Jesuits right, or was it wrong? Settle this question, and a good many other questions will be easily settled.

Culture is of use only as it induces spiritual character to unfold. It is towards this our care, if it have any meaning in it, must address itself.—Non-Confessors.

DONATIONS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR UP TO JUNE 1st.

Received of G. Smith, Petersburg; \$10 00; M. Mitchell, Shingle Creek, 2 00; S. Bigelow, Boscawen, N. H., 1 00; S. S. Sheldon, Easton, Mass., 1 00; J. Emery, Whitesboro, 2 00; A. Friend, in Whitesboro, 2 00; O. B. Campbell, do. 0 33; W. W. Whitmore, Lockport, 0 50; S. Hunt, Deerfield, Mass., 9 00; G. Steadman, Rome, 1 00; D. K. Hawke, Esq., Honesoe, 1 00; Rev. — Rice, do. 0 50; Rev. A. Gaston, Delavan, (Wisconsin) 0 50; C. T. Gaston, Chicago, (Ill.) 0 50; L. Hayes, Big Hollow, 0 50; A. Peck, do. 0 50; Miss E. Verplanck, Rondout, 2 00; G. & R. D. Sharpe, Abington, Conn. 0 00; Dr. J. B. Whitcomb, Brooklyn, Conn. 0 50; Rev. S. W. Hester, Auburn, (O.) 1 00; C. W. Hart, Old Guilford, Conn. 0 50; J. Coddling, Meriden, Conn. 3 31; Rev. J. Keop, Hartford, (O.) 2 75; G. W. Durant, Rensselaerville, 0 50; Rev. G. Galt, year, do. 0 50; W. Osborne, do. 0 50; Mrs. G. Cockling, do. 0 50; J. Peck, Ballston Spa, 0 50; J. Collier, do. 0 50; Rev. F. Shipperd, Troy, 2 00; Rev. C. Gray, China, 1 00; S. Crosby, Litchfield, 2 00; B. J. Campbell, do. 1 00; J. Campbell, do. 0 50; S. Kendall, do. 1 00; W. P. Harris, Brownhelm, (O.) 0 50; A. S. Sampson, Eagle Harbor, 0 25; J. Kingsbury, Litchfield, 1 00; papers sold, 0 25. Amount, \$50 25.

Receipts since the first of June, will appear in our next number.

Subscriptions and payments may be made to S. P. Houghton and W. J. Savage, Whitesborough; Oneida; or to E. Shepard, printer, Rochester, Monroe co.

ENASTUS SHEPARD, PRINTER, 22 STATE-ST. ROCHESTER.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Volume 1—No. 7
Whole Number, 14

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JULY, 1843.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—Isaiah 60.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Five Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve number, in advance, always in advance and free of postage. Any person who will procure for the publisher, or send to him, a copy of the paper, without expense to the publisher, shall receive one copy of the paper for his services. Or, if procuring ten copies for his services, four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.
Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, at the following rates:—
Single copies, 50 cts. Sixty papers, \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers for 3 00
Always in advance, and free of postage.
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE VI.

RITUAL DESPOTISM vs. HUMAN RIGHTS IN AMERICA.—PRESENT STATE OF THE STRUGGLE.

The churches in America have been loudly led upon to enlist in the cause of emancipation, a cause of human rights. Not unfrequently we have appeared pleasing indications, in many the churches, of a disposition to respond to the call, and to engage in the work. Confident predictions have been uttered and recorded, pledges have been given, and hopes have been inspired. But the promise broken, the hope blasted. Not a struggle; indeed, on the part of what used to be the vital principle in the churches, these results have been permitted to mature themselves. A conflict there has been, enough to show that the prediction, the pledge, and the anticipation, were not utterly without a foundation, at least enough to redeem the churches, or portions of them, at least, from the charges of gross duplicity and double dealing. They are inclined to speak out, in favor of the crushed the dumb. They intended to do so. They posed they had tongues, and lips, and feet, and hands. They did not know that a gag was their own mouths—a fetter upon their own heels—manacle upon their own wrists. Even now, in the struggle is well nigh over, and most of the vanquished are becoming pretty well reconciled to their chains, there are few who seem to know who, and what, and where, the unseen power is, that has touched, and paralyzed, and crippled, and bound them: A spiritual tyranny is too ethereal and subtil to be readily perceived, and detected by its victims. And hence, in the preceding lectures, we have been compelled, in the light of church history, to analyze its constituent elements, and trace its progress, from its earliest developments to the present day. To be successfully encountered, it must be carefully examined, correctly understood. And if the churches are to be the defenders of human liberty, they must be free from the entanglements and dogmas in which has been shown, their predecessors have been so long, and so extensively held.

duly estimate, without some attention to the topics hinted at in the historical sketches and observations already submitted to the reader.

STATE OF SPIRITUAL FREEDOM.

The specific point of inquiry, now, is the condition of *christian freedom*, the absence or the presence of those ascertained elements or infallible concomitants of *Spiritual Despotism*, which, from the second century, onward, to the dog days of Papal domination, to the period of Luther, and surviving the Lutheran contest, have been true to ecclesiastical domination as the needle to the pole, as the morning star to the day dawn.—*The idolized ritual, its monopoly by the priesthood, the clerical caste, its exclusive right of religious teaching, its self creating, self-regulating, self-perpetuating prerogatives, its moulding power over the church creed, and over church polity—its grasp upon the keys of the church, its prohibition of reformation or change, its proscription of free inquiry and free discussion—these* are among the things that always imply the presence of despotic ecclesiastical power, and enter into every intelligible definition of the thing. How will our existing arrangement bear an examination in these particulars? Let us see.

THE RITUAL, ITS PERVERSION AND ITS MONOPOLY.

"When the priest pretends to have something to bestow—as well as something to teach, when he may, at discretion, bestow or withhold the *invaluable boon*—then indeed the relative position of the priest and the people becomes clearly defined."—[Vide "Spiritual Despotism," page 50.]

But in order to this, there must be a commonly prevalent impression, first, of the invaluable efficacy or indispensable necessity of the ritual to be administered—second, of the mysterious, the sacred, and (if possible) the exclusive prerogative and power of the officiating administrators, to administer it effectually, and duly.

If the first of these impressions can be made, there will be little difficulty in creating the second. For the second is the natural result of the first. When men believe in *magic*, they always believe in a *magician*. It would no longer be *magic*, if the power were within reach of all, and could be exercised by all, alike. Nothing but the uniform action of nature, or of nature's God, would be recognized, then. And an admiration, or high estimate of God's uniform, every-day operations, forms no part of the superstitious man's creed, or religion. The bubble of *ritual regeneration* would soon burst, were it committed to vulgar and secular hands, hardened with honest, homely, universal toil. When the fisherman of Galilee, with the Carpenter of Nazareth, administered water, or broke bread, no one ever thought of any thing mysterious, or mystic, or spell-like in the transaction. They saw nothing but a simple pledge, a memorial, or symbol, that a child could understand. There was no superstition, no engine of priestly domination in this.

Yet it has never been difficult, in this idolatrous world, to create the requisite impression. The outward, the visible, the tangible, in religion, the mere external ceremony or form, is very readily substituted for the invisible, the spiritual thing signified. A compliance, here, is less costly than the homage of the heart, the consecration of the life, the service of the active faculties, the will, the feet, the hands—the living energies, the propensities, the aims, the entire being of the individual. It is, that the masses of men are prone to

ized ritual meet them. He carries with him the commodity they are seeking—the shadow, as a substitute for the substance. They have only to believe true what they desire. They have only to confide in the administrator and the ritual—to submit to the observance—and all is well!

Need we pause to theorize? Or are we in danger of over-painting the picture? What do facts speak? Facts in the history even of Protestant Dissenters—facts in our own land?

In the first place, inquire to how great an extent, the existing sects in England and America, have been founded, sometimes partly, sometimes chiefly, sometimes wholly on *ritual grounds*—in either case, making a conformity with some particular mode or ceremony, the condition of membership in the sect—the church—the family of the faithful—thus evidently teaching that the door to the Communion of the Saints hinges on the rite or ceremony required to be performed. If this be not to teach the doctrine of *ritual* (baptismal or sacramental) regeneration, it must be, because not even regeneration itself can entitle to a place in the church, without a compliance with the ceremony, thus placing regeneration and the ritual on equal grounds, and both alike necessary to secure a brotherhood in Christ's house:—Or because a brother in Christ may be shut out of the church, for the neglect of a rite;—Or because a compliance with the rite is the necessary evidence of regenerating grace. In either case, the rite is magnified at the expense of *evangelical truth*, and to the inevitable promotion of a religion of rituals and forms: It is magnified into a fulcrum upon which the lever of *Spiritual Despotism* rests firmly, for without the administration of the rite, the convert cannot enter the church; and that key of the church is in the hands of the clergyman; a power of veto to admission that may bar the door of even the "independent church" so called, in opposition to its own unanimous vote. The rare use of this power does not prove it extinct. Thus it must be, if the administration of the rituals be exclusively in the hands of the clergy, and if their reception be the condition of church membership. If no man can enter the church without the application of water, and if none but the duly licensed and ordained clergyman, (ordained and licensed by a clerical body) may apply the water, then, evidently, the clergy hold, at least the *veto power*, of admission into the church. No one, without their concurrence, can enter. And if, by the usages of the sect, no one can continue in church membership, without the continued and repeated reception of the "consecrated" bread and wine, and if these may not be administered, but by the hands of the "regularly ordained Pastor," then no one remains in church membership, but by sufferance of the clergy; nay, it is for the clergy to say, whether the church itself, as a congregation, shall have the benefit of the "sacrament" at all. Little as this may have been noticed, and though no practical inconvenience should ever have been felt, it serves to illustrate the relative position of laity and clergy. Hundreds and thousands of professed Christians, a few of each sect, in a place, especially in new settlements, are often left without the benefit of these rites, because they may not be administered by "laymen." If the magnitude of the loss is to be estimated by the place they occupy in church arrangements, this grievance cannot be felt to be trivial. Incidental developments sufficiently indicate the prevalent sentiment of the efficacy of these rites. Sects, as already noticed, have been founded wholly upon promises of eternal

them—the Communion of Saints is suspended, commonly, on their due and uniform observance. The Baptists, in England, "in 1644, separated from the other Independents and set up separate congregations." On the great principles of Christian freedom, of Congregational Church Independency, lay ordination of pastors, and the evangelical doctrines in general, they were happily agreed. But they could not agree on the mode and subjects of baptism, and have therefore continued separate to the present day. The Pedo Baptist Independents, "in 1694 entered into an association with Presbyterians in and about London." And in America, Congregationalists have connected to such a connexion and affinity with Presbyterians, as has led to the compromise of their distinctive principles of religious liberty, of church independency, and particularly of lay ordination. All this because Presbyterians, like themselves were Pedo Baptists! Thus evidently yielding what they had always held essential to Christian freedom, and all that was originally distinctive in their sect, for the maintenance of an affinity with those who were agreed with them in the form of a ritual! For the benefits of Presbyterian aid, in maintaining infant baptism by sprinkling, in opposition to adult baptism by immersion, they have surrendered their church independency, first to the association, then the Consociation, and at last "by accommodation" to the Presbytery itself; in other words they have become Presbyterians in fact, with a Congregational name. And, for the most part, they seem to have forgotten that the right of congregational and lay ordination, was ever claimed or exercised by them or their fathers.

The very names of Baptist, Pedo Baptist, Seventh Day Baptist, Six Principle Baptist, &c., &c., are standing monuments of the facts that our Protestant and Dissenting Sects have, in many cases, been based chiefly on outward observances and rituals. One of the "six principles" that lie at the foundation of the sect last abovementioned, relates to the laying on of hands, in the ordination of elders. These specimens may suffice for the present.

President Edwards was ultimately driven from his church in Northampton, because he opposed their superstitious belief that "the Lord's Supper was a converting ordinance." And it would seem that his sentiments on this point were considered a startling innovation, in his day. Few of the New England clergy were prepared to second his efforts, for dispelling the delusion, and by many of them he was earnestly opposed in the pulpit and in print. In our own day, the celebrated Whelpley, (author of the Triangle,) was obliged to confront, and almost single handed, the similar impression, in the city of New York, that infant baptism secured the salvation of the dying child, to whose regeneration and safety the timely application of the rite, by a duly authorized and ordained clergyman, was indispensable. His conscientious appeals, on an emergency of the kind, to comply promptly with the call of a wealthy parishioner and patron, who was not a church member, (and whose child therefore, in Whelpley's view, was not entitled to the rite,) threw the community into a ferment of indignation at his supposed indifference to the salvation of the child! In this case, too, as in that of Edwards, the loss of his pulpit, (if we mistake not,) was the final result. And how much clerical sympathy and aid he received, in his efforts to enlighten the churches and the public, may be inferred from his account of the city clergy, in the "Triangle," though we think he does not distinctly allude to that incident in the book.

4 "They united with their fellow christians in adopting, in 1706, the Baybrook Platform, (i. e., in Connecticut) according to the which the churches and pastors are consociated, so as virtually to be under Presbyterian government under another name." History of Presb. church, by Rev. Ezra Stiles, Esq., in Bayk's Theological Dictionary.

At the present time, such sentiments as those of the Northampton and New York city churches are less frequently and openly avowed. The latent sentiment often remains with those who are not distinctly conscious of it, themselves, and by whom it would be promptly, and perhaps, honestly disavowed. Like other superstitions, entailed upon us by former generations, it clings to us, unperceived, and is among the last things to be eradicated entirely. It is only by close scrutiny and by sidelong and glimpse-wise inspection, that we can detect it, for the most part, either in others or in ourselves. Could we know how little of intelligent, rational, and scriptural observance there is of the salutary institutions of religion, we should doubtless all be surprised. But "whatsoever is not of" this scriptural and rational "faith, is" superstition and "sin." If in writing or in speaking it be expressed, it is by implication, rather than direct assertion. But it is in actions, that speak plainer than words, that the doctrine of ritual regeneration or sanctification is oftenest detected. Things are said and done, every day, which would not be said and done, if people did not rely on outward observances, more than on character; on sacrifice more than on mercy; on rituals more than on integrity, and doing the will of God. What other evidence do we need, to prove this, than the fact that sects and churches united by rituals, mainly, will suffer no question of fundamental morality to divide them, and that those who propose it are promptly charged with the sin of schism and disorganization; while, at the same time, the proposal that those who agree in a common evangelical faith, in the distinctive traits of sound christian character, and in active efforts in the service of God and of human nature, should unite in church relations, notwithstanding their disagreement in mere rituals, is equally and instantly repelled with horror and alarm, as though the very foundations of the church militant were assailed and in danger! The church or the ecclesiastical body with which we are connected may be a man-stealing church, or a body of clerical thieves, (by the decision of a Wesley, or an Edwards, or an Isaiah or a Jeremiah,) but all must go on quietly, and the "peace of the church" must not be disturbed! But let the same church or ecclesiastical body exhibit defection, in the matter of a church ceremony, and the bond of connection snaps asunder of itself, and in an instant! A church member may become a rum seller or a slave holder, without affecting his standing; or he will with difficulty and at the expense of a commotion, be dislodged. But if he changes from a Baptist to a Pedo Baptist or vice versa, if he relinquishes the use of the bread and the wine, his church relation ceases, of course! We have little occasion to summon Baptist testimony in proof of the extensive and fatal reliance of thousands upon their infant baptism for salvation. We have as little occasion to cite Pedo Baptist testimony in proof that an equally fatal reliance is made by thousands upon their adult immersion. We need not specify an Alexander Campbell, teaching, successfully, among Baptists, the doctrine of certain regeneration by immersion—nor need we name some half a dozen of less distinguished clerical essayists who, within a few years past, have edified the Pedo Baptist denominations, with their elaborate proofs that infant baptism, duly administered, and accompanied with the prayer of faith (without which, no priest of the second and third centuries, or afterwards, ever professed to procure a ritual regeneration or the pardon of sins,) would infallibly be accompanied with regenerating grace—nor need we stop to notice the almost equal pretensions of some, in respect to the sure effects of certain prescribed "measures," including "the anxious seat," nor need we cite Dr. Miller

* And yet the rush, among the gentler classes, from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy, and from both to Puseyism and R-

The reader will understand that in this allusion, as in the

of Princeton, and others in proof that infant baptism, merely, without any other evidences of regeneration, is held, on high Presbyterian authority, to be a sufficient passport to church membership. All these and many other witnesses may be spared. The single consideration that the rituals of religion are notoriously exalted above fundamental morality, is sufficient to settle the question. And a corroboration may be found if needed, in the fact that the day of rest is thought to be desecrated by its use for the high purposes of an original institution—the evident practical belief that the Sabbath was not made for man, but man for the Sabbath—that church organizations, designed for the elevation of humanity must be maintained at the expense of humanity itself—must be sacrificed for the means, and the means, like the brazen serpent of the Hebrews, converted into an idol.

Thus abundant are the melancholy proofs, that the current religion of our Protestant and Dissenting sects, at the present day, is, to a great extent, a religion of outward observances, of constitutional arrangements—of ritualized ritual. A religion of some sort, mankind will and must have, and the decline of vital godliness results from formality and superstition, of course.

One element of "Spiritual Despotism," is the idolatry of outward forms, most evidently, not wanting, in our times, and in our very midst.

THE SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

The next question is, whether there be, incessance among us, an organized clerical caste, whom this powerful element of spiritual despotism may be wielded, exclusively claimed and permanently held. For if there be, and if human nature remains true to itself, the uniform result past history, follows, of course. A Spiritual potism is the inevitable result.

Suppose all the Presidents of Temperance Societies in the State of New York, should assemble annually in solemn convention. They are Presidents, (Overseers, Bishops, if you please) to sure they are, and to this "office" they have been duly chosen, elected, in other words, "ordained." They are Presidents. Their conventions, may be called Presidential conventions, or conventions of Presidents. In due time, a regularly organized Presidential association is formed. The Association holds its regular sessions, in "business"; to arrange and transact. It passes judgment on the due order and government of Temperance Societies, and publishes its proceedings.

The form and mode of the public, solemn, porance pledge, for the whole State, is fixed and announced by the Presidents. By usage, length, no man but the President of the can "administer" the pledge. And no without the sign manual and anointing of the President, can become a member of the

preceding, it is not the measure, nor the observance, but the perversion of it, that we would expose. In respect to war and the supper, these divine institutions are an addition to their proper uses—that they may be lost.

blindly idolized—not imposed as a snare to a conscience—nor set up as a bar to keep christians from each other out of the church.

by the true religion, together with their children." Dr. Essey, page 18.

The Society of Friends may, perhaps, be triumphant as an exception. But the abuse of certain rites, common among other Christians, is made the test of fellowship.

If others will receive none but the baptism of the Holy Spirit, then they are Friends. Thus they agree in suspending fellowship and church membership, upon a merely incidental. And it deserves inquiry whether the hat and the dress coat are not as essential with them, as the immersion with others. And this, too, without of inspired precept or primitive example. Our advantage may claim. No clergyman holds the monopoly of conferring qualification. Any tailor and hatter can supply them when supplied they become potential. And who beside ordinary Quakers are detected by his Elders, "mirrored the world"—the profane wearers of black, and narrow, in any philanthropic endeavor, more than one Mariot, and a Gibbons may testify his sacred excommunication for the crime! How such a sect rises above the idolatry of forms. Yet such is the society of Hickeys Friends.

or recognized as a true temperance man. The next step is to assume that no man can properly be President of a Temperance Society unless before his election to that office, by the people, in local Society, or in his public induction into office, or both, he be "licensed" or "ordained" by the Presidential association to which he belongs. And any President of a Temperance Society may be deposed from office by the association of Presidents, instead of the Society. Then it follows, that the President of a Society is not subject to the discipline of the Society; in fact, is not a member of the Society over which he presides, nor subject to its rules, being amenable only to "his peers" or equals, in the Presidential body. And common members of the Temperance Society are not eligible to the office of President. They belong not, and cannot belong, to the Presidential body, by whom only the Presidents are created, and from among whom the Temperance Societies, when in want of a President, must make their selection. Then, there are seminaries established, for the education of Temperance Presidents—for their instruction in the various branches of learning which a President of a Temperance Society ought to understand, such as the anatomy and functions of the human system—the pathology of drunkenness—the chemical properties of alcohol—the history of its invention, introduction into use, and effects—the statistics of intemperance—the history or moral and legislative efforts of its suppression, &c. &c. These seminaries are all under control of the Temperance Presidents, and the course of study is prescribed, without which no man can be duly "licensed" and "ordained" to the association of Presidents. The Temperance Society in Whitestown, for example, is in want of a President, and looks abroad over the county or the State, for a "candidate." He must be "regularly educated," or he cannot be "regularly ordained" to be a President at all; and then he must be "regularly ordained" by the same body, that "licensed" him, before the good people of Whitestown can have their Temperance President. When in office, he exercises, with a "session" of officials (not easily displaced when elected) the entire functions of the Society.

Who does not see that the Presidents, in that case, would have erected themselves into a separate caste—distinct from the people? Would our Temperance Societies submit to such an usurpation? Why, then, should the churches? Is there a particle of scripture—of precept or of prelude—for the practice? Does it accord with the first principles of the Christian Religion—its objects—its spirit, or its aims? Is it not a man-made invention? And if so, is it not "innovation and disorder?"

But the requisite polity of a church, it may be said, is vastly different from that of a Temperance Society. It is a more sacred affair. Its officers deserve higher veneration. They may justly advance higher claims.

Well, then, let us make another supposition, in which the parallel, in this respect, may hold good. Deacons and Elders are church officers as well as Pastors; and Dr. Miller proves, by a formidable array of evidence, that Pastors and Elders, in primitive times, were one and the same thing. Suppose, then, all the Deacons of Congregational or Baptist churches should, in the same manner we have described, separate themselves from the churches, and organize themselves into Deacons' Associations, and Elders' Associations. Suppose the Deacons should claim the exclusive right of creating men to the dignity of Deaconship, and deposing them at their pleasure. Suppose they could tell the churches that it was "irregular" and "disorderly" for them to elect Deacons at their own discretion, from among their own number, from "the laity"—that none but those who belonged to the Deacons' Association, or who had been "licensed" and "ordained" by the Dea-

cons of a given territory of country, to be Deacons, could be eligible to the office by choice of the people themselves—so that, in choosing Deacons, they must confine themselves to the list of those whom the Deacons' Association had licensed, though it became necessary to look over the country to find them. More than this, that when thus chosen, they could not be inducted into office without the help and concurrence of the Deacons' Association for the county. That without such license and ordination, the ministrations of the Deacons would not be "valid," and the "sacraments" distributed by their hands would have "no efficacy," and the distribution would be an "unauthorized" and profane act. Finally, that whenever the Deacons' Association should depose a Deacon from his station, it would be unlawful for the church to retain him in office. What would our Baptist and Congregational churches say to such pretensions?

Suppose the class leaders or the stewards, or the "local preachers," among the Methodists, should thus associate, and set up similar claims. Would not the Methodists, accustomed as they are even to Episcopal arrangements, see something like official arrogance, if it should be thus exhibited by these officers? But why not by these as well as by others?

Turn now to the Presbyterian churches and their Elders. Suppose Elders' Associations should be formed, of a similar character with those of the Deacons, just described. Or suppose the Presbyterians should make the same claims for the Elders as for the Pastors. Suppose the Presbyterian churches should be pointed to as a distinct grade or caste of men—call them clergy, if you please—from whom, in distinction from the laity, all their ruling Elders must be chosen. According to Dr. Miller, this ought to be done in the case of Elders, if in the case of Pastors; for Pastors and Elders he has proved to be one and the same office. And Elders, he maintains, are Clergy, though they do not preach, as much as are the Pastors who preach. But will the attempt be made to place the Elders, in this respect, upon the same footing with the present Pastors? Would it not be universally regarded an innovation—an unwarrantable assumption—on the part of the Elders? If so, let it be admitted that it is equally an unwarrantable assumption in the Pastors.

We scarcely need digress to say—though the logical order of our argument would have required it to have been said sooner—that the recognized clergy or ministry of all, or nearly all, the sects and churches, that use the rituals of baptism and the supper, at all, successfully lay claim to the exclusive right of administering them to the membership at large—the exceptions to this statement being barely illustrations of the general rule.

Who expects to witness the "ordinances" of baptism and of the supper, without the officiating presence of a "regularly ordained" clergyman? What novitiate, beginning to preach, under authority, it may be of an ecclesiastical "license," adventures to administer the ordinances, unless, in addition to the "license," [explain the difference who can?] he has been clerically "ordained?" Will his election by a local church, to the office of Pastor, before or unless sanctioned by the forms of a clerical "ordination" enable or "authorize" him to serve them with the bread and the wine? And the Deacons, too, whose very station it is (by usage) to carry round and hand to the communicants the sacred emblems, when received by them from the hands of the "ordained" clergymen—will they adventure, without that prerequisite, to offer their brethren the same elements? And would the communicants in general, feel warranted in receiving them, thus, at their hands? or would they think that there could be any "validity" or "efficacy" in the communion of the Lord's Supper, unless it came through clerical hands? And yet, upon what page of the New

Testament is it written—or from what incident or allusion is it inferred, that the disciples must not, and in primitive times did not, break bread and commune with each other and their Lord, without the presence and leave and intervention of an officiating and clerically ordained Priest? Do the simplicity of their habits, the genius of their religion, their scattered and unsettled condition, and their known custom of coming together around the table of communion on every first day of the week, appear to favor the supposition that the restraints of the clerical monopoly, with them as with us had erected a barrier around the table of the Lord, forbidding access, to the mass of the disciples, except at the convenience, or on the contingency, of clerical attendance and leave, and co-operation? Do the records of that period bring to our ears any dolorous accounts of the spiritual destitutions of scattered and secluded brethren, whose position and circumstances deprived them of any duly authorized clergyman, to "break to them the bread of life"—meaning, by that term, (as in our modern Reports) the appointed symbols of the broken body of Christ?

We pause not now to dwell on the semi-Romish and anti-evangelical bearing and drift of pretensions like those now under review. Our subject can scarcely fail to suggest the close connection between the preservation of liberty and a cherished, living, intelligent, Christian faith. The Lutheran Reformers did not err in supposing that to the restoration of that faith they must mainly look for their means of repelling the despotic usurpations of the Man of Sin. But the one point to which the scrutinizing and fixed attention of the reader is now invited, is the outstanding fact that the administration of the rituals so extensively perverted by a blind superstition, even in the midst of our nineteenth century Protestantism and the Dissenterism, in America, and substituted for the living sacrifice of the whole man to the Divine will and service, is made by existing church arrangements, the recognized prerogative, the exclusive monopoly of the clerical caste. Little must he know of men and things, of human nature and human affairs, who cannot see in such a fact, the certain, the living, the actual existence, activity and controlling way of despotic ecclesiastical power. The absence of secular jurisdiction and of physical force, as noticed and explained in a former Lecture,* detracts nothing from the reality and little from the power of this domination; for little more is he to be dreaded (by the devout idolator of the outward form) who can imprison and burn, than he who without this power over the body, can withhold "the bread of life" from the soul.

SELF-CREATED—SELF-REGULATED—SELF-PERPETUATED—POWER OVER THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTER.

Such a power as that of the monopoly of the idolized ritual, by whomsoever it might be held, on whatever terms, and under whatever regulations, checks, limitations, and restraints, must, in the very nature of the case, be subversive of true spiritual freedom. How much more when that monopoly is held by a well-defined and organized caste or order of men—a caste self-created, self-regulated, self-perpetuated, self-governed. A caste whose members are under the control of a conclave.

Yet such, with little exception and variation, is the just description of the body of men by whom this spiritual monopoly of the "bread of life," accredited as such, is commonly wielded and held. The nominal power of the laity, in some communions, to choose their own pastors is, perhaps, the greatest existing check or limitation of the power of the caste. But then, let it be noted that this power of choosing is but the power of selecting from among the previously "licensed" and

* See note on page 31, Lecture IV., in our May number.

organized members of the caste. Out of the privileged body, the churches may not look for a Pastor. Or if, among Baptist or possibly among Congregational churches, a selection of a Pastor is sometimes made from among the "lay" brotherhood, behold! there forthwith assembles, in due dignity and solemnity, a clerical body, of some sort, to confer, by its mystic power and authority, the clerical character requisite to wipe out the reproach of laity from the candidate, and to initiate him duly into the clerical caste, before his official career can be commenced. Thus solicitous is the clerical body that its ancient domain shall be preserved unpolled and untouched by the contaminating foot of the inferior grade. And woe betide the honest John Bunyon that shall adventure, even among "Independents" themselves, without leave of the associated clergy of the sect, to minister to the churches to which they belong, though at their own unanimous request.

The suppositions we made concerning the Presidents' of Temperance Societies, concerning Deacons and Lay Elders, are, we believe, veritable realities, in the case of the Pastors of the churches in the Presbyterian and Congregational sects. We are not aware that any important or general exceptions should be made, in the application of the same remark to the Baptists. And among Baptists and Congregationalists, if any where, we are accustomed to look for usages in accordance with primitive Christian freedom. What, then, must be the condition of other denominations of professing Christians? But even among Congregationalists, if not among Baptists, no person is recognized either as a Preacher of the Gospel, an administrator of the ordinances or a Pastor of a church, unless or until he receives the sanction of a clerical association. The same clerical body prescribes, of course, the qualifications of ministers, their literary qualifications, and theological tenets. It regulates every thing relating to the official conduct and prerogatives of Ministers and Pastors. It calls them to account, and deposes them from the ministry at pleasure.

The same is done by Presbyterians (consisting of Pastors and Elders,) in the Presbyterian church. And in a recent instance, where a local church had decided in favor of retaining its pastor, the Presbytery reversed the decision, and declared the pulpit vacant! It was by the third Presbytery in the city of New York, that the truly apostolic JOHN R. McDOWALL was deposed from the Ministry, on the ostensible charge of having defended himself from the aspersions of his enemies, in a public newspaper, but in reality, for having, by his example, reproved the churches and ministry for their dereliction of duty in regard to the seventh commandment. And such was the dread of this clerical power of deposing from the ministry, that a young minister, friendly to McDowall, who, after his having been deposed, had expressed himself, at a meeting, in his favor, declined the publication of the proceedings of the meeting in which he had participated (in a paper then under his own editorial charge,) because, to use his own words, "it would cost him his ministerial standing to print it!" Such is the controlling power of the caste over its members.

And, that nothing might be wanting to the completeness of this control, and lest the churches should exert a counteracting or correcting power, the usage not only in the Presbyterian, but in many so called Congregational churches, conforms to the theory that the Pastor and the ordained minister is not a member of any local church, nor subject to its discipline, but only to the clerical body to which he may belong. He can be "tried only by his peers or equals"—not by so inferior a caste as the laity. And a Presbytery in central New York has taken the ground of denying the clerical or ministerial character of ministers ordained or licensed by a certain Congregational association, because, as was alleged, that association (contrary to the custom of associations of Congre-

gational Ministers in general) had admitted the lay element into its composition.* These specimens may suffice to illustrate our meaning, and to sustain our statements, when we say that the clergy who hold the exclusive monopoly of church rituals, are so inducted, organized, and governed, that they constitute, for the most part, a separate and distinct caste, elevated above the brotherhood or laity—that they are self-created, self-organized, self-regulated, self-perpetuated, self-controlled, and that they are not held responsible to the churches, while they hold a controlling sway over them.

It may be said, and with some force, that, in matters of pecuniary support, the pastors are sufficiently dependent upon the laity. This is true, but such a sort of dependence may not, perhaps, avail much, in supplying a corrective to the evils under review. Such a control of the people over their ministers is more likely to corrupt than to purify. The very fact of this sort of dependence may tend to whet the appetites of the clergy for that sort of pre-eminence and authority that may make them available amends. And, on the other hand, the sense of ecclesiastical arrogance and usurpation may suggest (as we know it often does) to the laity, the use of the only expedient in their power, but the very worst that they ever can wield, the policy of starving the aristocratic aspirations that they could not otherwise tame. Two belligerent wrongs cannot make a right. They may aggravate, but they cannot annihilate each other. The history of Romanism sufficiently proves that an army of clerical paupers and mendicants are the fit tools, not the trust-worthy correctives, of a bloated hierarchy, an overgrown clerical power. So far from congratulating the churches upon the possession of the money-power over their clergy, we ought to warn them that its unwise and capricious use is among the most certain instruments of their own subjugation. The scene of spiritual imposture and priestly cunning is seldom reached, except among a sensual, worldly-minded people, who seek to bribe their teachers into a compliance with their own corrupt tastes, and by a priesthood who have been effectually taught the bad lesson of pliability to the money power.

Returning from this digression, we must notice that in other sects than those already specified, the self-creating, self-governing, self-perpetuating powers of the clerical body and its control over the people, are still more striking and manifest. The Methodist Episcopal Bishops and Conferences station their preachers. The Methodist Protestant Conferences, without Bishops, do the same thing. So far from permitting the people to choose (even from among the clerical body) their own religious teachers, they kindly save them the trouble of judging and acting for themselves. A man may be duly authorized by the ecclesiastical powers of these sects, to exercise the functions of a gospel minister. He may pray for a field of labor, and in answer to his prayers he may find it. In every respect, it may be the field of his choice, and he may be greeted by a brotherhood who hail him with gratitude, as emphatically the man of their prayers and endeavors. But no! The Bishop or the Conference, most of whom never saw, perhaps, an inch of the ground, or a face among the inhabitants, have appointed him to another field. And if his place be supplied by another in whom the laity have little or no confidence, they have no redress, and the admonition to "beware of false prophets," and to know the tree by its fruits, might as well be blotted from their Bibles.

Of the nature and extent of the powers held by these bodies over their members, some idea may be formed by a single instance of their exercise. The New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal church, very distinctly informed the candi-

dates for the ministry seeking license at their hands, that before their requests could be granted, they must pledge themselves not to agitate the subject of American Slavery; and most of the applicants, including some who, until that time, had been active abolitionists, complied with the demand. Ministers already licensed and ordained, have been called to an account by their Conferences and Bishops for circulating a Methodist Anti-Slavery paper, and attending Anti-Slavery Conventions. The successive trials of La Roy Sunderland, Editor of Zion's Watchman, furnish striking illustrations of the same power.

Reverting again, just at this point, to the power of Presbyteries, and clerical associations over their members in the ministry, we may see how nearly it approximates to the power of the Methodist Conferences and Bishops. A Presbytery or an association of Congregational Ministers adopt a resolution that they will not admit Anti-Slavery Lecturers into their pulpits on the Sabbath, or that they will not open their pulpits or houses to the discussion of any political subject, or for any purposes not strictly religious. The object is well understood. Perhaps, to keep the thing out of sight, and elude public inspection, no formal resolution is adopted, and nothing of the kind appears in their published proceedings. Nevertheless, an understanding has been entered into, among the members of the body. By "interlocutory" conference or in some informal way, the thing is substantially done, without the knowledge of the people. The result is that the pulpits of the entire connection are silently closed. Ministers recognized as abolitionists, and heretofore freely opening their pulpits, and inviting lecturers, are found to follow the lead of their brethren.* And why? They cannot afford to lose caste with the clerical body to which they belong. It might cost them their ministerial standing. The example of McDowall is before them in terror. Or if not literally and formally deposed, they might be quietly crushed, as scores of ministers have been by the secret blight of a less tangible and visible hand. In the clerical associations of Congregational ministers, where there is less of regular or recognized power, there is more of ambitious management and intrigue. Such extensive bodies are notoriously controlled by a few. It would be easy to name the men in New England whose influence is as much dreaded by the mass of the ministry as though they were Bishops. And in some instances, Congregational ministers have run for shelter into the Protestant Episcopal church, that they might be governed by Bishops of their own choosing.

POWER OVER EDUCATION OF MINISTERS.

Look next, at the power held by the organized clerical caste, over the education of young men desirous of entering the ministry. It deserves notice that the power to license, to ordain, to create, ministers, and to unmake, or depose them, supposes, of course, the right to fix upon the qualifications, and to specify the process through which the candidate must approach the object in view. And measures have been matured within a few years past, by which our self-organized clerical bodies have reached very nearly to the summit, in this direction, of pulpit monopoly, and pulpit control. Not less noteworthy is the fact that those clerical bodies whose denominational usages have prevented them from fully grasping the stationing power, to the entire annihilation of the lay election of Pastors, have been most ingenious and successful in making amends by a control of the education of ministers. Congregational and Presbyterian Clergymen (and the Baptist are not slow to follow their example) have very solicitously founded Theological Seminaries and Education Societies in such a manner as to place the vast interests involved, under an almost exclusive clerical control. The contributions of the churches for the educa-

* Perhaps the Presbytery agreed with Dr. Miller that Presbyterian Elders, (who, in Presbyterian churches, assist in ordaining ministers,) are not laymen.

* This is now a common fact in Central and Western New York.

tion of indigent young men, must pass through channels controlled by prominent and powerful ecclesiastics. By them, the course, and even the places of study, must be prescribed. The practical bearing is well known. Young aspirants for clerical favor and clerical station, with their patrons and friends, understand well enough, what Literary Institutions they may enter, and what they must avoid, if they would advantageously, (nay, if they would at all,) pass the ordeal of examination and obtain the requisite "license" and "ordination." Without these they may not "administer" the "ordinances"—may not participate in the monopoly of the idolized rituals—may not enter the Pastoral office, nor dare the churches, in most cases, employ them! Already the patronage of the Education and Domestic Missionary Societies have been withheld from students and ministers educated in Literary Institutions, conducted on the principles of Christian progress, Human Equity, and Human Rights. The discussion of the fundamental principles of Freedom, of duty to the oppressed and enslaved, has been authoritatively forbidden in some of the Theological Seminaries, and in others, more prudently discountenanced by influences less odious but equally effective. The tendency toward Anti-Slavery feeling and exertion, among Theological students, at an early period of the present contest, is well known. And equally undeniable is the fact, that, in some way, this feeling and tendency has been, in nearly all our Theological Seminaries, neutralized, smothered, or suppressed. The reader will understand that these allusions are here made, not so much for the purpose of proving the subserviency of leading ecclesiastics, at the head of these Seminaries, to the Slave Power of the South, as to illustrate their perfect control over the ministry, and especially the young ministry of the country, at the very threshold of their ministerial life. The lesson of obsequious submission is the first that is taught them, and the habit of subjection to ecclesiastical domination, is fixed upon them almost in their boyhood. Can Christian liberty have a foothold in churches where a ministry thus educated can be exclusively welcomed and sustained?

CONTROL OF BENEVOLENT AND LITERARY INSTITUTIONS.

Observe, further, the vast power of the self-organized clerical caste, as exercised over and thro' the various colleges and voluntary associations of the day. On this point in its connection with the preceding, we cannot forbear to copy a few sentences from a discourse by Rev. J. Blanchard, of Cincinnati, before the Literary and Moral Society of Ripley, Ohio.

"There are now a few more than one hundred chartered colleges in the United States, exclusive of medical and law schools, and sixty theological seminaries. Of these, 21 are houses of Roman priests. Almost all these institutions are under the control and instruction of the religious denominations." Their professors, students, and graduated alumni, together, make a college and seminary population, in the United States, of more than fifty thousand men. These men, dispersed through the country, to a great extent do its thinking and reasoning on morals and religion."

"There are, in this country, more than thirty religious sects, which have a membership of above two million one hundred thousand, influencing, more or less, a population directly connected with their congregations; and the opinions and measures of these religious denominations are largely influenced by a comparatively few leading minds, occupying posts of influence in the church."

"There are twelve leading benevolent societies, whose aggregate receipts and disbursements, at this time, must exceed a million of dollars. And though this sum is far less than the nation ought to pay for benevolent purposes, yet it is obvious that the collection and disbursement of such a sum, annually, by agencies, for the most part connected with the church, must necessarily exert a powerful influence on its opinions and measures. For besides that multitudes depend on these funds for their daily bread, the secretaries and agents of these so-

cieties, by the central position they occupy, and their personal acquaintance, gained by their necessary travel from place to place, are enabled to exert an almost incredible influence upon the public opinion of the church, to render those men unpopular whose zeal for reform disturbs the collection of funds by the societies they represent."

"These three influences combined—viz.: that of the seminaries, the church organizations, and the societies, or, rather, the influence of the men who direct and control them, may be said, almost, to make the public sentiment, as to what is evil and what is good. For, in respect to morals and religion, institutions of learning are the nation's eye, churches are its heart, and benevolent societies are its hand; and whatever remedy is to be blest with a pure religion, these points of influence must be pure. If the eye be dim, and the heart diseased, the hand will soon be paralyzed, and the body a corpse!"

"Now, on the men of wealth the college depends for its endowments, the society for patronage, and the denomination for popularity. And as the givers of money always influence the receivers, while the palmers of the country will be controlled by the voters, whether rich or poor, the wealth of a nation will always give character to its literary and religious institutions." There would be no harm in this, were it not the experience of mankind that the wealthiest portion of the church is not usually the purest."

Let it be borne in mind, that this vast power is mainly in the hands of a few leading clergymen, to whom a great majority of the clergy, including the young, and especially the agents and the secretaries, look up for direction, and on whom they are dependent for favor. Let it also be understood, that between these governing clergy, in the churches, the seminaries, the colleges, and the benevolent associations, and the wealthy patrons of all these institutions, a good understanding and co-operation must needs be maintained. We may then judge whether the pecuniary dependence of the great body of the clergy is to be reckoned, by the people, among the indications, favorable or unfavorable to religious freedom.†

THE AMERICAN BOARD.

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is a self-constituted and self-perpetuating body. The members hold not their places by the vote of the brotherhood in the churches, or the contributors to their funds. It is chiefly in clerical hands. Its claims are urged as though they were identical with the claims of the heathen and the missionary enterprise. The command to disciple all nations is construed into a command to sustain the A. B. C. F. M. The duty of sustaining it is as confidently urged as though there neither was nor could be any other medium of access to the heathen.

This Board is chiefly supported by Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Yet it wields, on a most extensive and magnificent scale, the most plenary Episcopal powers. The "ministerial parity" often contended for by Congregational and Presbyterian ministers, all vanishes under the administration of the Board. To all intents and

* One of the most honest, discriminating, sagacious, and venerated among the clergy of New England, himself one of the founders and patrons of the American Board, felt constrained, at the close of his long life, to leave behind him the following testimony concerning "National Societies" and the "aspiring ecclesiastics" which control them:

"I have been," says he, "an attentive observer of the late revolutions in the religious opinions of the clergy, the churches, and the people of New England and the United States. I have also been considerably acquainted with the various societies, which have been formed for the promotion of very important and laudable purposes. Some of these societies, and some of their measures, I highly approve, and wish to promote. But I do not approve of any of them as NATIONAL SOCIETIES, and claiming a national authority to take the education of children out of the hands of parents; or assuming a national authority to superintend our academies, our colleges, our theological institutions, or our churches and their pastors. And if they persist in their claims, and succeed in their measures, I see nothing to prevent their establishing a national religion, and exercising an ecclesiastical domination, as arbitrary and dangerous as any that now exists in the Christian world. * * * The question now is, What can we do, and what ought we to do, in order to obstruct and check the growth of luxury and arbitrary power among our churches and aspiring ecclesiastics."—*Examiner*, Vol. 1, p. 36.

† That is, so long as these institutions shall be modeled and governed as they now are.—*Editor*.

purposes it is a Bench of Episcopal Bishops. Their diocese, not less extensive than that of the Romish pontiff, covers the whole habitable globe. They are the bishops that direct and govern the churches in the Sandwich Islands and in India, with their pastors and teachers. They select and station, and control their ministry at their pleasure. Neither the churches or contributors at home, who sustain them, nor the churches or ministry abroad, whom they govern, have any control over them, or representation to sit with them. If there be any limitation to their powers, by what terms shall it be described? In what instrument is it to be found? By whom shall it be applied? We speak not now of the wise use or abuse of their power. It is of the power itself that we are speaking—the ecclesiastical (in the absence of any secular) authority. And we ask, to what quarter shall we look, to find a hierarchy more irresponsible, or exercising a more absolute and unlimited spiritual sway?

In their "instructions" to their missionaries in the east, they prohibited their expression of any disapprobation of the superstitions and idolatries of the Greek Church. They prohibited likewise the organization, by the missionaries, of any new churches, into which their own converts from that idolatrous and corrupt church might (on their own urgent request) be received. From the Sandwich Islands we hear complaints from the missionaries that the "rules, laws, regulations, &c., of the prudential Committee of the Board, are pro-slavery in their spirit, and nature, and application."† We hear it intimated, likewise, that they attempt to restrain their missionaries from writing home their views of slavery, and of the conduct of their employers.

POWER OVER CHURCH POLITY, THE CHURCH CREED, AND CHURCH PUBLICATIONS.

We need spend no time or labour to prove that the ecclesiastical polity, and the specifications of the church creed, as well as the form and mode of the rituals, in most or all the churches and sects, are shaped and moulded mainly by the clergy, and by clerical bodies, apart from the brotherhood. Who framed the polity of the Protestant Episcopal Church—the Church of England—the Methodist Episcopal Church—the Presbyterian Church? The Thirty-nine Articles—the Homilies—the Book of Common Prayer—the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism—the Methodist Book of Discipline—the Presbyterian Confession of Faith—the Congregational Church Creed—what hand have the laity commonly had in writing, arranging, or authorizing them? The hymn books and psalm books in common use—even these not unfrequently bear the marks, not simply of clerical recommendation, but of associated clerical permission of their use. In one instance (that of the Methodist Episcopal Bishops) we have a most solemn and authoritative prohibition of the purchase of any hymn books not signed with their names. The monstrous monopoly of the Methodist book concern, with its funds and its patronage—who control and wield that mighty engine? And what power do the laity hold over it? The American Tract and Bible Societies, and the American Sunday School Union—who control these? The periodical presses of the sects, the newspapers and quarterlies, and monthly magazines—do not the organized clerical bodies, directly or indirectly, control the most of them? Have they not employed editors and dismissed them—enriched publishers and thrown them out of business, as they saw fit? And how much do the mass of the laity participate in this denominational power, or hold a check over its exercise?

This prerogative of shaping the church polity, the church ritual and the church creed, (the control of church literature, being a mere incident,

† Letter of Rev. Lorris Andrews to Lewis Tappan.

* That is, chiefly of their principal clergy.—*Editor*.

may be left out of the account,) may properly be denominated *legislative power*. It is in vain for clerical and ecclesiastical bodies to disclaim legislative authority over the churches of Christ, so long as every body knows that they do legislate, and publish their statutes, and appeal to them as authority in ecclesiastical trials.

And not only the legislative, but the judicial and executive power is chiefly lodged in their hands. At any rate, they commonly exercise, as well as claim, all these three powers. The well-known principle of all civil governments not thoroughly despotic, that these three functions must be kept distinct, and in separate hands, finds little or no place in the churches of the principal sects.

What remains to be attempted or accomplished in the way of popular subjection to despotic spiritual power? *What*, but that these manifold abuses shall not be exposed or investigated—that *the laity shall be gagged*? Has this been attempted or done? Let us see.

MONOPOLY OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING VS. FREE DISCUSSION.

There can be no free discussion in the churches, if there be a monopoly of religious teaching. And such a monopoly enters into the very idea of a clerical caste. We will only notice here a few modern specimens of this Antichristian innovation upon the primitive usages of the Church of God.

In Trumbull's History of Connecticut are recorded abundant exemplifications of this claim, on the part of the clergy, one of whom defined the relative position of clergy and laity thus: "A speaking aristocracy, in the presence of a silent democracy." The General Association of Congregational Ministers, in Connecticut, adopted resolutions by which Whitefield and Davenport were excluded from their pulpits—that is, forbidden to preach to the people, and the people virtually forbidden to hear them. The whole territory of the State being cut into congregational parishes, and the sect being the recognized "standing order," the resolutions of the clergy were enforced by the civil authorities. The evangelists were banished, and lay preachers were imprisoned. But neither resolutions nor statutes, pastors nor prisons, could wholly suppress "the disorders of lay preaching" until the "great awakening" had ceased, and the religious feeling had subsided. Quiet times were then enjoyed by the monopolists of religious teaching, till the irruption of Baptists, Methodists, and other sects, when the same clerical power was again exerted, and was partly successful, for a time. The Congregational Clergy of New England, like their Presbyterian brethren in the other States, as a body, have commonly watched jealously, and repressed cautiously and perseveringly, the often rising tendencies towards free speech by the laity in the churches. Conference and prayer meetings have, at times, disputed their prerogatives, and encroached upon their monopoly. Intelligent and pious laymen, including deacons, have noticed, with pain, for the last half century, a constant though quiet effort, on the part of a majority of the pastors, to occupy the time themselves, even at meetings appointed originally for social conference and prayer, so as to leave as little opportunity as possible for lay speaking; designating by name the persons whom they might choose to fill up the remainder—thus keeping the meeting entirely under their control. With the Congregational Clergy, this precaution was doubtless thought particularly necessary, because the form of church government gave the people so much control over ecclesiastical affairs. A free scope in devotional exercises and social worship would seem to bring them upon too frightful an equality with their pastors. With the founders of the Methodist Episcopacy, on the other hand, an opposite policy, in this respect, might be safely and advantageously pursued.

Having secured to themselves the control of the church government, the clergy could afford to give the popular feeling full vent, in the way of vocal prayer and exhortation, in devotional meetings. This attracted many to their standard who were under restraint in the assemblies of other sects. The absence of power in the management of church matters was scarcely missed by the Methodist laity, and they congratulated themselves upon the enjoyment of a freedom in social and public worship unknown to their Congregational brethren. Among Baptists, the exercise of church government, and the participation in the exercises of religious worship, for a time, went hand in hand. But in both respects the laity are now in process of coming, more than formerly, under clerical control, or supervision.

In this state of the American churches it was that the reformatory efforts of the laity, first in the cause of temperance, and then in the cause of the enslaved, began to agitate the community and the churches. Nothing could be more natural than that the voluntary associations, with their popular discussions, their free open conventions, and their itinerating lay lecturers, should throw the clergy, with the views they held, into an attitude of self-defence. The temperance cause, to a great extent, had been impeded, or held back, both by clerical opposition and by clerical supervision. The laity had become impatient and restive. The vindicators of the rights of others began to assert and to exercise their own. The exclusive right of moral and religious teaching, on the part of the clergy, was in evident jeopardy. A portion of them felt and acted with the laity, and have been foremost in the struggle. But the majority, and these in high station, have set themselves resolutely against the people's rights. The particulars we all know. The same General Association of Ministers in Connecticut that had shut Whitefield out of the churches, an hundred years before, attempted to shut out the anti-slavery lecturers, in the same way. A similar association in Massachusetts attempted the same thing. This was in 1836. Within a few months past, two Presbyteries, if not more, in the State of New York, have, indirectly and informally, yet in reality, made similar efforts. Meeting-houses have been extensively closed against the discussion and the lecture. Churches, through pastoral influence, have refused to examine the subject in church meetings. The particular topic, and the dread of its agitation, on political and ecclesiastical grounds, was, indeed, among the chief causes of the opposition. Ministers have extensively refused, on these accounts, to speak on the subject themselves. Yet no small part of the difficulty, with clergymen, has been, from the first; that they do not wish to encourage the discussion of moral and religious topics in open assemblies of laymen, and by the people at large. This unwillingness has been often and openly avowed, and sometimes in print, sometimes in pastoral letters, &c., of clerical bodies.

The suppression of free discussion, therefore, on the subject of human rights, so far as it has been suppressed in this country, we have good reason to charge, in a great measure, to the prevalent prejudices of the clergy against "lay preaching," or lay agitation of moral and ethical subjects. That department they consider *exclusively their own*; and whether they wish to cultivate the field or not, they do not wish to see it occupied by others.

Nothing, therefore, short of a restoration of *free discussion in the churches*, by such a return to primitive usages as shall put to rest, for ever, the clerical monopoly of religious teaching, that manifest "innovation" of the Antichrist in apostacy—will ever give to the American people that *right of free discussion* which was first crushed in the church, and then smothered in the national councils. There must be freedom in

the church before there can be freedom in the state.

And the evil is not so recent in its origin as some men seem to imagine. Abolitionists complain, and very justly, of the treatment they have received. But they should know and remember that *free discussion* has held but a partial and disputed foothold in the churches of Protestant Christendom, and among Protestant Dissenters, hitherto, and even in our own land. If the right has been more strenuously restrained or violently invaded within ten or twelve years past, it has been very much because there has been a greater disposition to exercise it, and in a direction more dreaded—to wit, the investigation and advocacy of those *inalienable human rights* of which the monopoly of religious teaching, by a self-created caste, is so manifest and flagrant an invasion. For many years previous to the present agitation, the right of free lay discussion in the churches was seldom disputed, because the earnest exercise of it was seldom attempted. Let the lay lecture, the lay convention, and the lay discussion be now abandoned—let the people content themselves to listen, in silent listlessness, to the two Sabbath sermons, and the stated weekly lecture from the pastor, as they did five-and-twenty years ago, and the dead calm of that quiet and "orderly" period will return. The right of free discussion will not be disputed, when nobody attempts to discuss. But if abolitionists, or any body else, will persist in pressing then free ethical discussions, in the presence of an ecclesiastical caste who claim, and have claimed, for sixteen centuries, the monopoly of that field, let them count the cost, and not marvel at the expenses they incur, nor think themselves worse dealt with than their predecessors of a century ago, who paid the forfeit for "lay preaching" in the jails of New England.

And let them understand, too, the length to which they may go, without danger. The common place exhortation that reaches no great principle of morals, and urges no tangible, self-denying duty, will never subject them to the charge of "lay preaching." Nor need they fear to be earnest and even eloquent, in times of special religious excitements, if they will only obey the signal for sinking back into themselves again, and talking in silence, the place of laymen, as soon as the religious season is over. All this, as in the Methodist Episcopacy, the clergy of other sects are learning to tolerate, on the principle upon which steam is let off through a safety valve, to prevent an explosion. Would they go further than this? Would they use, steadily, the talents God has given them, and gain more? Would they "speak often one to another," "proving all things," that they may "hold fast that which is good?" Let them understand that primitive church order must first be restored, and that the disorderly monopoly of religious teaching must be first done away. In the very nature of things, the people's right of *free discussion* on religious and moral subjects, cannot subsist with the commonly prevalent notion of a clerical caste, for that notion, includes, among other things, the exclusive right of the clergy to teach.

The Protestant Reformation, then, in this respect, at least, has to be completed, to be reformed, and the sooner the matter is understood, and the work attempted, the better. Much indeed, is already in progress, and by many who little understand what they are doing. The teacher in the Sabbath School* and in the Bible Class, as truly as the traveling lecturer upon Temperance and Emancipation, is making substantial and durable inroads upon the sixteen-century enclosure—the

* The jealousy of Sunday Schools, on the part of leading clergymen in this country and in England, at an early period in the history of their introduction, is well known. It was a lay invention and a lay enterprise. But with more tact than they have since manifested toward lay movements, the clergy find means to guide what they could not prevent. The history of the American Sunday School Union, would repay a close study.

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, JULY, 1843.

Our distant friends (especially those among whom we have lately resided and labored) may be interested to know that in the place of our *acclimation*, and in several villages and neighborhoods in the adjacent region, there is an increasing interest in the cause of the oppressed, particularly in respect to the religious and ecclesiastical bearings of the enterprise. There is a growing demand for lectures on *anti-slavery Church reform*, and we are receiving frequent orders for the published numbers and current volume of the *Christian Investigator*.

STRAINING AT A Gnat, AND SWALLOWING A CAMEL.

Among the marks of hypocrisy which the scrutinizing eye of the Savior detected in the Pharisees, and which, by his blistering and unparelleled denunciations, he branded into their foreheads, in the sight of the multitude, sending them down on the page of history, a warning beacon to all future generations, there was none more emphatic and signal than that by which he designated them as the punctilious observers of duties comparatively trivial and unimportant, while they overlooked and disregarded those of the highest and most manifest weight and importance. They could tythe the minutest herb in their gardens, while they neglected to remove the heavy burdens of the poor. They placed a higher value upon the gold than upon the temple by which it is sanctified. They could release the child from his heaven-appointed duty to his parent, on account of a stipulated payment into the treasury. In a word, to quote the cutting irony employed by the Savior to expose them, they could "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." And it was in this spirit that they found fault with the benevolent Redeemer for healing the sick on the Sabbath, while they made no scruple, on the same day, to take care of their asses and their sheep. The humanity that Christ came to elevate and rescue by the sacrifice of his own life, appears to have been among the lowest of all things in their esteem. To trample that in the dust, was, with them, a less crime than sitting down to eat with unwashed hands. And it is possible that, on some occasion, (though the Scripture narrative does not warrant the affirmation,) they may have solemnly condemned, in grave ecclesiastical conclave, the man who should have danced with a maiden, while they deliberately refused to reprove him by whom the same maiden might have been chattelized, embruted, heathenized, robbed, sold, scourged, and reduced to the lowest state of degradation. By whom but by an assembly of Pharisees and hypocrites, could such a course have been taken?

HOSTILITY TO THE MINISTRY.

The Editor is aware that what he has written on the subject of clerical caste and clerical usurpations, will be construed by many into a hostility to the Christian ministry, a low estimate of its value, and a willingness to see it sink into contempt. But the opposite of all this is the truth. Had we any hope of the spiritual and moral regeneration of mankind without the active and unceasing instrumentality of an efficient, independent, self-denying and numerous body of Christian ministers, we might better afford to let the subject alone, and content ourselves with things as they are. And were we willing to see the institution of the Christian ministry fall into contempt and neglect, we should have nothing to do but to sit still and watch the inevitable results of the usages of which we complain. In those usages we find the natural and fruitful causes of that growing disgust with which every thing connected with the presence and voice of the professed Christian preacher is coming to be regarded by the community at large. How comes it to pass that the recognized teacher of men's duties, may not execute his high

commission just there where his instructions are most needed—where sin and temptation, in close connection with high duties and vast responsibilities, cluster most thickly—for example, the arena of political life, where the battles of God, and of holy freedom, and of the slave, should be fought and won; but where Mammon, and Moloch, and Satan, are left undisturbed to hold sway? Why is it that the man of God may not cry aloud, and show the people their transgressions, just there where they most greedily commit them? You will say that the people are sensitively jealous of clerical interference in political matters—that they suspect they are grasping after power! But how happens that? Have the clergy been always and at all times the known champions of the people's rights—the rights of the continually oppressed poor? Or have they been *themselves* struggling after power, and joining affinity with men in power to obtain it—sustaining a despotism in the State, in order to obtain assistance in supporting a despotism in the Church? Let them not count us enemies because we tell them the truth. Instead of entrenching themselves in artificial arrangements inconsistent with human rights, and unknown in the apostolic churches, let them place themselves magnanimously and frankly where the God of human nature assigns them a place, where the great Redeemer of men cheerfully took his place, and where, like him, they can wash the feet of their equal brethren. Let them do this, and they may be truly independent. Let them do this, and though the aristocracy may deride them, the common people will hear them gladly. Not a few of them (and we heartily thank them, and bless God for it,) are even now in successful occupancy of the position we commend to them. Though they need no admonitions of ours, they will permit us to encourage them onward. Others there are who unconsciously cling to despotic arrangements, without knowing that they are despotic. They have gone on in the track in which they were educated, without suspecting they were wrong. To them, as to others, we would say, *examine—reflect*. We would not charge upon all who have supported despotic arrangements, an intentional contempt of human nature and of human rights. But can they be innocent if they refuse to inquire after truth, and follow where it leads?

A SUGGESTION OR TWO.

We would not forget—nor have our readers forgot—that in correcting what is wrong or defective in the polity and usages of the church, in the ministry, and in ecclesiastical organizations, the people of God would be doing (though they should fully succeed,) but a small part of what must be done before they will be placed in a position and attitude to become effectually and completely "the salt of the earth and the light of the world." A more radical and spiritual renovation would be still needed. The heart must be purified, the affections warmed, the soul touched and imbued with divine love. There must be an unreserved surrender and consecration of the entire man, of the individual, and of the Church, to the service of God and of humanity. The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, must be subdued and overcome. The love of the world, which is enmity with God, and the wisdom of the world, which is foolishness with God, must be displaced by the love of God and the wisdom that cometh from above. Otherwise, an outward reformation in Church polity and the overthrow of ecclesiastical domination would do little or no good in the end. The very source, essence, and spirit of all disorder and spiritual despotism would still remain, and would soon assume the same old forms, or other forms equally bad. And besides, without this spiritual transformation, there is little reason to think that any thing like a thorough and scriptural reformation of existing abuses in Church organizations, will ever take place. Not even a *dear conception* of true gospel order will be likely to be attained without that single eye that fills the whole body

exclusive clerical domain. They are properly religious teachers, and unless they can some how be added to the "regular ordained" corps, as a kind of secular clergy, the line of demarcation between clergy and laity, must become indistinct. In either case, the result will be very much the same. On the other hand, if the *caste monopoly* of religious teaching is to be longer maintained, the Sabbath School and Bible Class teachers, along with the Temperance and Anti Slavery teachers, must be silenced. The difference between a pulpit and a pew, a set discourse or a familiar exposition, is incidental and trivial.

CLOSING SUGGESTIONS.—We cannot trace further now, in detail, the "innovations" and "disorders" prevailing in the churches. Their name is legion, but they are readily detected, on a comparison with New Testament Christianity, and *Apostolical Church Order*.

In times of collision and contest, nothing, scarcely, is more important than that the contending parties should understand, correctly, their relative position, sufficiently at least, to avoid mistaking and misrepresenting each other. For want of this, we confess we have our fears that abolitionists, in their relations to the churches and ministry of the times on which they are cast, will be liable to do them unintentional injustice. They may construe into *personal affronts*, or hostility to their *particular object*, what would be better resolved into the *vicious ecclesiastical arrangements of the age*—the restrictions upon free speech, upon free discussion, and change of every sort, growing, of necessity, out of a strict adherence to those arrangements. We may misdirect our efforts. We may try in vain, to yet continue to weary ourselves and others in trying to obtain from existing church organizations, what their very *constructive principle* forbids them to grant us—what they will not and cannot yield to us—because it is not in them, and does not consist with them, to wit: assistance in the work of ethical investigation—of christian progress—of moral and social reform. If such be the ascertained fact, we may be certain that such churches are not framed upon the primitive model, and that others, more scriptural, must be established in their stead. Such a work will be less grating and harsh than the ceaseless demand that existing organizations shall undertake a task which their contrivers never contemplated, and which, upon their present structure, they can never perform.

"CHURCH UNITY AND SECTARIAN SCHISM."—The next lecture in the *Christian Investigator* will be devoted to these topics. We expect to prove that the charge of "schism" lies upon the present prominent sects in this country, and their supporters—not upon those who secede from them on account of their usurpations, and schisms, and hostility to human rights. We expect to show, likewise, that abolitionists seceding from those churches, and recognizing each other as Christians, will be justly chargeable with "schism" if they *divide from one another*, and set up separate sects, after the manner of the corrupt churches from which they secede.

On this subject we feel deeply, and we beg Christian abolitionists to pause, and consider, before they take the leap from one act of *evimatic* arrangement, into another. Nothing but the elevated and pure platform of a common Christianity and uncompromising Christian liberty should content us, now, as certainly nothing else can suffice for us, at this crisis. Split us into sects, we should soon fall an easy prey to our opposers. Worse than this, we should be corrupted by the same influences which must inevitably corrupt all *schismatic sects*.

Be of the same mind one towards another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.

Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free, and be not entangled AGAIN, with the yoke of bondage.

with I, said: "A heart to do the will of God—that it is that makes men 'know of the doctrine.'" And besides, were the true theory of Church order ascertained and understood, without a spirit of self-denial, self-renunciation, crucifixion to the world, and consecration to God, there would be nobody to endure the labor, the reproach, and the suffering that such a vast undertaking must involve. The attempt would be like that of a man who should undertake, in the face of hostile armies, to remove the rubbish of a decayed city, and build it anew, without workmen, or materials, or citizens to inhabit it! First, then, and foremost, Christian brethren let us seek the divine influences that purify—that subdue. Let us consecrate ourselves, wholly and forever, to our God. He will then be indeed *our* God, and work *in* us and *by* us. Yet never let us be deluded into the monkish search after sanctification, any where but in the prayerful, and laborious, and intelligent and patient prosecution of *our* heaven-appointed path.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.—BOATMEN.

To Abolitionists who seek the Purify of Christian Mission.

DEAR BRETHREN,—At the request and on the behalf of a worshipping congregation about to organize themselves into a Christian Church on the principles of primitive freedom, at Honeoye, Ontario county, N. Y., I take the liberty to address you on a subject which, it is presumed, has already a place in your meditations and prayers.

Abolitionists, to a great extent, are separating themselves from those *Foreign Missionary* operations which are carried on, as they believe, on *other* principles than those that lie at the foundation of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Already they have in part opened channels through which the religion of Christian liberty may be communicated to the distant heathen.

This is well. But have we not, likewise, a missionary field nearer home—a field lying in our midst, and even at our own doors? Shall we do nothing in the department of *Domestic Missions*—nothing for the boatmen on our inland lakes and canals, a class whose neglected condition, (next, perhaps, to that of the poor slaves, in this particular,) give them a claim upon our sympathy and our aid? Shall we leave them and the other destitute portions of our population, to the teachings and the tender mercies of religionists who glory in their neglect and contempt of the poorest of the poor? Will they, can they, through such instrumentalities, be guided to the Savior of lost men? Or may we, without guilt and apostasy, lend our support and mingle our labors in a direction which shall sanction such efforts in behalf of the destitute in our midst?

For ourselves, we have been compelled, as the result of earnest consultation and prayer, to give a negative answer to these questions. Our attention has been particularly drawn to the claims of the boatmen on our lakes and canals. We would gladly respond to those claims; but in what way can it be consistently and honestly done? Our patronage has been recently solicited for the AMERICAN BETHEL SOCIETY. Can we give that association our support?

The following are among the facts that, in our view, forbid such a course:

1. From the Society's account of its organization in 1836, we perceive that, although the movement in favor of the enterprise, originated much, if not chiefly, among active abolitionists, and on them a large portion of the labor devolved, yet the list of officers shows that much of its power (its controlling power, if we mistake not,) was put into the hands of men holding diametrically opposite views on the vital questions of human equality, inalienable human rights, and the claims of the poor. Some of the most zealous advocates of colonization, the most bitter opponents of abolition, and open apologists of slavery, stand high on the list:

2. The Constitution of the Society provides that fifty dollars paid at one time, shall constitute a *Director for life*. So that the possession and appropriation of money may control a religious and benevolent enterprise! An institution for the benefit of the destitute laborer, is based upon the principle that *capital* confers the right of moulding the religious instruction of the *laborer*—the *poor*!

3. The plan of operations includes the erection of separate houses of worship for the boatmen, as though they were to be regarded and treated as a *distinct caste*; and as though it were not to be expected that *other* houses of worship on the lake or of the canal and in the ports on the lakes, would be opened freely to boatmen, and in such a way as to make them feel welcome and at home. This we think savors of colonization and the negro-pew, in the case even of our white brethren who are boatmen.

4. In one instance, at least, it would seem that a traveling agent of the society visited a slave-State (Virginia) soliciting donations, and received a contribution or subscription at Wheeling. Among the stations to be occupied,* we notice Louisville and St. Louis, though we understand they have not yet been occupied for want of the means. The policy of the Society, nevertheless, appears to involve operations both in the free and slave States; and for this purpose the contributions of abolitionists and slave holders.

5. The present Corresponding Secretary, who manages its affairs, and concentrates in himself, for the most part, the vitality and activity of the Society—the principal representative and agent of the body—is understood to be very far from sympathizing with, and participating in, the efforts making for the emancipation of the enslaved.

What we inquire farther, of you then, brethren, is this—Who among you, and how many, will co-operate with us, and to what extent, in such measures as we may mutually, by a convention, devise, for entering the field of *domestic missions*, and especially the region of our inland waters and canals? May we not hope, by mutual efforts, to send speedily one efficient missionary of a purified and free Christianity into the field? Cannot the man be found? Who and where is he? And who will contribute, and how much, for his support? Any answers from the friends of Christian freedom, to these queries, will be gladly received.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

Honeoye, Ontario co., July 1, 1843. Committee.

* See Bethel Magazine, Vol. II. No. 4, p. 110. 11b. No. 2, p. 64.

SUICIDAL CLAIMS.

It is quite remarkable that the right of lay ordination has to be contested now, *not* so much with Episcopalians who hold the necessity of apostolic succession in the ministry, as with Presbyterians and pseudo-Congregationalists, who, in defiance of the validity of *their own* ministry against the arrogance of the Episcopacy and their exclusive claims, are constrained, of necessity, to take *opposite grounds*!

When the Oneida Presbytery, some time since, took the position of denying the validity of ordinations and licenseations of ministers by the Whiteboro' Association, on the ground that said Association had admitted the lay element into its composition, (that is, was composed partly of lay members,) did they know that; in so doing, they denied the validity of the ministry in the mass of the Congregational churches in Great Britain and New-England? Can they show that the majority of the ministry of the Presbyterian churches in England and America, derived their ordination from any others than laymen? Which, or who, or how many of the Presbyterian ministers in the State of New-York can show this in his own case? They were ordained by ordained ministers, they will perhaps say. But is it so? Who ordained the ministers that ordained them? Ordained ministers, they will perhaps again respond. But by whom were *those* ministers ordained? Trace it back, and you will find, of course, that unless they were ordained by the Romish

or Episcopal clergy, they were ordained in the first place *by laymen*! That we know must have been the general fact, although some Episcopal clergymen, and at times considerable bodies of them, may have succeeded from Episcopacy to Presbyterianism or Independency. Are our Presbyterian and Congregational ministers solicitous to trace back their ecclesiastical pedigree to this latter class of ministers? Not one of them in a hundred, probably, can do so; and as for the rest, they must admit that *their own* ordination is not valid, and submit themselves at once to the Episcopal bishop, craving ordination at their hands; or else they must give up, at once and forever, their own arrogant assumption that lay ordinations are not valid, and that none can be ministers or pastors whom ministers have not seen fit to ordain. For if clerical ordination only be valid, then ministers not clerically ordained, cannot ordain others; and the result is as we have seen. Let us have one thing or another. Let our ministers run at once into Episcopacy, and wherever else Episcopacy may lead them, or let them come back to the honest dissension of their fathers, and stand there by the side of their equal brethren.

* See the testimony of the late Dr. Estlin, in our June No.

Donations and Payments for the Christian Investigator, up to July 1, 1843.

RECEIVED OF Mr. Silo (for papers) \$1; N. W. Randall, Cheshire, 0 50; H. Livermore, do. 0 50; J. J. Johnson, Preble, 3 00; G. Thayer, Honeoye, for J. Thayer, Farmington, (Mich.) 0 50, and for E. Ingersoll, Jr. Clinton, (Mich.) 0 50; of L. Tappan, N. York, 10 00; Rev. A. H. Prentice, Parkman, (Ohio,) 1 00; G. F. Horton, Terrytown, Pa. 1 00; Dr. W. F. Sheldon, W. Bloomfield, 5 00; Dea. E. Curtis, Ridgeway, 0 50; S. B. Franklin, Honeoye, 1 00; Rev. Wm. Hall, Little Valley, 1 00; Friends in Canandaigua, by J. Mosher, 5 00; Rev. J. Heustis, Honeoye Falls, 0 50; J. W. Merrill, Danville, \$1; L. Hoyt, Otisco, 50; J. Baker, do. 50; L. B. King, Pompey, 50; G. Doletta, do. 50; C. E. Weld, do. 50; D. Porter, do. 50; P. Dyer, do. 50; I. C. Wicks, do. 50; P. Miles, Apulia, 50; E. E. Fulton, Borodino, 50; S. Smith, do. 50; M. Haight, do. 50; W. Conon, Clockville, 55; D. Mest, Morrisville, 50; J. Pratt, Pratt's Hollow, \$1; R. G. Williams, N. York, \$1; F. Wright, Utica, \$1; H. Whiteher, Poland, 50; J. Bicket, Canajoharie, 50; G. W. Crane, Saranquit, 50; A. Crosby, Winfield, \$1; E. Burnham, Madison, 50; M. R. Burnham, do. 50; S. Brownell, do. 50; H. C. Taylor, Oberlin, (O.) 55; Justin Parsons, Ridgefield, (O.) 55; D. Green, Plattkill, 50; A. Raymond, do. 50; Mrs. E. Crowley, Utica, 50; T. J. Hanna, Honeoye Falls, 50; J. Dickinson, Honeoye, 50; G. C. Sherman, Fulton, 50; A. B. Smith, Farmington, \$1; H. Bradley, Penn Yan, \$1; Dr. W. Hall, E. Bloomfield, \$2 50; L. C. Winchester, Bristol Centro, \$1; E. & D. Bridges, Prattsburg, 25; S. Beckwith, W. Bloomfield, 50; G. W. Clarke, Victor, 12; H. Bushnell, W. Bloomfield, \$3; L. B. Woodward, Canandaigua, 50; C. A. Wheaton, Syracuse, \$1; Job Cobb, Honeoye, 50; Friends in Canandaigua, by J. Mosher, \$5; D. G. Platt, Washington, Conn. \$1; T. C. Grahn, Mechanicsville, \$1; D. Carr, Cooperstown, 50; W. E. Lewis, do. 50; D. Russell, do. 50; J. J. Tucker, Euell, 25; J. Rice, Middlefield, 50; I. S. Ford, Richfield, 50; J. A. Northrup, Lowville, 50; J. Page, Marshall, 50; P. Allen, Camden, 50; L. Tuttle, do. 50; P. McEntee, Kirkland, 50; I. McCarrick, Romo, 50; G. Clark, Holland Patent, 50; papers sold sold, \$1 25.

Amount, \$86 38
Deduct commissions at sundry times, to traveling agents, 10 25

Net receipts, \$76 13

PRINTED BY SHARPARD, PRINTER, 57 STATE-ST. ROCHESTER.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. I—No. 7, }
WHOLE NUMBER, 15. }

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., AUGUST, 1843.

{ WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER. }

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, [NEW SERIES.]

Solve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly,
or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers,
advance, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward
money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy
of his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have
two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers,
shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the
volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, \$1 50 | Sixty papers, - \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
All always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE VII.

OF CHURCH UNITY AND SECTARIAN SCHISM.

Whenever the friends of Christian freedom propose
to separate themselves from those sectarian
organizations that stand convicted before Heaven
and Earth of constituting "THE BULWARK OF
AMERICAN SLAVERY," they are instantly charged
with plotting treason against the **UNITY OF THE
CHURCH**—of committing the sin of disorganization
and Schism—of "rending the seamless gar-
ment of Christ." It is high time that this un-
founded charge were not only repelled but thrown
back, and retorted upon the accusers themselves.
Without a solitary exception, the Church ar-
rangements to which they are devoted were
founded and are still maintained upon the princi-
ples and by the practices of Schism. So far as
as only legitimate elements of Church organiza-
tion—real Christians—are embraced within their
enclosures, just so far do their Church usages in-
variably lead them into the sin of Schism. They
unfessedly separate Christian from Christian:
they violate Church unity, and thus "rend the
seamless garment of Christ." It is, and forever
must be, Schismatic, to maintain and uphold those
Church organizations, nor is it possible in the na-
ture of the case, for the unity of the Church ever
to be restored, or the sin of Schism purged away,
or renounced by true Christians, till they abandon
those Schismatic organizations by which Church
unity is subverted, and establish Churches, on the
common platform of a pure Christianity, in their
stead.

Yet we would not deny that Christian aboli-
tionists, who separate themselves from the blood-
stained Churches of the land, are in great danger
of running, now into other Schismatic and disor-
derly Church organizations, separating brother
from brother, violating *Christian liberty* as well as
Christian unity, and thus sowing afresh the seeds
of that Sectarianism and Schism, by means of which
(more, perhaps, than by any other cause,) the
churches have been seduced into an alliance with
kindred usurpations and congenial oppressions.—
This they will do, if they follow in their Church
usages, the example of the Churches in which
they have been educated, and from which they
secede. They will do this if they continue to
range themselves under their old partizan leaders.
They will do this if they continue to remain
divided into sects. They will do this, if they
call themselves Wesleyans, and Baptists,
Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Friends—
disciples of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, of Cal-

vin or of Luther. This they will do, if they
suffer themselves to be split up into new sects,
or to set up separate Church organizations, upon
any plea of differences of opinion or practice
that do not involve the *fundamentals* of religion.
This they will do, if they divide themselves from
any whom they account Christian brethren, and
who, maintaining the platform of a common
Christianity, shall accord to them an equal place
with themselves, without requiring the sacrifice
of their integrity, or a compromise of their Chris-
tian freedom.

And this, likewise, they will, in effect, and ulti-
mately do, if they unwarily run into the seemingly
opposite error—the error of regarding *nothing*
essential to Christian fellowship and Church
membership, but a mere conventional agreement
to unite against that specific form of iniquity that
is named *Chattel Slavery*, thus overlooking the
living spirit, the vital principle, the essential
truths of that heavenly religion, by which alone
the true Christian philanthropist and reformer can
be armed for the warfare against all forms of im-
purity, degradation, and sin. For it is only in the
light of those elementary truths, and by the in-
spiration of that living principle, that a common
Christianity can be defined and exemplified.—
And it is only in the clear conception, and by the
faithful practice, and soul-refreshing energies of
that Christianity, that the unity of the Spirit and
the oneness of the Church can be maintained, or
become a veritable reality, under any ecclesiasti-
cal forms.

The discussion of Church unity, therefore, and
sectarian Schism, cannot be out of place in our
columns. These subjects, the faithful Christian
abolitionist must correctly understand, if he
would successfully repel the charge of "Schism,"
and show, in the face of all men, that the charge
rests on his accusers. And he must earnestly
consider, and fully understand them, if, in his
new position, as a seceder from an apostate
Church, he would guard himself, amid apparently
opposite sources of temptation—from committing
the error of which he is now so unrighteously
charged.

ONENESS OF THE TRUE CHURCH.

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one
Lord."—God is one. The Father is one with the
Son, the Son is one with the Father; and the Fa-
ther and the Son are one with the Holy Spirit.—
Christ prayed that his disciples might be one, as
he is one with the Father. One with each other
they cannot fail to be, if they are one with him.
To be one with him is the same as to be one in
him.

God is one. Truth is one. Holiness is one.
There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism of the
Holy Spirit, of which all outward forms of bap-
tism are but the symbols. The true baptism, like
the true circumcision, is that of the Spirit, and
not of the letter, whatever form or name may be
used.

God is one. God is love. And love is one.—
It is unity in its own nature. It is the harmony of
soul with soul. It is the peace of God, that pass-
eth all understanding. Wherever love, or holi-
ness is, there is harmony, or unity, of course.—
The one is the measure and the evidence of the
other. By this shall all men know that ye are my
disciples, said the Savior, if ye love one another.
Love is of God, and every one that loveth is born
of God, and knoweth God, for God is love. And
he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and
God in him.

God is one. And all holy beings, whether on
earth or in heaven, are one with him. They are
one in their sentiments. They are one in their
principles. They are one in their affections.—
They are one in their desires. They are one in
their aims. They are one in their efforts. They
are one in their interests. They are one in their
expectations, their hopes, their prospects and their
high duty. Who shall separate them from the
love of God, which is in Christ Jesus their Lord?
And who, without doing this, shall separate them
from the love of each other? To be alienated
from each other, is to be, in the same measure,
alienated from Him.

This sublime peace, or unity, "passeth all un-
derstanding." This is testified by those who have
known most of its divine nature. It wholly
transcends all the conceptions that our finite ca-
pacities can form of it. It unites man with man,
and with his Maker. We may say—for the Sav-
ior hath said it—that, in some sense, it is like the
unity of God, manifest in the flesh, with the in-
visible Father. The true Church universal, or
great assembly of the faithful, is declared to be
the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth
all in all. Of this body, every real disciple of
Christ, is a living, and acting member. What
room is there, in such a body, for separation and
Schism? How can the members be separated
without a disjoining of the body of Christ? Or
who, without rebellion against Christ, the living
head, can attempt the work of dismemberment
and division, among his members? Nothing but
the fundamental departure of a Church from the
Savior can justify a secession from it. And
nothing but a similar defection in a member of a
Church, can justify his expulsion by the body.—
In such cases, there is no Schism in the body of
Christ. There is only the performance of an act
essential to the preservation of true Church unity,
and of the Church itself. There is in the aban-
donment of the rotten carcass, the body of sin
and death, an union with which is a Schism from
Christ and his flock; or there is the amputation
of a mortified limb, whose gangrene endangers
the body. In either case (for the cases are but
one) there is only a separation of Beliel from the
family of Christ, and that is no Schism!

CHURCH UNITY NOT ARTIFICIAL.

Church unity is no mere conventional affair.—
It does not consist in the fact of visible submission
to Church authority, to this or to that ecclesiasti-
cal body, or constituted head, other than the
Great Head of the Church. It is the living, free,
spontaneous, intelligent, affectionate, and active
agreement, affinity, and co-operation of individ-
ual minds, and hearts, and hands. It is the un-
ion of all with each, and of each with Christ.—
It is the fellowship of congenial souls, united of
choice and of necessity, by the fellowship of all
and of each with the **TRUE** and the **RIGHT**—
with the ever truthful and righteous **ONE**.

ARTIFICIAL ARRANGEMENTS SUBVERT IT.

But although Church unity cannot result from
mere outward compacts, agreements, convention-
al arrangements, constitutions, confessions of
faith, digests of discipline, or church creeds,
though these of themselves, do little towards cre-
ating or maintaining a true Christian union—and
though such an union consists essentially and
mainly in things more vital and spiritual than any
of these, yet it is manifestly inconsistent with
Church unity and subversive of it, for Christians
to construct and maintain Church arrangements
by which Christians, recognizing each other as

such, are separated from Christians. And this is done whenever an agreement in things not deemed essential to sound Christian character, is made essential to a relationship in the Church. And Christian liberty as well as Christian unity is violated when this is done, or when over ecclesiastical arrangements confessedly conventional, discretionary, and in addition to those required in the Scriptures, are entered upon and maintained by the Churches. For, in this case, human inventions are superadded to the institutions of Christ, and the benefits of the latter are denied to those who cannot conscientiously submit to the former!—This single consideration should be sufficient, to unite the friends of Christian liberty and Church unity, in rejecting all ecclesiastical combinations and arrangements that are not plainly essential to the simplest forms of Church discipline, enjoined by the Savior, and sanctioned by apostolic example. However convenient and expedient some of those extra scriptural arrangements may be deemed, no man, or body of men, can have any moral right to engraft them upon the Church organizations of the Savior, for these were intended for all Christians, who, as equals, have no right to lord it over their brethren, or oblige them to remain out of the church, as the only means of preserving their conscientious fidelity and their freedom.

CHURCH UNITY IMPLIED IN CHURCH ORGANIZATION AND DISCIPLINE.

The fundamental idea of church institutions includes the idea of unity of all Christians, in composing and sustaining them. If Christian churches are needed because the world lies in wickedness, and because the safety of Christians and the proper discharge of their duties, as reformers, requires them to organize by themselves, then, of course, all who are not Christians should be excluded, and all who give evidence that they are Christians, should be cordially received, and on the broadest principles of an equal and common brotherhood, to a participation in the privileges and duties of the entire body. Church organization, on Bible grounds, is nothing more nor less than mutual recognition and fellowship of true Christians, whose position in the neighborhood of each other, enables them to assemble together for worship, to watch over each other, and to unite in a wise cooperation, and division of their christian labors. The organization is but the appropriate expression and instrument of Christian principles, affections and endeavors. The form of the institution must be determined by its spirit, and its aims. All these point to the organization of churches, on the mode that extends membership to all christians, and forbids the exclusion of any. As a christian church is a "congregation or assembly of faithful men," of "believers in Christ," as distinguished from the unbelieving, the faithless, so the same principle that excludes the latter, as unqualified, is a proclamation of invitation to all by whom the requisite qualification is possessed. Church discipline, excommunication, and excommunication, become unmeaning, unless the members, are excluded by their forfeiture of the christian character requisite to membership. But if the faithful as well as the faithless, may be rightfully excluded, what becomes of church discipline, and excommunication? On what principle can they be maintained, or what becomes of their influence and value? In another connection, and for the very object of restoring church discipline and church order, we have found it necessary* to advert to this principle, and to insist that good men and bad should not be rejected, together, to the utter confusion of church order, and the annihilation of church discipline.

FALSE NOTIONS OF CHURCH UNITY.

That gross conception of church unity, that makes it to consist chiefly in the fact of a common submis-

sion to ecclesiastical authority, infused power and efficiency into the arrogant pretensions and supremacy of the Catholic, (or Universal) church. It was on the duty of maintaining such a universal church unity, that the Romish pontiffs planted themselves, and, to this day, the divisions and schisms of Protestant christendom are cited triumphantly by them as evidences that the true church is not to be found among Protestants, but resides solely in the Romish communion. False as are those pretensions, they convey a just reproof to Protestant divisions, and, at the same time, illustrate the real nature of many efforts to create or maintain church unity in the Protestant sects; efforts that are founded on the same gross conception with the Romish. The sect that undertakes to maintain its unity by the mere exercise of ecclesiastical power, and (either with or without an alliance with the civil arm,) attempts to wield that power over an extended territory or province, proceeds upon the same principle of church unity that is acted upon by the Roman See. But the Protestant jurisdiction is less plausible than the Catholic, because it is bounded by territories and states, whereas the Catholic aspires to that universality of church unity, which the scriptures so manifestly enjoin.

We conclude, then, that the universal church unity of the New Testament is a unity in principle, in affection, in pursuits, and in aims—not the subjection of christians to extended ecclesiastical arrangements, and submission to ecclesiastical power. Otherwise, the Romanists have the argument, and every form of Protestantism becomes schism.

It follows that every departure from strict local church independency, so far from promoting true church unity, is a violation of every sort of church unity, except that of despotic subjugation—a lame and abortive imitation of Romanism.

Very nearly akin to this false notion of Church unity is another, not less fallacious, and not unfrequently connected with it. This conception of Christian Union or Church Unity would make it a union of all sorts of conflicting principles, or a union effected by the compromise, or forgetfulness, or suppression of the conflicting sentiments of the uniting persons. It was evidently the fear that conflicting sentiments would be expressed, and Church unity thus marred, that led to the suppression of free inquiry and free discussion, among the Romanists. The Clergy of the Church of England have, from time to time, and for the same reason, been prohibited by their Bishops, the discussion of certain disputed questions. And recently, in our own country, a motion was made, in a convention for organizing a new ecclesiastical body, (we cannot say whether the motion prevailed,) that certain sentiments concerning baptism might not be preached, though they might be held, and practiced, in the communion! And not a few of the zealous advocates of "Christian Union" among us, insist that, in order to such a union, theological discussions and investigations must be laid aside, and that men's religious principles and sentiments are not to be taken into the account, or inquired after, in forming our conceptions of Christian character, and deciding who are to be recognized and welcomed to church fellowship, as Christians. A Christian union, they seem to suppose, must be a union in the dark, a union with the unknown, a union of the unknowing, which the least gleam of light, or breath of inquiry would dispel!

This shallow and vague notion of Christian unity is held in common by two classes "exceedingly diverse" in other respects, "from each other," to wit, (1.) the Conservatives of the existing sects, who admonish us not to "disturb the peace of the Churches," by discussing those "exciting topics" upon which, it is known, the members of the churches are already disagreed; and (2.) a portion of the assailants of the existing sects, who

think to build up "Union Churches" on the principle (if it may be called a principle) of uniting men without an intelligent agreement in any distinctive principles whatever!

It seems a pity that intelligent men, whether holding the position of conservatives or reformers, could not master the conception of the thing wherein the "peace," the "union," or unity of any body of men must consist. Suppose all men, of all religious opinions, could be gathered into one church—would the fact of their organization together constitute a union? Suppose those who hold American Slavery to be a Bible institution, and those who consider it the sum of all villainies, should agree to seal their lips and sit down together in church relations—would that be a union, or would it be a conspiracy?

DEFINITION OF UNION.

Without attempting to lay down any rules, or propound any sovereign specifics, for the promotion of a Christian Union, let us try to fix in our minds, some clear and intelligible conceptions of the thing itself, that we propose to attain. And, in the first place, what do we mean by union in general? What is it, for rational and accountable beings to unite? Let us open our dictionaries, and learn, if we can, the meaning of the word. Ask Noah Webster, and he will tell you that "UNION," (in the moral or spiritual sense of the term,) means "concord, agreement, conjunction of mind, will, affections, and interest."

According to this definition, the intellect, the heart, and the active powers, must all come into exercise, in order to the existence of any union whatever. And these must not only be exercised, but exercised by different individuals, in unison—otherwise there is no union, and can be none. Wherever these things, as a matter of fact, exist, there you have a union of course, and nothing under heaven can interrupt it, while these facts continue. But where these things, as a matter of fact, do not exist, there is no union, and no conventional arrangements, organizations, racks, gibbets, inquisitions, or milder persuasives to union can create or preserve it. A combination, without a concurrence of these things—(without "concord, agreement, conjunction of mind, will, affections, and interest,") is no union at all. And this the inspired penmen seem to intimate, when they speak of the false prophets, who "cry peace! peace! when there is no peace!" Nothing can be more truthless and hollow than the complaints of these men, that the reprovers of oppression disturb the peace of the churches! How can that be disturbed that does not exist? If the churches were agreed, how could the agitation of the topics on which they were agreed, disturb their agreement? Or, how is it possible that there can be peace in the churches, where one portion of the church members are in a state of open war with another and trample them in the dust? To suppose that there is harmony in such churches is to suppose that all their members are agreed in iniquity. Without agreement there is no union.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL.

This definition of union is in accordance with that of Paul. "Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together, in the same mind and judgment," 1 Cor. i, 10. The union enjoined by Paul, was a union in mind, in judgment, and in testimony. Instead of this, suppose he had said; "I beseech you that

* It is true indeed, and quite note-worthy and significant, that Dr. Webster finds himself obliged to employ very different language in defining that thing which, in modern ecclesiastical life, takes the name of union. "In ecclesiastical affairs," says Webster, union "is the consolidating or combining two or more churches into one." Just as though "concord, agreement, conjunction of mind, will, affections, and interests," do not enter into ecclesiastical unions! What a cool, unpremeditated irony upon "ecclesiastical affairs," have we here!

for the sake of union, ye speak nothing at all, but conceal your opinions!" Or suppose he had said—"I beseech you that while ye all speak different and opposite things, on fundamental questions of religion and morality, ye be perfectly joined together, without any agreement either in mind or in judgment!" Could any one, in such a case, have apprehended the apostle's meaning? Or could any human beings have complied with his directions? Certainly not. Such a union never existed and never will. It involves a contradiction in terms. So far from ever having had an existence, no one ever yet formed a conception of any such thing. What avail then, those exhortations to peace and union, (whether uttered by the conservatists or by the assailants of existing sects) that are coupled with dissuaves from that intelligent and free discussion from which, alone, any conceivable peace or union can result? Or what is meant by a union of those who at vital points, hold diametrically opposite sentiments and aims?

CHRISTIAN UNION NO SHAM.

In every available union, there must be something to be united about—something to be united in—something to be united for—something to be united with. There must be a common centre or object of attraction—a mutual agreement in respect to it—a unity of purpose or design concerning it.

A Christian union must involve a union of views in respect to the fundamentals of Christianity—the object of worship—the essential duties to be performed—the principal ends to be pursued.—Any thing short of this must be absurdity and delusion. To tie up in the same outward organizations, men of opposite principles and aims, betrays very low and grovelling conceptions of union. It is not an agreement in mind and judgment that these promoters of peace and union are seeking after. What is it, then? Is it the enrolment of men's names on the same paper or parchment?—Is it the congregating of many persons in the same building? Their concurrence in the support of the same minister? Is it an agreement in circumstances, without an agreement in fundamentals? Or is it an understanding, entered into, for purposes of advantage, that those who actually disagree, at vital points, shall profess to be agreed? Or is religion so far removed from every thing rational and ascertainable, that the eye of reason must be shut, before the heart can feel its inspiration? Can our religious affections bring us together, while our religious principles are opposite? Can two walk together, except they are intelligently agreed? Does Christian union flourish best in the dark, and is ignorance the mother of devotion?

Church history presents us one almost unbroken and every varying series of abortive experiments to maintain a church unity in some cheaper way than by an intelligent agreement in the truth.—How long will it be, ere such fruitless experiments shall be abandoned? How long before even the lexicographer's definition of the word *union*, can be appreciated and understood? When will men learn, that there can be no Christian union without an agreement in the fundamentals of Christianity itself?

Much has been said and written, within a few years past, of the necessity and the obligation of Christian union. This is well. But let us learn at length, the true secret of becoming united. A Christian union can be effected in no way but by becoming intelligent, consistent, self-denying Christians. When a purified and living Christianity can be restored, and embraced, a Christianity at once scriptural and rational, experimental and practical, then, and not till then, may we hope to witness any thing like true Christian union.—For what union hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?

Men look with almost uniform incredulity upon the attempt to secure Christian union by bringing Christians into an actual and intelligent agreement

concerning religion. Just as though religion were not founded in truth or as though religious truth like other important and necessary truth, could not be successfully studied and ascertained. No one thinks of securing a union of intelligent men, upon any other subject, without a mutual perception of the truth. But in religion, it is taken for granted, on almost all hands, that man, gifted by the inspiration of the Almighty,* cannot ascertain the truth, and, therefore cannot be intelligently agreed with his fellow man. Hence the conflicting expedients to make them agree in the dark! Some, by saggets and inquisitions—some, by the imposition of creeds to be assented to, not examined—others, by the inexplicable process of making men agree about nothing! Agree, without the perception of any truth. Agree, by keeping the great truths of religion out of sight!

SOLUTION OF A PROBLEM.

It has been demanded, sometimes with triumph, and sometimes in despair, whether men can walk together, in church relations, who do not agree in their observance of the rituals of their religion. To be sure they cannot, if those rituals, and their own mode of observing them, constitute the essence, the sum, and the substance of their religion. In order to effect an intelligent union of such men, they must first come to an agreement in respect to the minutest circumstances of their respective rites. The Baptist must give up his immersion, or the Pedo-Baptist his infant sprinkling, before they can come together, at all. But if the conception can be reached, (in an age and among a people where the idolized ritual holds the high place it does with even Protestant dissenters, at the present period)—if the conception, we say, can be reached, of a higher, a more spiritual religion than that of outward ceremonies, it will then become possible for Christians to walk together, on the foundation of that thing, (whatever it may be,) in which as a practical fact, they make their religion to consist. The restoration of CHRISTIANITY ITSELF, in its simplicity and purity, is all that is wanted, to secure the restoration of Christian union.

ILLUSTRATIVE FACTS.

Look at a few illustrations of this truth. The primitive age was an age of union, because it was an age of purity. Heresy and schism, if not absolutely identical, came into the churches hand in hand. The slumber of the dark ages was not union; it was the absence of all in which true union consists. Protestantism failed to introduce union just so far as it failed to imbue men with the love of evangelical truth. The churches of the reformation split asunder when they "became carnal"—when the remaining leaven of Papal superstition, led them to place their religion, very much in outward ceremonies and forms, in respect to which the author of Christianity had given them no specific directions, because he would not lead his disciples to place their religion in them.

In every revival of true religion, the bonds of sectarianism, that divide real Christians, are found to relax. The decline of religion and the revival of sectarianism are simultaneously witnessed.—From whatever cause a worldly spirit creeps in, its presence is always the signal for the disappearance of union among Christians, and the revival of partizan strifes. Or, (no unfrequent occurrence) when Christians who had united in effort to reclaim lost sinners, begin to busy themselves with rival efforts to gather the converts into their respective partizan churches, the Holy Spirit is grieved, and the revival is at an end.

In the same way, all those benevolent enterprises and reformatory efforts that bring Christians of different communions together, and make them more practical and magnanimous Christians, bring them together, in their affections, and make them place a lower value upon the ecclesiastical arrangements that divide them. And whenever the

* There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty hath given him understanding.—Bible.

Spirit of sectarianism springs up, among such philanthropists and reformers, their union is marred and their Christian enterprises languish.

THE TRUE SPIRIT OF SECTARIANISM.

The truth upon which we are insisting, is affirmed in the writings of Paul. He tells the Corinthians, expressly, that their sectarianism, their party divisions, their ranging themselves under the names of different teachers of religion, Paul, Apollos, and Cephas, was owing wholly to their having become carnal.† Had they retained the spirituality of their religion, they would not have lost sight of that radical distinction between the fundamentals of religion and its mere incidents—between its spirit and its rituals—between its moral precepts and its outward institutions—between mercy and sacrifice, which the Savior had taken so much pains to inculcate. And of course, they could not have been occupied with the question by whom they had been baptized.‡

WHAT WILL RESTORE UNION?

The fact then, that the most conscientious and intelligent Christians arrive at different conclusions respecting the mere rituals of religion, furnishes no argument against our position, that they are capable of coming to such an agreement, in all the fundamentals of religion, as shall open the way for their harmonious action together, in church relations. In order to this, there is no necessity for their arriving at the same conclusions in respect to ceremonies and rites. Nothing is needed but that they should so far apprehend the alphabet, the self evident first principles of Christianity, to see plainly that the essence of acceptable worship lies in another direction than outward observances, and in a more elevated region—that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams"—that where true spiritual obedience exists, the answering of a good conscience, in a compliance with the rituals of religion, according to the best light we can obtain, is all that our Creator requires of us, and all that we can require of each other.

PROHIBITIONS OF SECTARIANISM.

In the fourteenth chapter of his letter to the Romans, Paul treats of this subject at length, and insists that Christians shall receive each other on the ground of their common fidelity to the Lord Jesus, without judging or condemning one another on the score of mere doubtful disputations concerning outward observances and rites, in which the vitals of religion are not involved. And this is the direction of the same apostle who (in 1 Cor. 5) so rigidly insists those who violate the precepts of a sound morality, or who, by their covetousness, or unchastity, or idolatry, or railing, or intemperance, or extortion, give evidence that the spirit of Christ is not in them, shall be excluded from the companionship of the faithful, as the only means of preserving the entire body from corruption.

Little more than a reference to the Scriptures already cited, will be needed to prove that the division of Christians into separate sects, is explicitly forbidden in the New Testament, and that all such sectarian arrangements are disorderly and schismatic, and cannot be innocently countenanced or sustained.

THE EXISTING SECTS.

So far, therefore, from its being true that the friends of the oppressed, who secede from these sectarian organizations on account of their upholding oppression, are guilty of disorganization and schism, in separating from them, the reverse of all this is the truth. Those organizations, whether Baptist or Pedobaptist, whether Episcopal, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, Congre-

† 1 Cor. III. 4.

‡ That this was the gist of the contention, appears by the gratitude of Paul, that he had baptized so few of them. He evidently thought they had better have never been baptized at all, than to split into sects, about their baptism. And he intimates a doubt whether such converts were proper subjects of baptism at his hands.

gational,* Methodist, or Friends, are constituted on the principle and maintained by the practice of *schism*. And therefore, aside from their position in respect to the chattel slavery of the South, (a position into which their sectarianism almost inevitably draws them,) they ought to be abandoned by all who would escape the pollutions of disorganization and schism.

There is no way of escaping this conclusion, but by denying, either that the original constitution of Christian churches forbids them to establish regulations by which Christians shall be excluded from church membership; or else by denying that the churches just named, do thus debar acknowledged Christians from the privileges of membership.

If those who cause divisions and offences among Christians, contrary to the doctrine of Christ, are to be marked and avoided—if those who separate themselves from Christian brethren, are declared carnal and sensual, not having the Spirit—if Christ prayed that his disciples should be one—if those who called themselves by the names of favorite religious teachers, were severely reprov'd—if no doubtful disputations concerning ceremonial observances are to separate brother from brother—if no account of rival sects among Christians can be found in the apostolic records—how can it be questioned that unity was the divinely established order of Christ's house? Or who can deny that that unity is violated and broken by the present division of Christians into contending sects?

Will it be pleaded that there exists Christian fellowship now, between Christians belonging to different sects? And will it be urged that because Christian fraternity is a spiritual affair—the union of heart with heart, and cannot be begotten or maintained by outward organizations, that therefore their distinct organization is no breach of their fellowship and unity?

It is freely granted that all the Christians in the world, or all in a province or populous city, cannot worship together in the same place, cannot take cognizance of, and watch over, each other, as members of one flock. It is granted, too, that no ecclesiastical government or organization, except that of the local church, assembled together, is warranted by the New Testament writers. It is granted, therefore, that the convenient division of Christians into separate congregations, for the purposes of social worship self-government, and division of labor, is no breach of the unity of the church.

But such are not the sectarian arrangements against which we contend. They are based on other grounds, and conflict with the convenient division of labor in appropriately organized congregations or churches. They forbid the few Christians of a little village or neighborhood, to come together as brethren, and send them crossing each other's tracks for miles, to meet with their favorite sects. They set them at strife with each other. They foster separate and discordant interests, to the confusion and disgrace of the churches.

Conubial concord, it might be urged, cannot be created or preserved by the mere fact of ceremonial wedlock, and the occupancy of the same house. But what would be inferred, of the matrimonial unity of the husband and wife, who must needs, at great expense and inconvenience, maintain separate establishments, occupy separate habitations, divide their children into separate families, employ them in separate labor, and provide for them by a separate purse? Whenever the heathen become acquainted with our sectarian divisions, the very natural idea takes firm possession of them, that we are worshippers of so many different Gods. If their conclusion is not correct, then it follows that the unity of our worship of

the same God is marred and violated by our sectarian divisions.

A HINT TO SECEDING ABOLITIONISTS.

The same principle that impels us to separate ourselves from ungodly professors of religion, binds us equally to welcome to our companionship, all those whose fidelity honors their professions. It is the principle of maintaining a distinction between the righteous and the wicked. We secede from existing church organizations—so we say—because we find them fundamentally corrupt. We disclaim the sectarianism and schism of seceding on any lighter ground. We have clung to our old organizations and our old associates, so long as we could reconcile their position with the conception of their Christian character. But having done this till we could do no longer, we secede. Suppose, now, we turn round and re-organize ourselves upon the principles of sectarianism—we establish our Wesleyan, and Baptist, and Presbyterian, and Congregational Anti-Slavery churches—thereby setting up bars among and between ourselves—among and between those whose Christian character and fidelity to God and humanity, we do not adventure to question—among and between brethren in whom we confide, and for whom we profess to cherish the most tender and brotherly affection. This separation from each other we make and maintain at great inconvenience and expense, with the full knowledge that "in union there is strength," and that from the weakness of our numbers, as seceders, we shall find it difficult, if not impracticable, to gather worshipping assemblies of a convenient size. The question is, how will our practices, in this case, correspond with our professions? How shall we make it appear that we are not *schismatics*, separating from Christian brethren, on frivolous pretences; or, at any rate, on *lighter grounds* than our conscientious convictions of the *forfeiture of Christian character*, on the part of those from whom we separate? If we separate ourselves from our fellow laborers in the cause of the oppressed, in whose Christian character we are known to confide, and whose theological or ritual differences from us we do not consider as affecting their character as Christians,* how shall we make people believe that we would not likewise, from partisan feelings, separate from those who would not join us in our reformatory measures, notwithstanding our consciousness that their Christian integrity was unimpaired? Could our separation from hitherto recognized brethren, on account of their contempt or neglect of the oppressed, weigh much with the community who should witness our subdivisions and separations from each other, on account of our different ceremonies and rites? Could our earnestly urged distinction between "*mercy and sacrifice*" be apprehended and appreciated in the light of such an illustration as this? Seceding alike (as we should do, in effect) from the *advocates* and the *neglecters* of the oppressed, how much of conviction or of reproof would the testimony of our secession convey to the latter class of religionists? Or how would it appear that we were contending for the *FUNDAMENTALS* of religion, and not for mere incidents and modes?

Depend upon it, brethren, our true position, if we understand ourselves, in this contest with a narrow-minded church, (whose sectarianism has eaten out its godliness and its manhood) is the elevated platform of a common Christianity, and no where else. This platform we must occupy, or we have nothing to stand upon, and shall soon fall to the ground. Be it *theirs* to act as the conservators of the sects, who have taken up their lot with them, content to flout down the same smooth current. Be it *ours*, if we truly reverence the authority of God above the traditions of the elders, to search after and regain the true foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself [not Edwards, or Wesley, or Barclay] being the chief corner stone.

EVILS OF SECTARIANISM.

That which is wrong in principle, must always be mischievous in practice; and no arrangements forbidden by the Great Head of the church, can ever be promotive of its true welfare. This is signally manifest in the case of sectarian divisions in the church. We must confine ourselves, for the present, to a brief enumeration of a few

1. Such divisions bring religion into contempt. Common sense teaches men that if Christian belief and practice were in conformity with the truth, they could not fail to bring Christians into harmony with each other. And since this harmony is not seen to exist among professed

Christians, it is readily inferred that there is nothing divine and intelligible in Christianity, in which its disciples can unite. This standing objection of sceptics is but awkwardly (however truthfully) answered by the supporters of the sects, when they say that the divisions of Christians are only on minor matters, not essential to Christianity itself. If this statement be true, it follows that they themselves are guilty of misrepresenting Christianity by supporting those schismatic organizations which separate Christians from each other.

It has already been shown that the exclusion of Christians from Christian churches, strikes a deep and heavy blow at the very foundations of church organization and church discipline. A man is thrust out of the church for non-conformity, in the mode of a ritual. What becomes of the weight of church discipline against immorality and vice? The actual result we now witness. The sects founded on *ritual* instead of *fundamental* distinctions, in order to strengthen their party, will refuse to admonish—much less excommunicate—the barbarians who traffic in their own flesh and blood, and sell infant humanity in the shambles, by the pound. The neglect or the practice of infant baptism, at the same time, smears asunder the cord of ecclesiastical fraternity in an instant. What man living can tell us the significance of church organizations, when the best of men are carefully fenced out of them, and the worst of men are as solicitously retained in them?

3. It is manifest that in such a condition of things, the points of sectarian difference are disproportionately dwelt upon and magnified. The symmetry of Christianity is sacrificed. The self-evident and vital points of religion upon which no controversy can be raised, and the enforcement of which adds nothing to the strength of the sect, (but displeases, perhaps, those whose defective religion detains them almost wholly in the region of incidentals) fall into comparative if not total neglect, and the consequence is that those topics upon which the scriptures insist most, are among the very last things that enlist the earnest attention of the preacher and the hearer, the writer and the reader.

4. And thus the Bible itself comes to be read in the same partial manner. Whatever can be made to subserve the distinguishing peculiarities of the sect, is at the tongue's end of its adherents, while there is almost a total neglect of other portions of more vital importance.

5. The same tendency is witnessed in the use of other religious writings. The religious reading of Christians is chiefly confined to the writings of their own sect, and very seldom will they examine the writings where theological views are inculcated that conflict with the tenets of their own sect.

6. A low state of religious knowledge, and narrow, contracted habits of thinking, are the unavoidable result. Instead of throwing the religious literature of all Christendom before all Christians, and making a common stock of the various gifts of the Christian world, we have in each of our sects, as it were, an *index expurgatorius*, after the manner of the Romanists, our lists of prohibited books, (though written by acknowledged Christians, as may be) which common custom, if not actual enactment, proscribes to all but those of the same tenets!

7. Any thing like progress in Christian knowledge is thus impeded and retarded. If a sect has embraced error, its members are in no favorable position for discovering them. And if an individual should discover them, the attempt to alter the church creed would be regarded a breach of covenant, a schism! And if a sect has embodied in its creed or usages any important religious truth or practice, not commonly recognized, the fact that this peculiarity has become the badge of a sect, prevents its reception and adoption by Christians of other sects. Many a rigid Calvinist and zealous Congregationalist, Presbyterian or Baptist, in full agreement with his sect in every thing else, has fallen under suspicion of Quakerism, and been regarded as unsound in the faith, or unwelcome to his sect, for no reason but because he had become convinced that the Quakers' were right, in the one particular of teaching the unlawfulness of war!

8. And this introduces the remark that the sectarian use of creeds is such as pervert their original design, and instead of promoting church unity, they prevent it. The Apostles' creed, so called, (by whomsoever it may have been written) was evidently designed to embody only the great truths in which all true Christians are agreed. Such documents, as declarations of Christian sentiment were useful in propagating the Christian faith—just as "declarations of sentiment," by Abolitionists, and other classes of men, serve to explain and propagate their views. But when the creed was made to comprise the sentiments of individuals on points, not vital to the Christian religion, and in respect to which the Christians were disagreed, it became the instrument of usurpation and the cause of schism.

* A very few of the churches called Congregational, take the ground of receiving all Christians; but most of these are churches from which the friends of the enslaved have no occasion to secede.

† Romans xvi. 17. ‡ Jude 19.
§ 1 Cor. i. 12. Yet it will not be affirmed that these sectaries go so far as to segregate by themselves, and set up separate and rival churches.

The creeds of our modern sects uniformly do this, and are understood to do it by most of those who frame and enforce them. They are commonly made by the few and enjoined on the many; by the clergy, and enjoined on the laity. They are made in one generation for all coming generations of the sect, for all the successors of its founders. They are imposed upon those who have never heard them discussed, and who are required implicitly to receive them. It is accounted disorderly and heretical for the church member to question or dissent from them, or move for their revision. A single individual, therefore, who succeeds in founding a sect, becomes an infallible Pope, not only during his life-time, like the Popes of Rome, but (what no Roman Pontiff could ever yet do,) for ages after he is dead, or until the sect itself shall run out or become revolutionized or broken up. And not only must no error be expunged from the creed of the sect, but no additional truth must be added, to guard against any new error, or reprove any new encroachment of wickedness!

No marvel that abuses like these are leading thousands to repudiate all creeds, and to assume a position, which, if consistently maintained, would prevent a Christian church or assembly from any expression of sentiment whatever, upon any principle of religion—upon the promotion of any virtue—or the repression of any vice.*

Thus it is, that one absurdity introduces by revolution another. Only let sectarianism become extinct, and let the creeds of the churches be framed by the members for themselves, subject to their own revision, addition or diminution, as increasing light shall be shed on their path, or as new occasions may arise for the expression of their sentiments, let them distinguish between fundamentals and mere incidents, let them cease to fetter invidious free thought and free discussion, and no longer confound the expression of general Christian sentiments with the doubtful disputations in which Christians are not yet agreed, and these evils will disappear. There will be no obstacle, then, to the free and spontaneous expression of Christian sentiments, by assemblies of Christians. Their voice will be a living reality and not a mere echo. It may be uttered when needed, and when uttered will have meaning and effect.

9. Sectarian divisions weaken and distract the people of God, waste their resources, and turn their weapons upon one another. Moral wastes and desolations are multiplied in our midst, and the distant heathen are neglected, because Christians cannot unite in maintaining Christian institutions at home, and sending the gospel abroad. Abortive attempts are witnessed to maintain weak and rival churches, in locations where one united church or assembly of Christians might be efficient, and prosper.

10. The mutual jealousies and rival internecine of the sects are a fruitful source of corruption—an ever standing and almost insuperable obstacle to the prosecution of every benevolent enterprise, especially those having in view the eradication of any prevalent vice. A volume would scarcely suffice to embody a fair specimen of the illustrations of this melancholy truth, which the annals of our temperance, moral reform, and anti-slavery efforts might furnish. We must repeat here, as our firm conviction, what we have intimated before, that anti-slavery churches, founded on the usages of sectarianism, (even if strong enough in numbers and resources to gain a reputable standing in the community,) would almost inevitably become corrupt, from the natural tendencies of sectarianism itself, and float down the current of pollution. There are other vices, besides intemperance, licentiousness, and oppression, with which Christian churches must contend; and experience has fully proved that sectarian churches are not to be trusted in such conflicts.

There is nothing so high or so holy that the touch of sectarianism will not taint, and transmute into its own debased image. The most sublime truths of Christianity itself are dwarfed and belittled, perverted and distorted, misconceived and misunderstood, the moment they become the watchwords of a sect—the shibboleths of a party. They may be retained in the creed, but they will be retained as a dead letter, bereft of their vitality and their vigor. The doctrines of human equality and human rights, when connected with sectarianism, would fare no better than their fellows. This we might know from the nature of the case. And the history of Methodism and Presbyterianism furnish the records of the fact. No new churches can be founded with more thoroughly anti-slavery creeds than are still retained by those sects.

* It might, perhaps, be regarded as somewhat marvellous that a position approaching to this is assumed by those great ecclesiastical bodies that claim the sole right of dictating to us our church creeds—should be assumed, too, on the very modest pretence that it would be an assumption of unwarrantable power! The true secret is, the church creed, being infallible and complete, must receive no addition—must suffer no change!

Not even the slaveholders themselves will consent to their erasure from the creeds, for their having a place there enables them to glory in being "opposed to slavery in the abstract." This 18th FIRST VICE OF SECTARIANISM, the substitution of the creed for the substance, the profession for the practice, will always produce similar results. Only insist that *Christian practice* shall constitute church membership, and sectarianism at once falls. But where any other rule is admitted, profession has to be accepted instead of practice, of course, for there is nothing else upon which church membership can be based. From this single principle the ultimate defection of a Wesleyan anti-slavery church, or a Presbyterian, or Baptist, or Congregational anti-slavery church, founded on the basis of *sectarianism* instead of the basis of *CHRISTIAN CHARACTER* is the membership, becomes a matter of no certain calculation as the downward current of a stream on an inclined plane; and no good fidelity on the part of the founders, were they all as devoted as a Wesley or a Hopkins, could prevent it.

And what shall we say more? For the time would fail to recount all the mischiefs of sectarianism, as they stand enumerated by standard writers of the sects themselves, in good repute with their brethren. We might cite a VAN DYCK, setting forth, with the clearness of demonstration, that sectarianism "banishes love and peace—cherishes pride—multiplies false professors of religion—keeps men from the proper reading of the Bible—prevents reformation in Christian doctrine and practice—retards the latter day glory—weakens the church, and tends to destroy it." Very much to the same import we might quote the "Fraternal Appeal" of Prof. Schmucker, so highly extolled by the leading divines and journalists of the prominent sects, who always professed to deplore sectarianism, and who seldom fail to commend Christian union, "in the abstract!" The evils and the sin of schism, as we said to occupy a high place in the belief of all the schismatic sects; but, like all the other articles of their creed, it is a dead letter—it is only a belief "in the abstract"—a faith without works, which is dead, being alone. And here, as at every other point of their speculative belief, the man is always accounted by them a "fanatic" who proposes to reduce their own professed principles to practice. No heresy, in the eye of sectarianism, is more deadly than the heresy of attempting to reduce profession to practice. For since the whole structure of sectarianism rests upon *profession*, and discards the opposing basis of *practice*, it follows that the *say-and-do-not* religion is in much better harmony with its prevailing scope and genius, than any other religion that can be named.

OBJECTION AND ANSWER.

It might seem uncourtous to close this discussion without some attention to the multiplied objections that have been raised against the abolition of sects. Yet these objections, so far as they possess much of probability or weight, may be substantially comprised in this one, to which we will devote a few moments' attention. The objection demands.

"How can I consent to unite in church relations with those with whom I am not agreed? How can two walk together, except they be agreed? To what would an union amount (by the lecturer's own showing) without an agreement in sentiment? How, then, without a sacrifice of principle, shall I relinquish my sect?"

ANSWER.—You must not unite in church relations with those with whom you are not, substantially, agreed. You cannot do this, if you would, and you ought not, if you could. Such a combination would be no union at all. And you must not sacrifice principle (correct principle) in order to relinquish your sect.

But in what is it that you must be agreed with your brother, in order to unite with him, in church relation, in Christian communion, or fellowship? Is it in anything but the substance of true religion that Christians must be agreed, in order to walk together? Must they be agreed in the color of their coats, in the size and binding of their Bibles, in their standing or kneeling in prayer, in outward ceremonies and forms, in the doubtful disputations on which even the primitive Christians themselves differed, but upon which Paul would not suffer them to

* See "Van Dyck on Christian Union, or an Argument for the Abolition of Sects,"—Table of Contents, page 7. Mr. Van Dyck was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church, and dedicated his work to the Rev. David Abel. The work was favorably noticed in our principal religious journals.

† Prof. Schmucker charges the sects with promoting Romanism, and quotes "the excellent Richard Baxter" as saying, "Thousands have already been drawn to Popery, and confirmed in it by Protestant divisions. And I am persuaded that all their arguments in Bellarmine, and all their other treatises, have not been so effectual to make papists, as the multitude of sects among ourselves."

‡ See their names and their recommendations, in a note to Lecture IV., in the Christian Investigator for May.

divide. What is your religion, my brother? In what does it essentially and vitally consist? That is the question for you to settle, and then adhere to your principle of not uniting with any who are not agreed with you in the fundamental points of your religion. In your religion a religion of *virtue*—of vice, speculative points, on which practical Christians are notoriously disagreed! If so, then by no means enter into church relations with Christians who do not agree with you on these points. But, at the same time, ponder the matter, mayhap, whether such a religion as yours is, will ever carry you into the blissful presence of the Savior, who holds communion with all Christians.

But if your religion consists, vitally and mainly, in something inconceivably more precious than this—if it consists in that in which the religion of *all other* Christians consists—namely, in supreme love to God, and impartial love to your brother—what should hinder you from walking in loving harmony and companionship with all Christians?

You cannot give up your principle, you say, on any point of Christian doctrine or duty, however minute, in order to become a member of a church. That is right, my brother; and remember that the sectarian church you support, and all the rival churches of sectarianism, compel thousands and tens of thousands of Christians to give up their own principles—nay, to profess principles they do not hold, or else stay out of the church. But no such sacrifice of principle is required of you, in quitting your sect and joining a church organized on the basis of Christian character. Your own peculiar views and usages, on minor and doubtful points, you may take along with you, and enjoy them undisturbed.

But you ask, perhaps, whether there would be no sacrifice of principle in belonging to a church, all whose members did not perceive all the truths you perceive, and practice all that you consider to be duty? I answer,

1. If it be a sacrifice of principle for you to do this, then you cannot, without the same sacrifice, expect yourself with any church whatever, until all their members, on every point of doctrine and duty, agree perfectly with each other and with yourself. You will not pretend that any such church exists; and it is well known that members of the same sect or church, all over the country, differ from each other on points vastly more important than those upon which the sects are now divided. The Christians in Rome, to whom Paul wrote, were not thus perfectly agreed; and if any expect it in our day, it must involve the expectation of the universal perfection of Christians, not only in holiness, but also in knowledge. If a union in fundamentals cannot serve as a basis of church membership, a union in circumstantial and incidental cannot be more promising or more rational. All churches are based upon one or the other of these principles—viz., a union in *fundamentals*, or a union in a few specified *circumstantial*. The only point in debate is, which of two principles is correct.

2. But how does it appear that your uniting in church relations with acknowledged Christians who differ from

* For example: A Christian happens to disbelieve infant baptism, but, at the same time, believes in baptism by sprinkling. What sectarian church can he join, without a sacrifice of principle?

† It may be questioned, perhaps, by some objectors, whether the points at issue between slaveholders and abolitionists are quite as important as the controversy between Calvinists and Arminians, between Old School and New School, between Pedo-Baptists and Baptists. We cannot spare time to argue such a question now. It would be useless to reason or quote Scriptures to one who had sunk so low into the depths of animosity and "the carnal mind" as to imagine that God cares more about our speculative opinions, and the quantity of water we use in outward baptism, than he does about the weightier matters of the law—judgment "between man and man," "mercy" to the poor, and "fidelity," to our common humanity. But it might be well to remind even such an one, that a uniformity, even in speculative theology, and in ritual observances, is not quite reached even in the sects that are founded on them. The Presbyterian and Congregational communions, with their Calvinistic creeds, contrive to tolerate many thinkers, as well as laymen, who are much more Arminian than John Wesley. The Old School and New School controversy involves nearly the same points; yet the schism started in the General Assembly is rarely and with difficulty carried out in the local churches. The Episcopal church tolerates everything in theology, from Socinianism to Calvinism, provided you will read prayers and reverence the bishop. Baptists find little difficulty with Arminians or Calvinists, provided they have been duly immersed. And the Pedo-Baptist Sects, without any change in their creeds which should intimate a relaxation of their principles, contrive to get along, in practice, now-a-days, with almost any who will stay with them, and prop up their sects, though all the distinctive principles of the sect (along with fundamental morality and common humanity) are set at naught by them. "Only stay with us, and support our party," they seem to say, "and you may do or neglect what you please." And the leaders of the sects nearest each other in sentiment and practice, are proverbially most bitter against each other, from their constant apprehension that the rival sect will draw away their members.

‡ Rom. chap. xiv.

you on points not vital to Christianity, would involve a sacrifice of your principles on those points? Your *Journal* as well as practice you might retain, for, remember, you would be in no sectarian church then, with its pulpit and pews. Free discussion dwells in those churches, and in those only, that are based on Christian unity and Christian freedom.

But would not the jarring testimony of members in the same church breed confusion? Not not if the members were truly and firmly agreed in the vital points of a *spiritual and practical Christianity*. If not, the sooner they were dispersed the better. Of church schisms, the world has specimens enough now, and sectarianism has done enough to multiply and bolster them.

No sacrifice of correct principle should ever be made, in order to secure a union. But if you hold any principles which prevent you from Christian fellowship and co-operation with all who hold fellowship with Christ, and co-operate with Him, you may be certain that such principles are wrong, and ought to be relinquished. Be careful that you do not adopt principles that, if carried out, would prevent you from entering the church of the first-born in heaven.

With many, who plead fidelity to their principles as a reason why they cannot sustain church relations with acknowledged Christians, it seems to have become a principle that *they, themselves*, have a right to lord it over the faith of their brethren. That principle is a false one, for no such right ever existed. You have a right, judging the tree by its fruits, (and under a solemn sense of responsibility for the proper exercise of the right,) to determine who exhibit, in your view, the characteristics of Christians. And you have a right to do all you can, consistently with their rights, to correct what you consider their errors. And they have the same right, in respect to you. But Christians have no right to exclude acknowledged Christians from the church on account of their supposed errors, or refuse holding church relations with them, for that cause.

So far from its being true that Christian principle must be sacrificed to promote Christian union, there are no principles of Christianity more imperative than those by which Christian union is enforced. Indeed, all the vital, living principles of religion forbid the division of Christians into sects. Add to all this, the direct and repeated Scripture prohibitions of such divisions are most explicit and emphatic. How, then, can any one plead in favor of the practice, that it is required by an adherence to Christian principle? Low indeed, and weak in the extreme, must be the bonds of Christian principle, when even in a handful of Christian reformers, in the very act of seceding from the corrupt and corrupting churches of sectarianism, they cannot prevent new schisms, in the establishment of churches upon the disorganizing and Antichristian usages of sect.

NOTE. In so vast a field of inquiry as that of Christian Unity and Sectarian Schism, it cannot be expected that full justice can be done to the discussion in a single lecture. Our topics, however, press for a place in our columns; and the Editor desires his readers to consult the able writers who have written on the subject. VAN DYCK'S work on Christian Union, and Professor SCHWICKER'S Fraternal Appeal, have already been mentioned. For a small and cheap work, RANNEY on Christian Union is, perhaps, one of the most satisfactory. Mr. Ranney was a Baptist, and he enters intently into the consideration of such objections as would be likely to occur to the members of that sect. Mr. Ranney's ideas of the manner in which a Christian union is to be effected, strike us, likewise, as more clear and distinct than those of Mr. Van Dyck, more simple and apostolical than those of Prof. Schwicker, who, after all the excellent things he has written, seems to recommend, for the present, a union of the sects, instead of a union of Christians. A union of the sects, through their leading men, (as it seems to us,) would result in a union perpetuating many of the existing abuses, instead of abolishing them.

Mr. Ranney's work on Christian Union may be had, at retail, of Sage & Brothers, booksellers, Rochester, price 57½ cents. If they are wanted by the dozen, they may be had at \$3.00, of the Editor of the Christian Investigator, Honeyoye, Ontario Co., N. Y., with whom the author has left a quantity for sale.

Satan seldom sets up a church of his own, where Christians will allow him a place in the church of Christ—seldom sets up a *heretical* church so long as he can govern the nominally orthodox. This accounts for the facts (so loudly boasted of) that heretical sects have never gained a permanent foothold in the slave states, and have lately been on the decline in New England. Satan would be a fool to spend his money in building heretical meeting houses now, when he can shut Christ and his poor out of most of the (so called) evangelical pulpits in the land!

Clouds may obscure the sun—darkness may encompass Truth.

Christian Investigator.

HONEYOYE, AUGUST, 1843.

Our "Honeyoye," we believe, are *properly* distinctly before the readers of our seven numbers of this New Series. We believe that pro-slavery, or apparently neutral churches, are anti-Christian. We believe in the duty of secession from anti-Christian churches. We believe in church organizations as they were maintained in the times of the Apostles, composed of Christians—all Christians, and Christians only, (so far as ascertained) and each congregation governing itself within itself. We believe in such a Christian Ministry, and such only, as our best Episcopalian and Presbyterian writers describe as existing in the times of the Apostles. Of course, we discard the self-created and self-regulated clerical caste, with its notoriously usurped and unscriptural monopoly of the pastoral office, of religious teaching, and the administration of the rituals. We go for such a reformation of Protestantism as shall embody Protestant principles in distinction from the Romish. We go for freedom of speech in the nineteenth-century churches in America. And finally, in opposition to the schisms and disorganizations of the existing sects, we go for church unity; that is, the free admission of all Christians to all the privileges of Christian assemblies (or churches,) and (in opposition to the present prostration of church discipline) we go for the exclusion of all church members who do not bring forth the *fruits* of practical godliness. Such are our "Aims"—such is our "*disorganization*." To those who can tolerate *these*, we may venture to send our little sheet, in the hope that they will not find it a disturber of the religion they cherish. In our *theological* views, we are not conscious of departing from the commonly received evangelical faith of the churches—only with this difference—we hold that the evangelical doctrines are to be embodied in *practice*—not merely held "*in the abstract*."

Our *Recruits*, it will be seen, are unusually small this month. A considerable number of those who subscribed last autumn and winter to the support of our enterprise, are still in arrears. We hope they will remember us at as early a day as practicable. The crops of wheat are harvested—the wool is shorn, and much of it sold. Money is said to be stirring more briskly than for some time past, and (we are sorry to add) the desire of "*speculation*" begins to revive, and many are beginning to nibble again at the old bait of contracting new debts on a large scale in order to get rich! Better learn, at length, the art of using the world as not abusing it. So long as the complaint of "*hard times*" could be made, people felt excused from contributing for moral enterprises, or even paying for their papers of that stamp. But we have often found that the period of a revival of business is *not* the period of a cheerful and liberal support of benevolent and reformatory efforts.

"HOME MISSIONS AND THE BOATMEN."—The first response we receive to our appeal (on behalf of the brethren in Honeyoye) in favor of Domestic Missions, particularly among the boatmen, on the principles of human equality and freedom, comes to us from a pastor of a church in New England. This brother heartily approves the object, and is willing to enter the field of labor as a Missionary, if the friends of Christian liberty will give him a support. Brethren, what say you? How much will the friends in this, that, and the other location contribute to the support of a Missionary to be selected by themselves in convention?

Error is ever at hand—for it lies on the surface of all things.

Artifice is the weakness of man: nature is the efficiency of God.

Secession in Ohio.—Presbyterian Abolitionists in Ohio, are moving already in the direction of secession. A number of them, while attending the meeting of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, "assembled in the church" and after due deliberation, concluded to call a general convention of Anti-Slavery Presbyterians, Old School and New, to meet at Ripley. Mr. Rankin, so favorably known among Abolitionists as an able writer against slavery, is a prominent Presbyterian Minister, and has lately been writing in favor of secession. The proposal, if we understand it, is to form an Anti-Slavery Presbyterian connection. Such a movement would be like the "Wesleyan" secession from the Methodist church. It seems a great pity (since secessions are doubtless to come on and multiply) that these brethren, both at the east and west, could not organize upon the ample platform of a *common Christianity*, and throw aside the miserable thralldom of sect. Such, we trust, will be the happy result of secessions in the State of New York. Why should we fritter away our little remaining strength in these untimely divisions? Will not our Massachusetts and Old brethren think of it? Let *spurious* Christianity expend its energies in rival and sectarian efforts. In this *chosen work*, let it find an appropriate destiny. But let true Christianity put on the unity of the spirit and show an unbroken front to the enemy.

"A VOICE FROM ONEIDA INSTITUTE, No. 3, July 1843."—Heretofore the "Voice from Oneida Institute" has come to us on a small sheet. The present number is a pamphlet of 33 pages. It is devoted to a historical account of the Institute, and records, with a faithful picture of the wicked expedients resorted to by the local aristocracy of the country to crush the Institute, to cut off its support, and to hedge up the path of those who seek an education there, preparatory to ministerial labor. Those who stare with wonder and startle with affright at the proposition that abolitionists should wholly disconnect themselves from the ruling ecclesiastics of the dominant sects, would do well to ponder these pages. They will there see a specimen of the arts by which those men (standing as they do at the head of our Education, Home Missionary, and other associations,) contrive to brow beat, over-awe, and put down, if possible, in some way, all reformatory efforts, and all the institutions of learning that are in the hands of the active friends of human freedom. It will do for them, not only to stand aloof from every religious movement and enterprise in which Abolitionists hold a prominent place, but to urge a war of extermination against them by the most dishonorable and dishonest methods. But that Abolitionists should ever think of preferring the support of *their own* institutions of learning, and Missionary Societies, &c. &c., to the support of the Seminaries, and the Societies in the hands of the adversaries of human freedom, is something that they hardly know how to understand? It is altogether too "ultra and fanatical"! It is "carrying things too far and too fast"! And not a few Abolitionists, from their criminal inattention to such facts as are recorded in these pages, are ready to give currency to the sentiment! All may be proscription and persecution on the one part, yet nothing but passive submission, brotherly love, and *passive support* is expected from the other! As well might Abolitionists continue to support the pro-slavery parties in politics as the pro-slavery sects in religion. The leaders of the latter have shown themselves quite as despotic and corrupt as the former.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY—NEW SCHOOL.—There are two points to be noted and remembered in respect to the late doings of the Assembly, that we failed to mention in our brief statements in June. It seems that a southern delegation to that body were in lobby attendance during the discussion, declining to take seats, until they saw that

Assembly would take no action against slavery. On this was decided to their satisfaction, they came and took their seats. So that, in addition to the act of secession, on the part of the slave holding members already in this body, that they would secede unless legislation of the subject could be dropped, there was also a proffered accession of northern strength to New School in case the Assembly would decline acting. It was under these influences that the vote was taken on the decision made. Mr. Myers had told them distinctly, that there was danger of a northern secession, and Anti Slavery action could be had. So with their eyes open, they preferred to retain the slave-holders and in a first accession of slave-holders to their number, run the risk of losing northern Abolitionists! It remains to be seen how Presbyterian Abolitionists will at the issue thus made up for them, by the Assembly, whether they are as true to Liberty as southern Presbyterians are to Slavery.

Another instructive incident to be recorded, is the reference made by Dr. Wiener, of Ithaca, to the fact that Richards, President of the Theological Seminary in Auburn, is a slave-holder. This reference was made in the course of the speaker's Bible argument in favor of slavery. And this before an assembly composed partly of slaveholders! Thus was the weight of Dr. Richards' influence by Dr. Wiener to strengthen the slaveholding ministers present in their iniquity! Who will attest the innocence of Theological slave-holding in the city of New York, now?

"THE SCOTCH SECESSION."

The New York Evangelist deeply sympathises with seceders from the Church of Scotland, and gives us to understand that "a large number of European journeymen" in expressions of the same sympathy. So, there are causes which justify secessions from parent churches. And what was the trouble in the Church of Scotland? This, briefly. The British Government, by whom the Church of Scotland is sustained, church and state establishment, and richly endowed with the national funds, persisted in claiming and exercising their ancient prerogative of appointing the preachers and supplying the pulpits. Their manner of doing through the Scottish lairds and the natural result of preference given to worldly and anti-evangelical ministers gave great offence to Dr. Chalmers and other evangelical clergymen, who began to claim that the Church of Christ should have the appointment of their ministers, without any intrusion on the part of civil power. [Hence the name of non-intrusionists, as applied to Chalmers and the Evangelical party.] But yet failed to see the root of the evil of which they complained. While they protested against the governmental appointment of pastors, they still claimed and expected support of the government funds, still clinging to the fact that ministers of religion must derive their support from the state. The British Government, on the other hand, claimed that the appointment of the ministers was a fair prerequisite for the benefit of the funds—that the ministers that supported the ministry were responsible for the appointment, and could not relinquish the exercise of their prerogative.

And thus the issue was made up which resulted in the secession, recently, of more than 400 ministers of the Church of Scotland, with their congregations, who have refused to give up the national funds and provide for support among themselves, in order to secure the right of appointing their own ministers. And in this, the New York Evangelist sympathises with them, as it should.

Suppose the pith and essence of the same controversy should be transferred to this side of the Atlantic? In the first place, we have the laity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who, if they may nominate (or propose)

their preachers, cannot ordain them, nor without leave of Conference or Bishop, hear them preach after they are ordained. In the second place, we have the laity of most of the other sects, whose power of choosing their teachers is, by usage, the power only of selecting from among a self-created caste, who hold the sole power of ordaining, and even this privilege curtailed, (at least in the Presbyterian Church) by the power of the Presbytery to veto the choice of the local church. In the third place, we have the great mass of Abolitionists, in the non-slaveholding states, who, in most cases, are a lean minority, even in the local churches where they worship, besides being, in almost all cases a minority of the larger bodies who have more or less the control of ministerial appointments. These men, be it understood, have no strong grounds of complaint against the clergy they are expected to support, and whom, from their position, they can neither appoint nor remove, as the evangelical party in Scotland can possibly have against the clergy quartered upon them by the Scottish aristocracy. In the fourth place, we have about 150,000 or 160,000 church members who are slaves, and consequently have no voice in the election of their pastors—no available protection in church courts. Their testimony in church trials, to a great extent, is excluded.

Will, then, let us suppose a combination of the disfranchised laymen, abolitionists, and slaves, in one grand "non-intrusion" secession! We will answer for them, that they shall not set up any whining complaints, like those of Dr. Chalmers and his associates, that the majority from whom they secede do not furnish them funds for the support of the pastors of their own choosing. What say the editors of the New York Evangelist to a secession movement like this? Will they plead the vast distinction between the grievances as suffered by laymen, and the same grievance as suffered by clergy? Perchance they may find a sprinkling of the ministerial element in the *Americans* as well as in the Scottish secession. For ministers, in scores, have been deprived of their places by their faithful abolitionism, and their grievances are as weighty as those of their evangelical brethren in Scotland. Or will it be said that the grievance is a light one because it is not enforced by the secular arm? or because the appointing power is not in secular hands? What boots it, we ask, in return, that sacerdotal hands inflict the injury of visiting ungodly ministers into the high places of the church? So much the worse! And as to the arm of secular power, there was nothing in the form of a prohibition of secession, and were it otherwise, the absence of secular coercion in America is no reason why abuses should not be redressed. It is a fact which leaves the conservators of such abuses without excuse. And no man in his senses will pretend that there were any abuses in the church of Scotland, of a more radically fundamental importance than those connected with the pro-slavery position of the principal churches and sects in America.

THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE.—This is the phrase used in England, to designate the principle of voluntary Church support, in distinction from compulsory principle involved in a national establishment. The Editor of the *Non-Conformist* refreshes his readers with a series of rich articles on the subject—one of which, under the head of "*Mental and Spiritual Vegetation*," we transfer to our columns in the present number. The "voluntary principle" in this country, has to contend with other adversaries than a State Church, to wit, the *Rulers of the Sects*, and the neglect of "mental and spiritual vegetation" is almost as apparent here as in England.

"THE SOLE RULER."—Under this head the Editor of the *London Nonconformist* has an able article against *National Church Establishment*, which, with the change of a few words, will answer equally well for *Episcopacy and Presbyterianism*. With this alteration, we present

one of his paragraphs: "It matters not to tell us, that there is no divine law against [Episcopacy and Presbyterianism]. We say that *in fact* of [local and independent Congregational Church government, by the entire brotherhood,] there is law—a law which no later revelation that we have heard of, has repealed, and adapted to the wants of human nature. Who are they, who set aside the original law? Whence is their authority? By what tokens do they undertake to convince us that they are the men, and that wisdom will die with them? When they displace a principle which has the undisputed sanction of the Ruler, in whose name they profess to act, and thrust into its room another, of which the most that can be said is, that it has not been expressly forbidden, we are entitled to ask, How comes it that you seek to improve upon the dictates of infinite wisdom, and that to enforce what you think better, you repudiate that of which He evidently thought well? You first charge the Sovereign of the spiritual kingdom with a mistake, and then set yourselves to amend his instructions. Now, it can hardly with any fitness be deened out of place for us to ask, Who constituted you referees in this matter, and gave you an appellate jurisdiction over the Court of Christ himself?"

[The establishment.]

[The voluntary principle.]

From the *London Nonconformist*.

MENTAL AND SPIRITUAL VEGETATION.

From the day-break of time down to the present hour, the nature and use of education seem to have been wholly misunderstood. They who pretend to the highest, to something like a fallible authority in this matter, betray ignorance of it as dense as the unlettered multitude whose state they profess to pity. One is tempted to conclude, taking their representations for his guide, that the human mind is a kind of receptacle into which it is our peculiar business to shovel as much and as various information as possible—an invisible bag for storing up facts—a living scrap-book, in which to paste pleasant pictures and to write fragments of knowledge. Hence, we have all sorts of mechanical contrivances for instructing the faculty of man—contrivances on the large as well as on the small scale—mystery puzzles and State education. One radical mistake pervades the whole. It would appear to be wholly forgotten that the one thing to be aimed at—that without which all else is so much superfluous—is the evolution, the growth of the mind itself.

That germ of vital intelligence which has been planted within us, in which lie wrapped up in embryo all spiritual faculties, susceptibilities, tastes—it is the budding forth, the gradual unfolding and expansion of that which nature demands our care. Knowledge is but the earth, out of which the living germ extracts aliment, and by a process of assimilation enlarges itself. It is just so far useful, and no farther, as it enters into combination with the mind to which it is supplied. What we really want is the growth of the inner and essential man. Our proper object is, not to put something within him which is now without; but by means of what is without, to make that which is within develop all its powers. We speak so frequently, for convenience' sake, of the mind of man as the soil, and its varied information as the many-colored flowers which spring up and root themselves therein, that our judgments become bewildered—and, for want of due reflection, we mistake accumulation of knowledge for intellectual growth. The truth, however, is, that the mind is the plant, and knowledge the soil which we heap about its roots. The first is the seat of vitality—the last only the means to it. It is the first, and not the last, which our culture must aim to push into blossom.

Precisely the same mistake runs through our modern and fashionable system of dealing with religion. Means—means—means—the great and exclusive object of our care is the multiplication of means. Build churches—subdivide parishes—endow clergy—appoint schoolmasters—teach catechism—and the result of all this, according to our legislators, will be national Christianity.

The stolid ignorance which all this evinces, is, for the middle of the nineteenth century, as strange as it is disgraceful. As though there were aught in Christian institutions, apart from their effects upon human character, for which it is important to sustain them, even at any sacrifice—as though their mere existence amongst us compassed all the designs of religion—is through the benefit conferred upon our race by revealed truth, was wholly extraneous, somewhat separate from and outside of ourselves.

Christianity, whatever it fulfils its glorious mission, imbeds, if we may so speak, in human intelligence, a vital and indestructible germ of character—casts into it a seed when in its childhood the rudiments of all the tendencies, aspirations, affections, susceptibilities, and powers which can permanently elevate and dignify human nature, and in it it enters upon its high and immortal destiny. The end of Christian institution is, in the first place, to scatter abroad this seed; and, as it quickens, to promote its expansion. Culture is of use only as it induces spiritual character to unfold. It is towards this end, if indeed it have any meaning, that it must address itself. The self-acting evolution of the modern—the beautiful efflorescence of a new principle of moral life—the manifestation to broad daylight of hidden elements—the opening into strength and perfection of powers yet undeveloped—this is the object of religious instruction. They are exclusively intended and adapted to accomplish this. Christian character, by means of them, imbeds such an indiment as best harmonizes with itself, assimilates it, buds, uncurls, puts out itself according to the laws of its own being, and becomes a splendid illustration of the infinite and eternal mind in which alone it is to be found—the original type of its existence.

All the arrangements of the Christian scheme harmonize with this, its end—all its provisions have put on their very surface this design—namely, to bring out into full-blown expansion what was first put into the heart as a primary and elemental seed. The very sphere we are made to occupy—that which we are compelled to know, and that which it is determined we shall not know—vicissitudes, physical and moral—whims of every description—trials of every order—every thing which is without ourselves—every thing which by any possibility can be made to touch our minds—may be looked upon simply as the compost out of which for practical piety to draw sap, and acquire fibre, and fetch the sustenance which may aid it in disclosing the latent beauty of its form, the erst veiled loveliness of its latent hues.

The voluntary principle is in exquisite keeping with the general tone of these arrangements. It unites something more than instruction—it gives education—it stimulates the subducing tendencies of the inner man—put it, if we may so speak, upon trial, and thereby exercises, invigorates, matures it. It addresses itself perpetually to the legitimate impulses of character which religion evermore superinduces. That principle of moral life which Christianity begets in the heart, slowly it may be, but progressively evolves under the influence of this system, displays its essential vitality, and manifests its latent power. And this is the special virtue of it—one of its main characteristics. It bequeaths to the church no fortune when by all necessity for her own exertions are superseded. It does far better. It rather makes her acquainted with the strength of her own powers, teaches her the proper use of them, familiarizes her with the pleasure to be derived from their lengthened exercise, leads her forth to becoming spheres in which to give increasing play to her own activities; and, by such training, aids the life within her in embosoming itself in a firm of surpassing loveliness. The church thus becomes comparatively independent of the accident of her own position. She is her own dowry. Her strength is within herself. Her prosperity flows from a fountain which nothing but her own unfaithfulness can seal up. She becomes, accordingly, a glorious expansion or embodiment of Christian excellence. All the beauty of heaven's own truth finds expression in her form and countenance. Dignity sits upon her brow. Tenderness looks forth from her eyes. Firmness is seen in the compression of her lips. Upon her cheeks there is the glow of purity, the bloom of health. And, radiant from all her features, beams forth the spirit of high, sacred, and unutterable love.

It will be observed that, in the preceding paragraph, we have changed the figure for convenience' sake, but we have retained the idea with which we started. Christian institutions are framed with a view to develop the latent energies of Christian virtue. Their primary end is to cause religious character to evolve itself, and by means of its attractions thus fully developed and most energetically displayed, to win the world to willing obedience. The mode of their support must necessarily be in harmony with their object. The voluntary principle is so, and the voluntary principle only. The conclusion is obvious.

From Professor Schmucker's Appeal.

SECTARIAN IDOLATRY.

The next source of alienation among Christians is what may be termed *sectarian idolatry* or *man-worship*, inordinate veneration for distinguished theologians, such as Luther, Calvin, Zuingli, Wesley, and others. What could man, possess-

ing any extensive acquaintance with the literature of past ages, can deny that the deference awarded to the opinions and practice of these men is altogether inordinate, entirely beyond what is due to the merits of other men, and far above the measure of their actual superiority. Protestants justly censure the Romish church for reposing such confidence in the authority of the ancient fathers—that is, of distinguished theologians of the first four or five centuries of the Christian church. Yet it may be doubted whether some Protestants have not inadvertently conceded to some of these modern fathers an influence somewhat similar, possibly in a few cases even equal in degree. The names of these good and great, yet fallible men, have become identified with certain distinguishing non-fundamental doctrines which they held, and by which they were distinguished from others. Their authority and influence, acquired by their zeal and success in behalf of the common Christianity, are thus often used as a shield of protection for the minor peculiarities. The very designation of these peculiarities by personal names, calls into play sectarian associations, and minister feelings, and is a kind of covert appeal to the authority of these fathers.

Moreover, each sect is prone to cultivate almost exclusively the literature of its own denomination. Enter the theological schools, or the private libraries of ministers, and you will find that generally Lutherans, and Calvinists, and Episcopalians, and Baptists, and Methodists, devote most of their time to the study of authors of their own denominations; and this peculiarity may also be distinctly traced in the libraries of many lay Christians. Many of these distinguished servants of God would have grieved to think of the sectarian use which posterity has made of their names and literary labors. Listen to the language of Luther, whose name and works were, for two centuries especially, thus employed in Germany for purposes of strife: "I had cherished the hope, that henceforth men would apply to the Holy Scriptures themselves, and let my books alone; as they have now accomplished their end, and have conducted the hearts of men to the Scriptures, which was my design in writing them. What profit is there in the making of many books, and yet remaining ignorant of the book of books? Better far to drink out of the fountain itself, than out of the little rivulets which have conducted you to it."—Whoever now wishes to have my books, I entreat him by no means to let them be an obstacle to his studying the Scriptures themselves, but let him look upon my books as I do on the decretals of the Popes and the books of the sophists—that is, though I occasionally look into them to see what they performed, and to examine the history of the times, I by no means study them under the impression that I must do as they teach."† Yet there is reason to fear that some good men have, by early and long-continued training, become so much accustomed to test and value their views rather as being Lutheran or Calvinistic than biblical—have so long been in the habit of dwelling on the conformity of their sentiments to those of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, or some other worthy of the church, that they would feel deeply distressed, and almost lost, if these names were wrested from them! In the spirit of such sectarianism we might commiserate the condition of the primitive disciples, whose Christianity was based on the Savior alone! We might exclaim, "Unhappy Paul! thou hadst no Luther, nor Calvin, nor Wesley to glory in, whose name thou couldst bear in addition to that of Christ!" But were such the feelings of Paul? He might himself have been a Luther, a Calvin, a Wesley, his name the watchword of a sect; but the noble-minded Paul would glory only in Christ. He would not allow the adoption of any sectarian name in the church. Sectarian names and party divisions he denounced as carnal.

"Therefore," said he, "let no man glory in men, for they are all yours, [they are all the property of the whole church,] whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, [and we may add Luther, and Calvin, and Wesley;] all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. So then [argues] let a man consider as [me and Apollos, &c.] as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God [but not as leaders of parties.]"† He would have all believers called Christians, and only Christians. All that this name implied he wished to be, and neither more nor less. Happy day, when this spirit shall return to the church! Then she may celebrate a jubilee, a glorious jubilee; and it will literally be, not a centennial, but a millennial jubilee. The last thousand years will have witnessed but one!

Nor would we pass in silence a collateral evil, resulting from the almost exclusive cultivation of sectarian literature. As this literature is all of a date subsequent to the Reformation, its perusal impresses the Protestant laity with the modern origin of our churches, and leaves them in almost total darkness as to our real identity with the church of the earlier ages. Hence our people are unduly impressed by the Romish claim to superior antiquity, and an advantage is conceded to Papists of which they cunningly avail themselves. If Protestants selected their literature prominently from among the different sects, according to the intrinsic merits of the writers, it would tend much to promote actual unity and mutual esteem among themselves; and if, both in their literature and creeds, they gave greater prominence to their identity with the primitive church, they would make the laity feel their connexion with the Christians of the earlier centuries, and thus nullify the most popular argument by which Papists proselyte Protestant members.

† Luther's Deutsche Werke, b. 14, p. 172.

† Luther's Deutsche Werke, b. 14, s. 120.

† 1 Cor. 3, 21—23: 1.

DONATIONS AND PAYMENTS

FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR UP TO AUGUST 1, 1870

Of J. Atwater, Lockport, 0.25; T. Atwater, do. 0.25; F. Gregory, do. 0.50; J. Roberts, do. 0.50; R. T. A. Alby, do. 0.25; Raphael Gregory, do. 0.25; L. Alwater, do. 0.25; Edgar Gregory, do. 0.25; B. S. Kuegele, do. 0.25; H. O. Gregory, do. 0.25; A. Craw, do. 0.25; J. W. Alby, do. 0.25; M. D. Hovy, Canastota, 0.50; F. Stone, Jr., W. Brookfield, Mass., 1.00; O. Thompson, Sanquoit, 1.00; O. Miner, Penn Yan, 1.00; A. W. Riky, Rochester, 0.50; B. Greene, Hecoy, 1.00; Mrs. Anna Mott, Rochester, 1.00; Edgar Gillart, Hecoy, 1.00; A. Henry, do. 0.25; R. Woolford, Pompey, 0.50; E. Bishop, do. 0.50; L. Wells, do. 0.50; J. Jackson, Waterville, 0.50; C. Horton, Stockbridge, 0.50; S. Thompson, N. Woodstock, 0.50; L. Lee, Syracuse, 0.50; W. Barker, do. 0.50; S. Giffy, Canton, 0.50; S. Ward, Camillus, 0.50; J. P. Kibbourn, Princeton, Mass. 1.00; S. D. Darling, Canastota, Mass. 1.00; T. Stringham, Canandaigua, 1.00; J. Mosher, do. 3.00; H. Gilbert, Richmond, 10.00; F. Hartwell, Oka Corners, 0.50; H. P. Prentiss, Tyrone, 1.00; S. Howe, Phelps, 0.50; I. D. Casey, Fowlersville, 0.50; G. W. Clark, Victor, 0.33; E. French, Ogden, 0.50; G. Fortune, Adams' Basin, 0.50; J. Whetstone, Dedham, Mass., 0.50; P. Grimshaw, Tyre, 0.50; B. Seckell, Seneca Falls, 0.50; A. Buxcom, do. 0.50; J. Baldwin, E. Cayuga, 0.50; P. Baldwin, Sennett, 0.50; D. R. Stone, do. 0.50; C. W. Hyatt, Auburn, 0.50; Abigail Kinne, Woodsport, 0.50; C. Morris, 0.50; W. Richards, 0.50; S. Hoyt, Jack's Reef, 0.50; J. H. Ransom, do. 0.50; H. Norton, do. 0.50; H. Barton, Seneca Falls, 0.50; papers sold, 0.16.

Amount, 42.4

Commissions and outstanding in hands of agts. 6.0

Net Receipts, \$36.80—

FRANCIS SHEPARD, PRINTER, 22 STATE-ST. ROCHESTER

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, [NEW SERIES.]

Twelve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly,
or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers,
\$2.00, always in advance and free of postage.

IF any person who will procure *five* subscribers, and forward
the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy
of his services;—Or, if procuring *six* subscribers, shall have
two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring *ten* subscribers,
shall have *four* copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the
set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, \$1.50 Sixty papers, \$2.00
Twenty-eight papers for 1.00 One hundred papers for 3.00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

IF Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE VIII.

RELIGION AND POLITICS—THE RE- LATION BETWEEN THE CHURCH AND THE STATE.

PREVAILING DELUSIONS.

Not a step can be taken by good men towards
rebuking wickedness in high places, and especial-
ly in the direction of wielding their own powers
and honoring their own responsibilities, as citi-
zens, in the election of good rulers, and breaking
the yoke of oppression—without rousing against
them the clamors of the thoughtless and the de-
signing, who, with one loud voice, vociferate,
"CHURCH AND STATE! CHURCH AND STATE!"

And this clamor is still more confidently uter-
ed, when the same men who are engaged in re-
forming despotic abuses in the STATE, adventure
likewise to demand a corresponding reform in
the CHURCH, and when, in their specifications of
the sins of which the Church needs to repent,
they distinctly enumerate the active participation
of Church members in the despotic legislation
of the country—their support of unjust rulers at
the polls—the backwardness of teachers of re-
ligion to espouse and vindicate the cause of hu-
man rights, and to give utterance to the Divine
declarations of displeasure against oppressive and
wicked rulers. "What," they demand, "can the
churches and the ministry have to do with po-
litics, in a country where there is no national
church establishment, where the community de-
precate clerical interference in public concern-
ments, and consider it evidence of a latent de-
sire to unite the Church with the State, and
bring us under the control of the priesthood?"

It is in consequence, partly, of these clamors
that many ministers decline espousing the cause
of the oppressed. It is regarded as a *political*
question; and with *politics*, they have been led
to conclude, the clergy must not interfere.
Whenever satan can contrive to get any sin sanc-
tioned by the laws of the State, that sin is,
henceforth, beyond the reach of clerical rebuke,
because the clergy must let political questions
alone!

This doctrine of clerical silence concerning
wickedness perpetrated by civil government is
sometimes carried so far, and urged on such
grounds, as to make the clergy the vassals and
tools of the civil ruler; thus introducing, in one
of its worst aspects, that corrupt union of the
Church with the State—that subordination of the
priest to the despot, which those who cry out
against "Church and State" (if they are honest,

and if they would be successful) would do well
to examine.

This is done whenever it is maintained, (as it
often has been) that constitutions and compacts,
legal decisions and statutes, are of so binding and
authoritative a character, that good men and min-
isters must not oppose them—must not expose
their injustice, but on the other hand, must them-
selves actively enforce them, and carry them into
effect, while they continue to be the laws of the
land, however subversive they may be of human
rights—however unjust and oppressive—however
at variance with the dictates of conscience, the
interests of humanity, and the requirements of
God! By this atheistic doctrine, which teaches
us to obey *man* rather than God, the foundations
of all liberty, civil and religious, are subverted;
and yet it is a doctrine strenuously maintained
by thousands who very sensitively raise the cry of
"Church and State" whenever a minister of re-
ligion opens his mouth against oppression, and in
favor of liberty! In the united energies and
votes of professed Christians, in support of op-
pressors and tyrants, they see nothing alarming
—no tendencies towards "Church and State."
But only insist that ministers and Christians shall
speak and act in behalf of liberty and against ty-
ranny, and all their jealousies against the Church
and ministry are instantly roused.

Another delusion results, of necessity, from
the preceding. When the laws of God—in other
words, the great principles of eternal right (the
principles upon which human nature is construct-
ed, and God's providential government is ad-
ministered)—have ceased to be urged upon men
wielding civil power—when those principles no
longer control men in their political actions—
when statutes are enacted, and legislators elected,
and when public business of all sorts is conducted,
on the assumption that morality and religion have
nothing to do with politics, and that God takes no
cognizance of men's political conduct—*what is
the result?* What can it be, but that human
selfishness reigns unchecked; that falsehood and
deceit, that violence and fraud, that injustice and
oppression, pervade every department of political
life? *Politics become corrupt*, and men cease to
expect anything but corruption in political men.
And since politics are thus corrupt and corrupt-
ing, the *minister of religion* (through whose
guilty neglect the corruption of politics has be-
come thus proverbial) finds a *fresh reason* why he
should not meddle with politics! The contact
might endanger the purity of his reputation—
detract from the dignity of his profession—re-
duce the amount of his influence—disturb the
quiet of his meditations, and lower the standard
of his spirituality and religious feeling! And thus
his previous habit of neglecting to teach the po-
litical duties and reprove the political iniquities
of men is strengthened and confirmed.

The next result is, that the deacon and the lay
elder, as well as the minister, begin to talk of
the "dirty waters of politics." It may be true
that, in most cases, there is no remarkable cor-
respondency between the *words* and the *actions*.
On election days, you shall commonly see the
same men at the polls, voting eagerly with their
favorite parties, who have been loudest in depre-
cating the course of those who insist on carrying
their principles with them, wherever they go.
And very few clergymen have been known to
carry their holy horror of politics so far as to be-
tray no political preferences, and exert no polit-
ical influence. It is not so much the wickedness
or the danger of rushing eagerly into politics

that they are apparently afraid of, as it is the
wickedness and the danger of carrying the fun-
damental principles of morality with them into
politics, and acting there under their control.

And hence the pathetic exhortations so often
addressed to the friends of temperance and of the
enslaved, not to degrade and sully their benevo-
lent and holy enterprise by dragging it down into
"the dirty waters of politics!" And these ex-
hortations commonly come from those who are
themselves chin-deep in those same "dirty waters"
—from those whose disregard of fundamental mo-
rality, in their political activities, were sufficient
to make political waters dirty.

The bottom line of all this it were not difficult
to predict, had it not already become history.
With those who *honestly* and *consistently* carry
out the notion that ministers ought not to meddle
with politics, the road is a short and straight one.
If politics be too polluting for the minister, then
they are too polluting for the deacon—too pollut-
ing for the Christian—too polluting for any one
who intends to be a Christian—too polluting for
any man!

In other words, civil government is an institu-
tion of the devil! All this follows, of necessity,
from the notion that Christian ministers must not
meddle with politics. Declaim against each other
as they may, our hyper-spiritualists in the minis-
try, in their dignified reticence from political life,
are perfectly at one, *here*, with the apostles of dis-
organization and no civil government. The lat-
ter are but the consistent disciples of the former,
and in their dissuaves from political activity,
and their placing "moral suasion" in opposition
to the "executing of justice between a man and
his neighbor," their phraseology is almost exactly
the same.

THE MISCHIEFS AND THE ABSURDITY OF THESE ERRORS.

The harsh bearing of all this, upon reforma-
tory efforts, whether in the Church or in the State,
must be apparent to men of observation and reflec-
tion. "It is a moral question," says one, "do
not pollute it with politics." "It is a political
question," says another, "do not pollute the
churches with it." Just as though a moral ques-
tion could have no political bearings! Just as
though political questions could involve no moral
principles!

How can the State be reformed without any re-
ference to the moral principles by which the State
should be governed? Or how shall we conceive
of a reform in the Churches which shall leave
their members in the practice of all manner of
iniquity in their relations to the State? How
shall we conceive of the abolition of slavery,
without a repeal of the slave laws? Or how shall
laws be repealed without political action of some
sort, either in the judiciary, in the legislature, or
at the ballot-box?

To say that politics—that legislation must not
be employed against any moral evils, is to say
that we must have no penal code—no laws against
murder or theft, or against any invasion of human
rights—in other words, that there should be no
civil government at all!

Or, on the other hand, to say that the churches
and ministry must reprove no crimes that are to
be repressed by legislation, is to say they must
not reprove murder or arson, adultery or theft.

If Christianity, through her Church and min-
istry, must not reprove oppression, because op-
pression must be removed by legislation, then
Christianity may not lay claim to the merit of

having abolished slavery, or any other form of legislative tyranny. If oppression must not be preached against, then it must not be prayed against—though the members of the churches (as in America) may be in chains!

NECESSITY OF INVESTIGATION.

Such are some of the contradictions and absurdities resulting from the commonly prevalent notions of the relation of religion to politics, of the Church to the State. Such are some of the disorders and obstacles that, from this cause, prevail in society, cluster in the path of the reformer. It is easier to expose these absurdities, and even silence and confound their propagators, than it is to show them how they have been led into error, and help them to get out of it. Very manifestly the subject requires investigation; and whatever the result of the inquiry may be, it is equally manifest that the ministers of religion have a deep interest in ascertaining and propagating the truth respecting it. In no conceivable case can they be absolved from the responsibility of teaching their hearers their duty in respect to political concerns. If civil government be an ordinance of God, then the ministers of religion are, of all men, under the most solemn obligations to explain the nature of that institution, the relations men sustain to it, and the duties growing out of those relations. On the other hand, if civil government be a despotic usurpation—an invention of the evil one—then, of course, it becomes the duty of the spiritual watchman to discern the giant iniquity, and warn the people to stand wholly aloof from all connexion with, and participation in it—to hold no offices—to assist in elevating no man to office—and the churches, too, should be kept pure from the contamination of holding in their membership the men who can thus join in supporting an institution of satan.

Or if it be true that civil government is neither from above nor from beneath, that it is neither an institution of heaven, nor a device of the tempter, but a mere invention of men, which they have a right to use or to neglect using, at their discretion, as they would a steam engine or a railroad—it will still remain true, that in the use of it men will be under moral obligation to use it for benevolent, and not for selfish purposes—for the benefit, and not for the injury of their fellows, especially of the helpless. And whenever it is perverted, or used for purposes of mischief, it becomes the duty of the religious teacher to bear testimony against the mischief; just as he ought if the steam-engine, or any other piece of human mechanism, should be wielded for purposes of cruelty and murder. From preaching about politics in some way, so long as civil governments and politics exist, and so long as bad men have anything to do with them, the minister of religion, the teacher of human duty and the reprover of human wickedness, cannot be excused. The nature of politics, therefore, and their relation to religion and morals, must be, on many accounts, an important subject of inquiry.

THE PROBLEM STATED AND DISCUSSED.

What, then, are **POLITICS**? and what is **RELIGION**? What do we understand by the **CHURCH**? and what do we mean by the **STATE**? These questions we must intelligently answer, before we can answer the query "What has religion to do with politics?" or the query "What is the proper relation of the Church to the State?"

RELIGION has to do with men's **DUTIES**—ALL the duties of men. Its proper province is the **ENTIRE MAN**. All the activities of men it claims to control. He may not eat, he may not drink, he may not speak, he may not desire, he may not imagine—but in accordance with the dictates of religion; in other words, in accordance with the will of his Maker in accordance with the constructive principle of his constitution, the law

of his being, the reason and the moral sense implanted within him.

The doctrines of religion are the doctrines of human relations—the relations of man to his fellow man—the relations of man to his God. The precepts of religion are the statements of the duties growing out of these relations. The sanctions of religion are the rewards and penalties identified with the compliance or non-compliance of man with these precepts—with the laws of his social and moral being. It is the social and moral in man that religion takes cognizance of, and claims to guide and control. Religion, therefore, includes morals, or ethics—more properly and strictly speaking, perhaps, religion and morals, comprehensively considered and spiritually defined, as applied to time and to eternity—to all duration, to all space—including our relations to God and to man, and taking cognizance of the motive and the temper, as well as the visible act—religion and morals thus contemplated, we say, may be considered as one and the same thing. The Scriptures recognize no morality as distinct from religion. And why should they? What can deserve the name of morality, but conformity with the moral law—the law of God? And this is religion. "For what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" In other words, to honor all the relations we sustain to God and to all men—to exercise that love which is the fulfilling of the law.

To admit the claims of religion *anywhere*, is to admit them *everywhere*. If its authority be binding in *one* department of human activity, it is binding in *every* other department.

Such is religion. And the Church—What is that? "An assembly of faithful men"—men who honor their relations to God and their neighbors. The business of the Church and its teachers is to exemplify, to explain, and to urge upon the consciences of men the claims of their Creator, the claims of his law, the duties growing out of the relations men sustain to their Creator and to each other.

This is **RELIGION**, and this the **CHURCH**.

And what are **POLITICS**?—The **STATE**—What is that? Among the relations men sustain to each other, are their relations to the communities in which they reside. The family circle constitutes one of these communities. Will any pretend that religion and morality have nothing to do with the duties growing out of the family relation—that the Church must take no cognizance of these duties, or of the violation of them—that ministers of religion have nothing to do with explaining these relations, in exhorting to a discharge of these duties, and reproving the neglect of them?

The local neighborhood, the school district, the township, the village, the city, though more irregular, discretionary, and artificial in their construction, embody, nevertheless, the principle of the community, and on a larger scale than that of the family. The social nature, the mutual wants, and the necessary and desirable intercourse of man with man, and of family with family, create, of necessity, these larger communities, in which all men, whether in savage or in civilized life, (particularly the latter,) find themselves placed. Are there no duties growing out of the relations men sustain to these communities—no guilt in the neglect of these duties, the violation of these obligations? Is there nothing for morality and religion to do—nothing for the Church and the Christian ministry to do, in defining these relations, in urging and exemplifying the discharge of these duties, or in preventing, guarding against, avoiding, and reproving the neglect or violation of these duties and obligations?

Well, then, human society, as we all know, is to be recognized as existing on a broader scale than that of the local neighborhood, or city.

Yes; there is the tie that binds us to our entire race, of every language and clime. And it cannot be doubted that there are duties growing out of these comprehensive relations which we sustain to all men, to the most remote and obscure portions of our race. Religion, the Christian religion, has much to do with defining and enforcing our duties to "all the world" and to "every creature." This point we need not labor to establish, as it is not disputed by those in our times who deny the political relations and duties of men. So far from this, they are wont to dwell largely on our connection with the *entire race*, and they seem to infer that *these* swallow up so completely our duty to our country, that no room is left for any recognition of *political* relations.

But on what foundation can such an assumption be based? It is admitted by those men, that our connection with the entire race and our duties to all men, do not annihilate or render nugatory our connection with a particular family, and the duties growing out of the family relation. There are, certainly, very, very few whose notion of universal philanthropy would lead them to such an absurd and demoralizing conclusion. Nor will it be pretended, by those who deny political duties and relations, that we sustain no peculiar relations and owe no peculiar duties to those who reside in our own immediate neighborhood, with whom we hold personal intercourse, with whom, for various purposes, we have occasion to assemble, to consult, to negotiate, and to enter into arrangements, more or less extended, more or less definite, more or less permanent, more or less obligatory and binding.

But is it perfectly certain, that between the local neighborhood, settlement, hamlet, village, or township, on the one hand, and the universality of a common humanity on the other, there is no intermediate space, no connecting link, no gap to be filled up with other sets of relations and duties, more extensive than those of the neighborhood, but less extensive than those of the universal brotherhood? Do not oceans, continents, islands, rivers, and mountains, almost of necessity define the boundaries of different portions of the race? Do not the records of our species, as well as of our religion, recognize the fact that "of one blood" the Creator has made, not only all individuals and all families, but "all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth," and that, in his providential government, he has "determined the bounds of their habitations?" Varieties of language, modes of subsistence, usages, and habits, together with conventional arrangements growing out of man's social nature, mutual dependence, and wants—meet our eyes everywhere, as existing and undeniable facts.

Now, is it credible, we ask—is it even an intelligible proposition that there are no relations involved in our connection with "the nations" to which we belong—to the country in which we are born, or wherein we reside? and that there are no duties growing out of those relations? But if these be admitted, then we have an admission of **POLITICAL** relations and **DUTIES**; for the statement of national relations and duties is the statement of the very definition of political relations and duties. These are the precise things of which we speak, whenever we speak intelligently of political relations and duties.

NECESSARY RECOGNITION OF POLITICAL DUTIES.

It is instructive to notice, that those who have gone farthest in denying political duties and relations, are obliged, nevertheless, to recognize those relations—to take an interest in the questions of duty growing out of them—nay, to instruct and advise men, in respect to their political interests and duties.

Our anti-civil government men in this country, though declining, in some instances, to vote themselves, are exceedingly solicitous to influence the votes of others: witness their almost uniform

hostility to the "Liberty Party" of the Abolitionists. These men protest that it is an Abolitionist that they object to the policy, and because they think that mode of political action not adapted to the object in view. They indignantly disclaim the motive sometimes imputed to them, of seeking in this way to promote their non-government views, by bringing political action into contempt. Owing them credit for honorable motives and fair dealing in all this, it follows that (unconsciously to themselves, perhaps) they have their perceptions after all, more or less correct, of political relations and duties! More than this, they have no small degree of assurance in their own superior political sagacity and foresight. But whether opposed to the Liberty party or otherwise, (for some exceptions have been found,) no instance has ever yet been found of a non-government man or woman without strong political predilections and preferences, nor without a political influence on those around them. So true is it that God and nature have encircled us with political relations, and impressed upon us a sense of political duties, from a sense of which we can never escape, the consciousness of which we cannot but betray, and in some manner express.

The very existence of such organizations as the New England or Massachusetts Anti-Slavery, and the New England Non-Resistant Societies, sufficiently proves that the founders and leading members of these bodies (however they may theorize) understand the locality of their habitations, and understand, too, something of the relations and the duties with which that locality modifies, and shapes, of necessity, their active endeavors. They understand that they are in Massachusetts and in New England, that they have intercourse and connexion with Massachusetts and with New England men, that they have not and cannot have with the rest of their species—that, consequently, a corresponding modification of their duties to Massachusetts and to New England has to be recognized. In the matter of government, too, they seem, with few exceptions, to be quite as rigid as their neighbors, and sometimes follow with the heavy penalty of their denunciations those who voluntarily secede from these voluntary bodies. It is remarkable, too, that certain novel plans (whatever may be their merits or demerits) of social organizations for economical (that is, political) purposes—plans that commonly seem to go farther than any existing political institutions in merging the individual in the corporation, not unfrequently find favor with the theoretical abjurors of civil government!

We cite these instances, not as proofs of remarkable inconsistency, still less of duplicity or of insincerity, in these men. We refer to them in proof that political relations and duties are impressed upon all men, by the same Divine hand that impresses upon them the family relation and duties. The anti-civil government theorists are seen verging towards a civil government of their own, in some form, not because they are lunatics nor because they are hypocrites, but simply because they are men; and because, being men, their speculations cannot annihilate their nature. God-gifted, as they are, with a social nature; heaven-stationed, as they are, among well-defined portions of their race, and under the pressure of wants and aspirations common to all men—political relations and tendencies are, of necessity, manifested among them, of course, as they are, and must be, among all men.

THE ARGUMENT PURSUED.

The point of political relations and activities being thus established, as an existing and necessary fact, in human beings, the question returns, Whether activities corresponding with these relations shall be called duties—whether this field of necessary human activity is subject to the laws of our social existence, the laws of God, the great moral law? An affirmative answer to this ques-

tion tells us precisely what morality, or religion, has to do with politics! It affirms that religion gives law to political action—determines its nature and scope, its end and its aim, its instrumentalities and its methods.

And what grievance or mystery can be found in all this? The will of God established the family relation, and, in doing it, established the law of the family relation, which no man with humanity may violate. Just so with the relation of the individual to the neighborhood in which he resides. In all this we see no cause for alarm. But a community of neighborhoods composes a State, or a nation. Is the principle changed? Can anybody give a good reason why the laws of God—in other words, the principles of religion and morality—should not govern our actions, in our connection with the people of a State or a nation, as well as our actions in our connection with that smaller state called a family, or a neighborhood? or that larger community, the inhabitants of the entire globe, or the entire universe? How comes it to pass that people of common sense should ever dream of so strange a thing as that their political relations are not subject to the same moral law by which all their other social relations are governed?

PROFLIGACY, ON PRINCIPLE!

On any other principle, it would follow that we could not reason on any political subject, from the same moral principles to which we refer on all other occasions. We could not plead that such and such legislation (including slave legislation) was a violation of human rights—that this administration was unjust, or that was corrupt! No; these common modes of expression in respect to public business should be laid aside, (most certainly they should!) if the laws of morality and religion have nothing to do with politics. To commend one statesman as honest, and to condemn another as perfidious, becomes worse than nomenclature, more unintelligible than jargon, unless morality and religion hold rightful authority in the department of politics. An end to all political obligation follows, of course. Whenever we use the words *ought*, or *ought not*, whenever we apply the terms *right* and *wrong* to any political conduct, our words, if they mean anything, mean that men are morally accountable for their political conduct. How, else, can we call them to a moral account? Yet such is the instinctive language of all men when they feel themselves wronged. And most deeply is it to be lamented that some who prate of "the dirty waters of politics," and are full of cant exhortations to exclusive "moral suasion," can nevertheless lose sight of moral principle so much as to advise men, in their political activities, to calculate nothing but probable results, making no account of the morality of the proposed course to be pursued! While such moralists thus deal in "moral suasion," no wonder the waters of politics become filthy! Whether this is done by the ecclesiastical conservators of existing abuses, or by those who take the position of reformers, it is evident that their moral influence is most pestilential and deadly. No man of nice moral perception or close observation can doubt this. The frightful shipwrecks of moral integrity with which the coasts of political activity are everywhere strewed, as far as the eye can reach, may be traced distinctly to the sentiments embodied in such teachings. If those teachings are correct, there is nothing in political corruption deserving regret; for the latter is but

* See National Anti-Slavery Standard. We do not complain that this organ of the "American Anti-Slavery Society" is opposed to the "Liberty Party;" nor do we care to inquire, in this connection, whether it is so from old political predilections, from a sympathy with non-government leaders, or from some other cause. But when, in giving Abolitionists political advice, it openly avers at the possibility of political morality, and urges to the abject calculation of consequences, irrespective of moral right—it then comes down to the low level of the New York Observer, and other demoralizing prints, and deserves sharp rebuke.

the living embodiment of the former. No instances of political iniquity can be adduced in which the perpetrators have done anything worse, or anything else, than to follow implicitly such advice. It is always "on a calculation of present [or ultimate] availability," and without the application of moral rules to political conduct, that profligate politicians presume to prey upon the vitals of morality and humanity.

If we may judge of the tree by its fruits, we may assure ourselves that the doctrine of moral irresponsibility, in political affairs, is a doctrine of the evil one. On the very face of it, and without stopping to trace further its effects, it carries the mark of atheism and sin. A man claims, (does he?) that in one department of his activity he recognizes no moral law, he holds himself under no obligation to do right, he stops not to inquire after the will of his Maker! All this, of course, he emphatically and distinctly enunciates whenever he says that religion has nothing to do with politics.

If called upon, from any quarter, to make exceptions to this sweeping statement, we shall demand a sight of the man who holds no political relations, expresses no political opinions, gives no political advice, and exerts no political influence. When such a man can be found, it will be in season to consider his claim of exemption from the remark we have made. Every other man who says that "religion has nothing to do with politics," says, in effect, that integrity has nothing to do with his own character. He may not understand the meaning of the language he utters. He may be better, in reality, than his own testimony would make him. It nevertheless remains true, that, in a man who expresses any political opinions or gives any political advice, the denial of religious or moral obligation in political concerns is a disclaimer of moral obligation and responsibility in his own political conversation or writings. It is a proclamation to all who hear him, "When I give you political advice—(understand me!)—I hold myself under no manner of obligation to be truthful—I disavow the impression of any accountability to the Being who made me!"

Such, soberly interpreted, is the true import of the current sentiment, that "religion has nothing to do with politics." And it must be confessed, that by far the greater part of those who give it countenance exhibit melancholy evidence, in their own conduct, that in their political course (including the political advice of some ministers, and some non-government men who are too holy to vote,) they are under none of the moral restraints by which moral beings should be governed. If instances in point are demanded, it were sufficient to cite the circulation complacently given by some non-government men to such jesuitical arguments in favor of pro-slavery voting (in preference to anti-slavery voting) as have found a place in the National Anti-Slavery Standard: putting this by the side of the clergyman (likewise a professed Abolitionist) whose holy dread of a political Anti-Slavery Convention, lest it should soil his priestly garments with the "dirty waters of politics," and "reduce the spirituality and religious feeling of his flock," was finally coupled with the earnest desire that the Convention (since some of his brethren would attend it, notwithstanding his pious dissuasions) "might be permitted to do nothing prejudicial to the political prospects of—Henry Clay!"

This we call *profligacy on principle*; for, starting with the dogma that "religion has nothing to do with politics"—all this, and more too, follows of course.

But if religion has to do with politics, and gives law to political activity—then political activities are to be reckoned among duties, and political relations are Heaven-sanctioned—Heaven-framed: for moral principles do not busy themselves with

nonentities; God's laws do not take cognizance of relations that exist only in men's imaginations.

BIBLICAL POLITICS.

Here, as everywhere else, the Bible is found to correspond with existing facts—with the unalterable and undeniable nature of things. Few persons, probably, are aware how large a portion of the Bible is occupied with politics—with political history, political maxims, political institutions, directions for regulating political conduct, for conducting popular elections, enacting, executing, and repealing laws; directions for the ruler, directions for the ruled; political promises, political threatenings, political predictions. For the present, we can but hastily classify and allude to a few specimens.

1. **POLITICAL HISTORY.**—The origin and history of ancient nations. It is to the Bible that the student of political history must look for the most venerable political records of the past. And everywhere the Supreme Ruler of the Nations is represented as interested in their affairs—as giving them laws, by which their political conduct should be regulated—of rewarding a conformity with these laws, and punishing violations of them—as raising up empires, and casting them down—as moulding and wielding them for the promotion of his providential designs, for the high purposes of his moral government, and the interests of his spiritual kingdom.

One nation was selected, in a special manner, and placed directly under his own legislative as well as providential supervision. What lessons of political wisdom are wrapped up in the history of that people! And the surrounding nations—all nations are represented as subject to the same general laws, as rising to glory or sinking into infamy, according to their regard or disregard of those laws.

2. **POLITICAL MAXIMS.** How profusely and richly are these scattered throughout the sacred pages! In the writings of Moses, of David, of Solomon, of the prophets, of the historians of the kings of Israel and Judah. The careful student of the book of Proverbs has learned deeper and more comprehensive lessons of political economy than can be found in all the volumes of all the Adam Smiths, and Malthuses, and Jeremy Ben-thams that have ever blotted clean paper, and darkened counsel by words without knowledge. The most sagacious statesmen of our own age, and of all ages, are, and have been, those who have most diligently studied the Scriptures. And the precise points wherein even these statesmen have failed of being wise and great, are the same points wherein they have departed from the Scriptures.

3. **POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS.** Notice the full statements of the Hebrew historian and lawgiver. Among many things peculiar, local, and transient, observe much more that is comprehensive, universal, ever-during. As long as man lives on the earth, and has a social nature, it will hold true that all this Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable for instruction in righteousness, that men of God may be perfected in good works.

4. **POLITICAL DIRECTIONS.**—First, How to elect rulers: "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee, in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes, and they shall judge the people with just judgment." (Deut. xvi. 18.)

Second, Qualifications of rulers: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." (2 Sam. xxiii. 3.)

Third, The proper province and business of civil rulers: "They shall judge the people with just judgment." [See above.] "Execute judgment between a man and his neighbor." (Jer. vii. 6.) "Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor." (Jer. xxi. 12.) "Rulers are a terror, not to good works, but to the evil." "For he is the

minister of God to thee, for good"—"a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." "For they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." (Rom. xiii. 3-6.)

In other words, they are to guard inviolable human rights. This is their sole business, the extent of their authority, beyond and beside which they are not authorized to intermeddle with human affairs. This accords with the language of Jefferson:

"The true foundation of Republican Government is the equal rights of every citizen, in his person and property, and in their management."

"The rightful power of all legislation is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and take none of them from us. No man has a natural right, to commit aggression on the equal rights of another, and this is ALL from which the law ought to restrain him. Every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of society, and this is all the law should enforce upon him. When the laws have declared and enforced this, they have fulfilled their function."

"The idea is quite unfounded, that on entering into society we give up any natural right."

[The reader will judge whether human liberty would be endangered by the presence of a church and ministry, by whom the duties of civil government, as thus explained, should be religiously taught! But how can Bible religion be taught without inculcating such lessons? "The natural rights and duties" of all men are not more clearly the "foundation of republican government" than they are of the Christian religion. How, then, can the two be separated from each other!]

Fourth, The duty of the citizen: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." (Rom. xiii. 1.)—That is, to such authorities as, in the same connexion, are described, authorities that are "not a terror to good works, but to the evil," &c. (See the foregoing.)

5. **POLITICAL PROMISES AND THREATENINGS.**

"The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his throne shall be established for ever." (Prov. xxix. 14.) "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." (Prov. xiv. 34.)

"Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that there be none to quench it, because of the evil of your doings." (Jer. xxi. 12.) "Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come, now, and let us reason together: saith the Lord, though your sins shall be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isa. i. 17-19.) "I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning. Afterward, thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city. Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness." (Ibid. 26, 27.) "Let the oppressed go free—break every yoke." "Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thy health shall spring forth speedily." "And they that shall be of thee shall build the old waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations, and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in." (Isa. lviii. 6, 8, 12.) "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall utterly be wasted." (Isa. lx. 12.)

6. **POLITICAL RELIGION!** "Did not thy father eat and drink, and do judgment and justice? and then it was well with him. He judged the cause of the poor and needy—then it was well with him: Was not this to know me? saith the Lord." (Jer. xxii. 15, 16.) "The cause which I knew not, I searched out, and I brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his

teeth." (Job xxix. 16, 17.) This act of political justice was Job's successful vindication of his religious integrity against his accusers, and God's voice out of the whirlwind attested his triumphant defence. And Nehemiah, after having convened a political assembly of the people, rebuked the nobles and rulers for their political oppressions, and by these means procured a political reformation of these abuses, devoutly ejaculates, "Think upon me, my God, for good, according to all that I have done for this people." (Neh. v.)

7. **POLITICAL PREDICTIONS.** To give a fair specimen of these would be to transcribe a great portion of all the prophetic writings. They are to be found copiously in Deuteronomy, in Daniel, in Isaiah, and in the Revelations of John. Jesus Christ himself uttered them, in addition to his discharge and inculcation of political duties. Hear it, ye clerical pretenders to a holiness that cannot preach politics—that cannot mingle with politics! Are ye more holy than Moses—than Daniel—than John—than Isaiah—than Jesus Christ! But these predictions include,

8. **A POLITICAL MILLENNIUM.** Some may call this a "carnal millennium," while they themselves are so carnal as to be incapable of recognizing any coming of Christ, except a coming in the flesh! The spiritual reign of Christ on the earth, for a thousand years, will include his spiritual and moral reign over the nations. "The kingdoms of this world [earthly kingdoms, political kingdoms] shall become the kingdom [plural] of our Lord and of his Christ." (Rev. xi. 15.) They will be spiritually controlled by his laws. And the predicted effects are thus stated: "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it." "And he shall judge among the nations, and rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning hooks, [shall exchange military for agricultural pursuits]—nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isa. ii. 2, 4.) This could not be said if distinct nations were not to exist. Furthermore, political rights are to be recognized and enjoyed. "And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob." "And they shall sit every man under his vine, and under his fig-tree, and none shall make them afraid." Slavery will be abolished, every oppression and encroachment upon human rights will cease, and all men enjoy the fruits of their own labors. To this same point of national along with individual reform, of political as a part of moral and of spiritual renovation, all the prophets bear witness.

"Thou shalt be a father of many nations" (Gen. xvii. 4, 5, compared with Rom. iv. 17, 18.) "He shall smite under the nations under our feet." Psalm xlvii. 3. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Isa. lii. 15. "Many nations shall be joined to the Lord." Zech. ii. 11. "Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord." Ibid. viii. 22, &c., "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it." Rev. xxi. 24. "And they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it." Ib. 26. "Cause thy face to shine upon us, that thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations." Ps. lxxvii. 1, 2. "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him." Ps. lxxii. 11. "All nations shall call him blessed." Ib., 17. "Arise, O God! judge the earth, for thou shalt inherit all nations." Ps. lxxxii. 6. "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name." Ps. lxxxvi. 9. "He will destroy the veil that is

over all nations." Isa. xlv. 7. "And all nations shall serve him." Jer. xxvii. 7. "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages should serve him." Dan. vii. 14. "And the desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with my glory." Hag. ii. 7. "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all nations." Mark xiii. 10. "Go ye, and teach all nations." Matt. xxviii. 19. "Made known to all nations, for the obedience of the faith," Rom. xvi. 26. "In thee shall all nations be blessed," Gal. iii. 8, as quoted from Gen. xlviii. 18—"All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him." "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart." Jer. iii. 17.

The intelligent reader will have observed, in these citations, political prayers, political praises, political devotion, political worship! And the political poetry of the Scriptures—what shall we say of that? The song of Deborah, the song of Miriam, the songs of David—aye, and then the song of Moses and of the Lamb! Do Christians expect to sing that? A song of praise for political deliverances, political judgments. Rev. xv. 3, 4. A similar specimen may be found in the 136th Psalm, which, to be fairly quoted, should be presented entire. The returning chorus celebrates the ever-during mercy of God to the human race, in the early and signal overthrow of ancient political tyrants: thus holding them up as a warning beacon to distant nations and coming ages, for the better protection and security of human rights, to the end of time. Eternity, perhaps, may reveal to us how truly the civil and religious liberties we now enjoy come to us through the moral and political influences of that glorious song.

ANTI-POLITICAL SCEPTICISM.

No marvel that some, along with their political notions and duties, have thrown aside, likewise, their Bibles.* The cause of a truly spiritual Christianity would lose nothing, if, in this movement, they should be joined by some scores of those dignified ecclesiastics whose contempt and neglect of their political duties has paved the way for all the "no-governmentism" and "disorganization" they profess to repudiate. But of what use will it be for them to get rid of their Bibles, unless they can shake off, at the same time, the spiritual natures God gave them, and dis sever themselves from "the nations" in which he has fixed the bounds of their habitations?"

SHALLOW PHILOSOPHY.

Not less unphilosophical than unscriptural is the theory that would divorce religion and morality from politics. Who does not know that, as a matter of fact and a matter of necessity, the religion of every nation under heaven gives shape and character to its political institutions? Where do you find the security of human rights and the enjoyment of civil and religious freedom, to any appreciable degree or extent, except among a people who, to the same degree and extent, recognize a religion that defines human rights, and prohibits aggressions upon them? Or where will you find a nation enslaved amid the controlling influences of a religion of freedom?

The student of a dim and distant antiquity need waste his time in hunting up parchments and papyrus in order to learn the political condition of a people, provided he can but ascertain the character of the current religion of that country. It will tell him what the statute book was, and what the security of the citizen. Or, on the

other hand, if he happens, in the first place, to light upon the documentary evidences of these latter particulars—if he has thus learned the moral character of the statute-book and the political condition of the citizen, he can tell beforehand, and without any further historical research, what was the character of the prevalent religion of that people.

Harshly as this rule may bear upon the current religion of modern Europe and of America, the rule nevertheless holds good, and Bible Christianity need not tremble for the issue. It is the actually prevalent religion—the practical, not the professed nor the theoretical, religion of a country that controls it. The prevalent, the dominant religion of Europe and America is not Christianity, but its impudent counterfeit. The actual religion of Europe does breathe through its statute-books—does show itself in its feudal arrangements—its grim restrictions of liberty and free thought. And just so the actual religion of the Slave States—nay, of the U. States—the prevalent, the controlling religion of this country, is fairly expressed in the bloody pages of the slave code! And those who mean to have and maintain a different religion, must separate from the promiscuous religious sects of this country.

When we say "the prevalent," "the controlling" religion of a country, we mean to recognize the fact that a sound religion may exist—does exist—in countries politically despotic and corrupt—exist among the minority, or among those who hold not the power—exist among the victims, and not among the perpetrators of political rapacity. What we mean to affirm is, that every nation has its prevailing, its controlling religion—the religion of those who govern the State; and that the moral character of this religion decides of necessity, and invariably, the political character of the government. And we say, too, that the obviousness of this fact stamps with shallowness, no to say lunacy, the idle prattle that "religion has nothing to do, or ought to have nothing to do, with politics!" Religion has everything to do with politics. Every nation, every government, on the face of the earth, is, has been, will be, cannot but be, precisely what the dominant religion of that nation makes it. Religion (good or bad religion) consists in action—moral action—social action. But politics comprise one of the most comprehensive and important fields of that same moral and social action! How then can you even conceive, distinctly, of a religion that did not exhibit itself in politics, or of politics that did not directly spring from the very vitals of some sort of religion? You cannot. No man can, or ever did? Atheism may prate its idle words; but man is a religious being. Some sort of a religion he will have, and that religion will show itself in his actions—his political actions.

AN OBJECTION.

And this suggests a ready answer to an objection sometimes raised against our doctrine that the religion of a country always controls its political destiny. "Why," exclaims the objector, "the prominent religionists of our country always follow in the wake of the political aspirants, and bow down at their bidding. How, then, can the latter be moulded by the former? Is it not the politics of the country that control its religion, and not its religion its politics?"

The objector forgets that the religionists he describes have been acting out their religion, all the while, in the very conduct he describes. "Their god is their belly. They mind earthly things." And no religionists are more zealous or more successful in making proselytes than they are. The "prevailing" religion of the country has been shaped and moulded by them and their kin. Or the religion they exemplify has—if you please—inspired and given character to them. The politicians described in the objection have formed their characters in the atmosphere of the same

religion of which these men are the fit priests and professors. Why should they not bow down to the work of their own hands—to the idols they have themselves framed and set up? Surely, it must be a part of their religion, such as it is, to do this!

CHURCH AND STATE!

And this may give us a clue to the true secret of those Church-and-State unions which so many very justly, though oftentimes blindly, abjure and condemn—giving countenance, unconsciously, to the very things in which such corrupt conspiracies against God and humanity consist—and then crying out, at the top of their lungs, "Church and State! Church and State!" against all who would counteract the influence they are exerting.

What is it that intelligent friends of liberty dread in a union of Church and State? What is the union of which wise and good men should be afraid? Is it the natural, the healthful, the necessary control of true religion—of just views and an honest regard of human rights, human relations, human duties, and moral obligations, over the political transactions of men? Certainly not. For this, and nothing else, can secure civil and religious freedom. Can they dread, then, the influence of those religious teachers and assemblies (or churches) in which these just principles and honest practices are exemplified, taught, and explained? This, certainly, cannot be credible. What is it, then, that we are to regard as an iniquitous and mischievous union of Church and State? The establishment, by law, of a national, or State religion, is the evil to be deprecated, is it not? The enforcement of a religious creed, or form of worship, by the secular arm. That one particular instance in which God himself, (not fallible human rulers,) saw fit, for peculiar reasons and for a limited period, to exhibit the experiment of a prescribed form of national worship, we leave out of the argument; as no general rules are to be drawn from particular exceptions, especially where the cases are not parallel.

What is it, then, that lies at the bottom of those mischievous arrangements which we witness in the modern nations of Europe, and of which we have had some temporary and partial illustrations in our own country? What is the essence of the evil? To what latent causes may they be traced? And what resemblance can there be found between that proper connection of religion with politics which we have approvingly described, and the Church-and-State unions with which modern nations have been cursed?

We have been insisting that a corrupt and despotic religion produces, of necessity, a corrupt and despotic state. Christianity had given place to a spiritual despotism, which had assumed its name, before there was any union of Church and State. This it was that ascended the throne of the Cæsars, and preyed upon the vitals of humanity. The same mischief, more or less aggravated, has been perpetuated to our own times. Here, then, we have a corroboration of our doctrine. A pure religion would not have done this. Its connection with the State, and its power over it, would have been of a different form as well as character—for the character of a religion moulds, of necessity, its form, at least to a certain extent. A pure religion, controlling all the natural relations of society, by its own inherent energies—by its hold on the thoughts, desires, affections, purposes, and aims; controlling thus the political activities of men, and doing this by the natural influence of its own life-giving spirit, its own enlightening truths, and its own sublime sanctions—could have had no occasion to call in the puny aid of the secular arm to its assistance. Itself giving law to the State, in its own name and under its own exhibitions of motive, it could not consent to be defined by the State, controlled by it, and made the tool of a ghostly tyranny.*

* The difference, one would think, must be heaven-wide be-

No! it is, emphatically, when the vitality of religion has departed—when its *rituals* usurp the place of its *spirit*—when, by a monopoly of these rituals, along with the right of religious instruction, a priestly caste enthrones itself in the place of God, showing itself as God—when fundamental morality is accounted nothing, and a compliance with the prescribed *ritual* everything—when the latter is superstitiously deified as exclusively *sacred*, and the homely, every-day duties growing out of man's natural, healthful, God-established relations and necessities, are profanely contemned and despised as *secular*—when the minister at the altar must not soil his lily fingers with degrading labor, and the laboring man must first bleach his countenance by holy idleness before he can become spiritual enough to proclaim the gospel of the despised carpenter—when a priesthood, thus trained, have learned to sympathize with a proud aristocracy, and partake of their contempt of the poor—to identify themselves with the oppressor instead of the oppressed—to hold great truths “in the abstract,” and brand as “fanatics” those who honestly practice them—to exalt expediency into duty, the calculation of consequences into obedience, and gain into godliness—when such a priesthood, self-created, self-regulated, self-perpetuated, and holding, officially, legislatively, and judicially, the keys of the church, affect a devout dread of “the dirty waters of politics,” while they cringe to the most profligate and despotic statesmen in the land, lending them their influence and their aid, receiving their support and influence in return—when, refusing to plead for the oppressed, they conspire with the oppressor in plodding the *expatriation* of “the most troublesome” among the wronged, for the greater *security* of the wrong-doer—when they stir up mobocratic violence and invoke legislative persecution against the reprovers of oppression—when they quietly witness the results of their own misdoings, till (with no remonstrance on their part) the entire nation loses, unconsciously and unlearned, even the *right of petition*, when, at such a crisis, they can dole out their canting exhortations to their flocks, dissuading them, in the name of gospel holiness, from any political efforts to secure or to regain their own freedom—when they can bid them beware how they “disturb the peace of the churches” by reproving tyrants, and “reduce the tone of their own spirituality” by preaching “deliverance to the captives,” “executing judgment between a man and his neighbor,” and choosing men to rule over them who are just, “ruling in the fear of God”; when these things, we say, are witnessed among a so-called Christian and Republican people, when they are witnessed without general alarm—above all, when the effort to restore or preserve liberty, by the influence of a liberty-loving Christianity, is met and repelled by the insane cry of “*Church and State!*” then, indeed, it may be apprehended, that a Church-and-State union of the worst character, *already existing*, in fact, may be quite as near to the point of taking a permanent form, as the most sensitive have ever conceived, though the danger may come from a quarter which few in the community have suspected.

We have drawn a picture. If any among the prominent clergy of America claim it as their own, or if their friends and admirers claim it on their behalf, they have our leave to hang it up in their parlors, gilt-framed, if they please. We can multiply copies of the print to any assignable extent, if they are ordered.

If any among us should suppose it impossible for any of the prominent clergy of America to

ride rough-shod over the liberties and over the necks of the great mass of the people—to do this in company with the most unprincipled and godless of politicians, whose lips utter horrid imprecations and profane oaths—to do this greedily, while the best men in community are forced to fly from the State, or be thrust, without judge or jury, into foul prisons, for no crime but the constitutional vindication of their rights—to do this while pious Christians, by scores and hundreds, including exemplary ministers and almost entire churches, are numbered among their victims—to do this by the joint force of pulpit eloquence, church authority, university influence, and power of musket and bayonet, personally shouldered by clergymen in the ranks of aristocratic rebellion against a government lawfully and peacefully organized by a known majority of the people—to do this under the pretended fear of a military despotism, and of lawless violence, and then establishing, themselves, a military despotism whose acts of lawless violence were sufficient to mantle with blushes the cheeks of barbarians—to do this at the bidding of the slave power, lest slaves should claim their rights as well as northern freemen—to do and consummate all this with public *Te Deums* and *Thanksgivings* for success, and the publication of *Thanksgiving Discourses*—to do all this without the rebuke, nay, with the tacit or express approbation of all, or nearly all, the prominent religious journals of the principal sects in the nation—if any, we say, should doubt the possible occurrence, in Republican America, of such scenes as these, *let them ask the MAJORITY OF THE WORKING MEN IN RHODE-ISLAND.*

And when the testimony of the laboring population of Rhode-Island is weighed and digested, then, and in view of the suggestions in this lecture, let it be determined *WHAT RELIGION HAS TO DO WITH POLITICS*—what relation the Church sustains to the State, and what prospect there is of “establishing justice, providing for the public tranquillity, and securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity,” without a radical and permanent Church reformation.

SECTARIAN PRIDE.

Another source of sectarian discord, is *ecclesiastical pride*. As long as man is sanctified but in part, this element of native depravity will more or less influence the disciples of Christ; will seek and often find fuel even in the sanctuary of God. Each sect is naturally disposed to regard its institutions and its ministers as the most learned and able, or its members as most genteel, or its rites most fashionable, its churches most splendid, or its members the most pious, its pates as far the best road to heaven. Ministers are tempted to be influenced by the fact, that they regard their churches as presenting the most conspicuous theatre for the display of their talents, or holding out the fairest prospects for advancement; their audiences as the most intelligent, their support as the most liberal or as best secured against contingencies. Hence they are in danger of looking on their less favored neighbors with secret disrespect; of cherishing ecclesiastical pride, and having their judgment warped by it. We do not assert that all ministers, or laymen yield to the influence of this temptation; yet, happy is that man who, on an impartial examination of his feelings as in the presence of God, stands fully acquitted by his own conscience! That caution here is not superfluous, was evidently the opinion of the great apostle of the Gentiles, who, having himself repelled all sectarian notions, gives double force to his admonition: “These things, brethren, I have figuratively transferred [applied] to myself and to Apollos, for your sakes, that ye might learn by us not to esteem ministers (see v. 1) above what is written, (in v. 1 and ch. 3: 4—9, 11,) that no one of you may, on account of one (minister) be pulled up against another!”—*Prof. Schmucker.*

Christian Investigator.

HONEYOYE, SEPTEMBER, 1847.

NATIONAL CONVENTION.—The National Liberty Convention, held at Buffalo the last two days of August, was a cheering season. Friends of the enslaved here and each other from the extreme points of the free States. Some from the West, had traveled 1,100 miles, and some from the East, nearly 1,000, to shake hands and unite counsels and efforts. The Convention met in the large Oberlin tent, procured for the occasion, and which was crowded a great part of the time, especially evening. Not less than 5,000 persons, including perhaps 1,500 or 2,000 ladies, were there in attendance. With great unanimity the delegates and the full convention united in the nomination of JAMES G. BIRNEY and THOMAS MORRIS, for President and Vice-President of the United States. Among much important business transacted, was the adoption, after able discussions, of a series of resolutions, setting forth clearly and affirming strongly the paramount authority of God and of the claims of his *real rectitude and mercy* over all human compacts, constitutions, and laws; applying this principle to the several contingent exigencies involved in the present contest, and solemnly pledging the members of the Convention in all such emergencies, to *obey God rather than man*. The Convention was again and again animated with the voice of melody, and hushed in reverent stillness in attention to the voice of prayer. On the whole, notwithstanding progress, we trust, was made in accelerating the triumph of liberty over despotism, of Christian principle over Atheistic “expediency,” of political justice over political iniquity; the elevation of “just men ruling in the fear of God,” in the place of the lawless and the wicked, and “frame mischief by a law.”

“A PLAN! A PLAN! What is your plan?”—Were the claims of immediate and unconditional abolition first urged on public attention, a few years ago, a clamorous demand was heard on every side, “*What do you propose?*”

Just so now, when the claims of church organization on the basis of *Christian character, equal brotherhood, and local independency* begin to be urged, there is a similar demand for a plan! In both cases “the plan” is so simple that it is overlooked—so self-evident that there is nothing more plain by which it can be made plainer. I state the principle is to state the “plan.” All we have to do, is to act out the principle.

Those who inquire after “a plan,” should be cited the 18th chapter of Matthew, and 1 Cor. v. If *Christ* is not to be found there, then there is none in the Bible; and we are left on the dark ocean of *disorganization*, with no chart but church history, and with no compass but “*expediency*,” while every gale that would sweep us an inch from the anchorage ground of isolated individuality, is wafting us toward Romanism! Let us come, then, “*the plan*” of the Bible.

Two or three assembling together in the name of Christ to do his work, to worship together, and to overreach other, are sufficient to constitute a church. The members are equals. All who give evidence of Christian character, are to be admitted. All who fail of this evidence, are to be excluded. All the officers of church, including pastors, are to be chosen by the members, and from among their own number. The business of the church is to be transacted in open church meetings by the members. Neither the church, the members, nor the officers, are to hold any connexion with any ecclesiastical body, except this local assembly or churches. Is not this an intelligible plan? Is it not rational, publican, scriptural, and Christian? Does it not accede with the doctrine and duties of Christianity? If not put in practice, then, without so much mystery about “a plan?” Other foundation can no man lay than is laid.

exercises the forcible control of a wicked world (including a false church) over the institutions of religion, wielding them for selfish ends; and the *living, persuasive control* of true religion and of good men, over the social and political activities of mankind, moulding them, with benevolent purposes, into a conformity with justice and honesty. The former is a description of Church and State union; the latter is the natural connection between religion and politics.

POWER OF SECESSION.—It is only during a short period, and to a very limited extent, that the efficacy of secession from pro slavery churches has been tried; and although has been done to test the efficacy of the measure, and to prove that in the present condition of the principal sects, it is the only measure that can be used with any salutary effect. So far from its being true that Abolitionists lose their influence upon the churches from which, on good grounds, they secede, it is already becoming manifest that secession is the indispensable condition of their retaining any influence at all.

Look at the Methodist Episcopal Church. For a number of years, the most efficient measures were pursued for the reformation of that sect, by the anti slavery members of the body. For a while, there were entertained strong hopes of success. But in process of time, it became manifest that the effort, in *this* shape, was a hopeless one, and it was abandoned in despair. The Methodist Anti-Slavery Societies, and Lecturers, and Periodicals, passed into oblivion, and loudly did their conservative opposers triumph! Some of the hitherto active abolitionists in that church contented themselves with *partial* abolition, now, and sat down quietly in a pro-slavery church, expecting no change in its position, until *other* means than church action, the evil should have ceased! After a dead calm of many months—(more than a year, if we mistake not)—a very few individuals raised the standard of secession. Less than half, probably, in number, of those who *would* have joined their standard, had it been raised six years sooner, were *now* in a position and temper to rally. The spirit of compromise had already marred their integrity and diminished their courage. Not a few had floated down the current of a corrupt church, too far to be reached or roused.

And yet, what do we witness? The very men who, *once*, had justified themselves in letting slavery in the church alone, on the ground that nothing *could* be done, *now*, and that the only hope was in *political* action, were *thoroughly* fired with new zeal and new courage for re-joining the old Methodist Episcopal Church! A Convention was held, and found favor with many Methodists who never before gave any countenance to Anti-Slavery movements, at all. And very soon, is the high *reputation* of the M. E. Church, and from the *very* sources whence ecclesiastical persecutions against Methodist Abolitionists had emanated, we hear the most pathetic and brotherly entreaties to Methodist Abolitionists to *remain* in the Church, with assurances that they may *at* their Methodist Anti-Slavery Conventions, and *renew* their Methodist Anti-Slavery publications, as *soon* as they please, and without reproach, if they will *continue* to be Episcopal Methodists, and remain in the church.

We say nothing of the *soundness* of such a reformation of the Methodist Episcopal Church—nothing of the *consistency* of the Abolitionists who, on such grounds, content to *remain* in it, and continue fraternity with slaveholders and their apologists. But we do say that even *if* a progress in the M. E. Church is to be credited *solely* to the power of *faithful* secession.

But so it would be in *all* other sects, if the experiment should be as *decisively* attempted. Already the *reformation* of local secession on local churches, is in progress. There are churches in which Anti-Slavery members were but *barely* tolerated, a few months *ago*; and only because a *very* few of them have now *seceded* and are about to organize a new church, with a *prospect* of increasing in numbers, behold! the old church is ready, not *merely* to tolerate Anti-Slavery members, but to *invite* an Anti-Slavery minister, if by that *means*, the *new* movement can be *thwarted* or *crippled*! The spirit and temper of such specimens of progress, say nothing, now. But we do say, that if the *proposed* Abolitionists connected with the churches had *in* the measure of secession, three or four years ago, *in* respect of the Anti-Slavery cause—in general, and *espe-*

pecially in the churches, would have been very different from what it is now. This delay, instead of proving a benefit to the churches, has been an injury both to the churches and to themselves. We feel impelled to say this, because we now see that *our* own position in regard to the necessity of prompt secession, was not sufficiently definite and decided, two or three years ago. We overrated, greatly, the probable success of efforts to reform the churches without a secession. If the local churches were strictly independent, there would be more hope of such success. But strict independency is found in none of the churches of sectarianism. Directly or indirectly, the *sect* controls the local church, and reformation in the local church becomes hopeless, unless the bond of sect can be broken.

A QUESTIONABLE POSITION.

THE WESTERN RESERVE ASSOCIATION, as we learn by the Oberlin Evangelist, have adopted a number of resolutions in favor of church action against slavery, among which is the following:

Resolved, That where abolitionists, either ministers or church members, are permitted freely to express their sentiments on the subject of slavery, and to remember those that are in bonds as bound with them, in meetings for social prayer, and allowed the undisturbed enjoyment of religious privileges, they should not separate from the churches with which they are connected, *even if such churches should refuse to enlist in the anti-slavery enterprise*. But where brethren are not allowed by the churches with which they are connected, to plead the cause of the poor and oppressed, they should withdraw from such churches and unite with *other* churches which *will* grant them *liberty of speech*, or form a new church on gospel principles.

Now if the resolution had said that abolitionists should not secede while progress was making, and with the prospect that the church was about to take a correct position, we should have no occasion to dissent. But the issue made is apparently a different one. Free speech, to be sure, is a *sine qua non* to church reformation; but does it *always* secure it? The resolution supposes otherwise. It contemplates a *free-discussion* church that *refuses to enlist* in the anti-slavery enterprise; and it advises a continual connection with such a church.

But is this *right*? Is the church, remaining such, a true church of Christ? If so, then the individual holding the same position, is a true Christian. And if *that* be true, what becomes of the fundamental distinction between the righteous and the wicked? [See Matt. xxv. 31—46. Prov. xxix. 7]

May I remain in a corrupt church, because, in order to retain me, (when God commands me to "come out" of it,) it forbears to persecute and gag me? Suppose the Pope had allowed Luther freedom of speech: might he have remained in the Romish communion?

Is there not an apparent squinting at selfishness in this policy? If the church will not trample upon my rights, nor cut me off from my privileges, I will go along with them, though they *do* trample upon the rights of my colored brother! Is this loving our neighbor as ourselves? Is it remembering them that are in bonds, as bound with them?

On the same principle involved in this resolution, many professed abolitionists support their political party that tramples upon all the rights of the slave, because, they say, it is favorable to *their* own right of petition. If this be reprehensible in *politics*, can it be right in the church?

Must the political party we support, be purer than the church with which we commune?

A MIGHTY WORK.—From a long course of observation and reflection, we are thoroughly convinced that the American churches can never be *morally* reformed until they are *spiritually* regenerated; and that *this* cannot take place until they are divorced from their superstitious, their

external idolatry of the rituals of their religion, however scriptural and appropriate those observances may be in themselves, and however well adapted to high spiritual ends. The abuse of the best things, makes them, by perversion, the worst. When it comes to pass that the symbol is substituted for the thing signified—exalted to a place by its side—confided in as the magic spell for securing it—made a bone of contention and a signal of division among Christians—a passport by which knavery secures a place in the church, while piety is shut out of it—and its administration a monopoly, by means of which a self-constituted caste bear rule over their equal brethren, and forbid them the right of free discussion—when all these things combine and centre in existing church organizations, they must be displaced before there can be either moral purity, spiritual life, or scriptural worship—three things, by-the-by, which cannot be separated from each other, if conceived to be distinct.

A DILEMMA.—If a church has a right to impose, authoritatively, a ritual upon its members, then it has a right to *describe* that ritual—in other words, to enjoin the *form and mode* of its observance; since all rituals imply and include these. And thus we arrive at the doctrine of "close communion," as commonly held by the Baptists. This sect has been much censured for its exclusiveness; but its sole error appears to be its carrying out, consistently, the commonly received principle of church authority over individual members, in the matter of ritual observances. If churches hold any such right or authority, then the believers in adult baptism by immersion, have an undoubted right to bar the door of the church (and of occasional church communion, which is the same thing,) against those who do not comply with that form of the ritual. The only question is, whether the commonly received principle of church authority over the ritual observances of its members, be a sound one. If it be, let there be no more reproaches about "close communion." But, at the same time, it might be decent, not to say necessary, to strike out, as apocryphal, the fourteenth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, along with sundry other passages of Scripture that might be mentioned. Those who make so much of the command to baptize, should be pointed to the equally authoritative prohibition of judging a brother on account of mere outward observances.

ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION.—The power of distinct Anti-Slavery action, in religious concerns, is illustrated in the case of the American Board of Foreign Missions. Up to the time that measures were taken to organize Anti-Slavery Missionary Societies, all the remonstrances of Abolitionists were not only ineffectual, but were treated with contempt. Lewis Tappan was charged with impertinence by one of the Secretaries of the Board, because he introduced the subject of Slavery, at one of their meetings. But now, it appears by the New-York Evangelist, that "IN CONSEQUENCE of the efforts made by the Agents of the new Union Missionary Society to cast the odium of countenancing Slavery upon the Board, on account of the connection of Mr. Wilson, as a Missionary, the Editors of the Vermont Chronicle very wisely addressed a letter to the Secretaries" on the subject. [No "irritation" now!] The N. Y. Evangelist gives the substance of the letter of inquiry, with the answer of the same Secretary that had charged Mr. Tappan with "impertinence," for introducing the subject. In this answer he labors very solicitously to exonerate Mr. Wilson from the charge of slave-holding [with what success our readers will judge, when they learn that Mr. Wilson claims, in a letter on the subject which is also published, that his slaves are not free, because he cannot persuade them (!) to go to the North and be free (!).] Be the position of Mr. Wilson and of the Board what it may, one thing is very manifest, and that is, that the attempt (successful or unsuccessful) to clear themselves,

before a scrutinizing public, from the "odium of countenancing slavery," is "in consequence of the efforts made by the agents of the new Union Missionary Society." So says the N. York Evangelist, whose Editors ought to know, and whose sympathies are evidently with the Board and against the agent of the new society. Abolitionists will judge whether this one acknowledged effect of the efforts of the "new Union Missionary Society," is not of sufficient importance to repay all the efforts and expenditures incurred in getting up and sustaining the new movement. They will decide, too, whether it is best to take passage themselves, in the car that propels, or remain in the car that has to be reluctantly propelled. Oh! what a comment have we here, upon the shallow philosophy and purblind observation that hesitates to go for the right, until, by a count of noses, it can be ascertained whether the numbers enlisted can produce any effect! See how that little missionary convention, chiefly (we believe) of colored men, has moved the great American Board!

PRIMITIVE UNITY.

But the obligation of Christians to preserve the unity of the church, is evident from the example of the apostles, of the apostolic and subsequent age.

It would be superfluous to affirm that no one of the apostles or their fellow laborers established any of the sects in the Christian church. The bare supposition of the contrary, is absurd and revolting to every mind acquainted with the inspired record. Yet what ample ground was there for such a course, if it had been regarded lawful? There was difference of opinion among the apostles, and difference among the first Christians; but neither was regarded as a cause for schism or division in the church. Paul differed from Peter, and disapproved of his conduct so much that he says, "At Antioch I withstood him to the face, for he was to be blamed;" (Gal. 2: 11-14.) yet neither of them dreamed of forming a sect for the defence and propagation of his distinctive views. Paul and Barnabas differed about their arrangements for missionary operations; and when the contention grew sharp, each took as fellow laborers those whom he preferred, and thus prosecuted the work; but it never entered into their minds to form different sects in the church. In the apostolic age there existed differences of opinion and practice between the Jewish and Gentile converts, far greater than those which divide some of the religious denominations of our land—the former enjoining circumcision. (Acts 15: 5.) and other ceremonial observances (Gal. 4: 10.); yet they did not divide the church into different sects under the guidance of the apostles. On the contrary, the apostle enjoined mutual forbearance. "One man," says Paul, "esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. But why dost thou judge [condemn] thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought [despise] thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." (Rom. 14: 5-10.) Nor did any schism actually arise from these differences, till the apostles had gone to their rest; when, in direct opposition to this advice, the Nazareans, in the reign of Adrian, separated from the body of Christians, who, however, strongly disapproved of their conduct. It is certain, too, that during several hundred years, there continued to be persons in the church, who exhibited a lingering attachment to the Mosaic ceremonial observances; yet they were not excluded, nor advised to form themselves into a separate sect. The observance of the Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, was universal; but some Christians, during several centuries, continued also to observe the Jewish Sabbath as a sacred day. The time for the observance of Easter, was another point of difference and even of warm controversy; yet, excepting some intolerant individuals, neither party

seriously thought of dividing the church or disowning their brethren on this ground. Had these differences existed in our time, who can doubt, not only that separate sects would have grown out of them, but that their formation would be approved by Christians generally? Nay, is not this question decided by facts? Is there not a sect of some extent in our land, the Seventh Day Baptists, who differ from other Baptists only in regard to the time of observing the Christian Sabbath—they believing that the seventh day continues to be the proper one under the New Testament dispensation, as it was under the Old? But in the apostolic churches it was different. There all who were regarded as Christians, and lived in the same place, also belonged to the same church and worshiped together, agreeing to differ in peace on minor points, and remembering that no Christian has a right to judge, that is to condemn, his brother Christian on account of his conscientious difference of opinion. Each one was to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and prepare to stand with his brother before the judgment seat of Christ. Neither was to sit in judgment on the other—Christ was to judge both; and until his final award, their differences were to be borne—in love.

Let it be borne in mind, then, that in the apostolic age, when the church was governed by inspired servants of God, and for some time after, there was not in the whole Christian world, any such thing as different sects of acknowledged Christians. All who professed to be Christians and resided in the same place, belonged to the same church. And if, as was probably the case in large cities, they met at different houses for worship, they nevertheless all regarded each other as members of the same church or congregation. They all frequently communed together; and the reason of different places for meeting, was not diversity of opinions among them, but because private houses in which they assembled, having had no churches till the 3d century, could not contain them all. Heretics there were, who denied some essential doctrines of Christianity. These were excluded from the church where they had resided, and were then disowned by all other Christian churches. But different sects of Christians acknowledging each other as Christians, yet separated on the ground of diversity of opinions, such as the different denominations of Protestants are, had no existence, and were utterly unknown in the apostolic age; nor was the great body of the church ever thus cut up in her purest day during the earlier centuries. We read of the church at Corinth, the church at Ephesus, the church in Rome, the church in Smyrna, the church in Thyatira, the church in Philadelphia, the church in Jerusalem, the church at Philippi, and in many other places; but never of the Pauline church in Corinth, nor of the church that follows Apollos, nor of the church of Gentile converts, nor of the church of Jewish converts, nor of the church that retains the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, nor of the church that does not. In short, Christians in those days were called Christians and nothing but Christians; and one Christian church was distinguished from another only by the name of the place in which it was located. This ought certainly to be a solemn fact to those who have taken it for granted, that sectarian divisions of the church are right! that they were doing God service by their utmost efforts to perpetuate them, by inscribing on the tender and infant mind the lineaments of their denominational peculiarity. One thing does appear undeniable. If the sectarian form of Christianity be its best mode of development, the blessed Savior himself—with reverence be it spoken!—the Savior and his apostles failed to give it their injunction; on the contrary, enjoined and practised directly the reverse!—Prof. Schmucker.

Faith and good works—prayers and alms—professions and practice—saying and doing—learning and working—nobility and free labor—abstract truth and its faithful

application—love and light—obedience and worship—humility and honor—holiness and heaven—these are among the things so joined together by God and by their own nature, that the wit and the madness of men and of fiends can never successfully separate them.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS

For the Christian Investigator, up to September 1, 1843.

Of E. Pierce, Honeoye, \$0 50; S. Carver, Panna Centre, 50; D. S. Curtis, Rochester, 1 00; J. W. Fox, N. Chili, 2 50; Wm. Carter, Marcellus, 50; A. Rockwell, do. 50; G. Bogardus, Dewitt, 50; W. L. Reed, do. 50; A. H. Cooley, Auburn, 50; Mary Loomis, Lairdville, 50; B. Kenyon, Burlington Flats, 50; E. C. Wright, Granville, (O.) 50; Drs. Bancroft & Guthrie, do. 50; Dr. Clarke, Honeoye, 1 00; S. Lewis, Honeoye, 50 for self, and 50 for David Lewis, Juliet, Will co. (Ill.); M. M. Porter, Lerayville, (Pa.) for 6 copies, (including one for G. Collington, Harpersville, and one for W. Dickerman, Mt. Upton,) 2 00; J. Brown, Oswego, 1 00; C. Briggs, Canadico, 1 1/2; P. Kennedy, Honeoye, 50; J. C. Babcock, Phelps, 50; Dr. J. R. Mitchell, Northampton, (N. Y.) 50; J. D. Brayton, Edwards, 50; S. M. Pond, Bucksport, Maine, 1 00; W. Twitchell, N. Y. Mills, 50; Nancy Church, Ill., do. 50; D. E. Heydon, Pompey, 50; L. Stone and A. Wheaton, do. 50; C. Cherry, Canoga, 50; A. Gray, Ovid, 50; D. Clark, do. 50; F. A. Seymour, do. 50; M. Bauvins, E. Cayuga, 50; H. W. Wilcox, Coquet, 50; Wm. Hamilton, Victory, 50; H. Lockwood, do. 50; J. McCready, do. 50; P. Wilson, do. 50; T. Tripp, do. 50; L. Wilkinson, do. 50; J. Cooper, Sterling Centre, 50; A. Rood, Jordan, 25; E. Mirick, Baldwinsville, 50; H. W. Jones, Seneca Castle, 50; M. Strong, Rochester, 50; A. T. Holt, Elmira, 50; C. J. Judd, Warsaw, 1 00; F. C. D. McKay, do. 1 00; Mrs. Sabin, do. 50; Rumsey Hatch, do. 25; J. C. Bronson, do. 1 25; Samuel T. Armstrong, Boston, 50; H. Bushnell, W. Bloomfield, 2 00; D. West, Syracuse, (Ill.) 50; S. M. Booth Meriden, Ct., 50; S. Booth Davenport, N. Y., 50; L. W. Gates, Pekin, 50; Dr. Codrington, 2 00; S. R. Wilson, Groton, 24; H. Robbins, Lockport, 50; John Pierpont, Boston, 1 00; W. C. Apple, Albany, 50 for papers; O. Cravath, Little York, 50; J. D. Baker, Hartford, 50; S. R. Briggs, do. 50; S. C. Cuyler, Pultneyville, 50; E. Clark, do. 50; J. Knight, Soda, 50; O. Lovejoy, Princeton, Ill., 1 00; T. E. Hudson, Oberlin, Ohio, 50; C. O. Shepard, China, 1 00; Dr. G. Wells, Castillo, 2 00; Dr. Frizbie, Phelps, 50; W. Hyde, Almond, 1 00; O. Page, Batavia, 50; D. Groton, Lockport, 50; W. Hecox, Skaneateles, 50; H. A. Sacket, Franklinville, 1 00; A. F. Hanna, Cato, O., 50; W. Flavel, Paterson, N. J., 50; W. H. Childs, Niagara, 1 00; M. Hamlin, Penn-Yann, 2 00; Eli Smith, Lockport, 1 00; Dr. Sharpe, do. 50; E. Hewood, do. 50; M. Stickney, do. 50; Wm. Kline, do. 50; R. McNulty, Troy, Ohio, 50; Nath'l Goodwin, for papers sold, 3 00; M. M. Southworth, Lockport, 1 00; Wm. C. Day, Lancaster, 1 00; A. Campbell, Hamilton, 25; T. Root, Pekin, 63; R. B. Bement, Battle Creek, Michigap, 50; W. Paterson, Belville, N. J., 50; T. D. Weld, do. 1 50; Mrs. Healey, Buffalo, 3 00; Gerrit Smith, Peterboro', 5 00; W. Waggoner, Lebanon, 50; E. Campbell, do. 50; A. Campbell, do. 25; Seymour, do. 25; I. Smith, DeRuyter, 50; A. Kingbury, for F. Hawley, Cazenovia, 50; I. Sims, do. 50; H. Fowler, Livonia, 50; A. Judson, Prattsburg, 1 00; Wm. Smith, York Mills, Oneida co., 50; John Hudson, do. 50; Wm. Padley, do. 50; F. Senour, do. 50.

Papers sold, 25. Amount, \$83 58
Deduct commissions to Agents, 4 23
Nett receipts, —\$79 35

KNIGHTS SHEPARD, PRINTER, 22 STATE-ST. ROCHESTER
L. S. J. Printing of all kinds done on short notice.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. I—No. 9,
WHOLE NUMBER, 17.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., OCTOBER, 1843.

WILLIAM CHURCHILL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, (NEW SERIES.)

Twelve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly,
or as often as possible.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers,
50 cents, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward
the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy
for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have
two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers,
shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the
set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, 42 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE IX.

AMERICAN RELIGION & AMERICAN SLAVERY —CONNECTION OF THE PAST WITH THE PRESENT—OF EFFECTS WITH THEIR CAUSES.

If the preceding Lectures shall have accomplished in any good measure, their object, they will have done something to prepare their readers for a more comprehensive and accurate survey of the American Churches, and a juster estimate of their present position in relation to the pending contest between SLAVERY and FREEDOM. If the track through which our discussions have led them has seemed an excursive one, it may, nevertheless, have been such as to have given them a more definite idea of the latitude of the point from which they are to start, and in which they will have to march.

RECAPITULATION.—CONTINUED.

It was to be the lot of unobscured empty dominions, this we ascertained at the outset, and the proposition was offensive in many, and yet, such precisely the outcome, that it could not be safely engaged in pleading the cause of the oppressed. It was a positive and anti-Christian, (1) that it is a Christian duty to recede from an in-
a highly corrupt and anti-Christian church; (2) B. we not been deeply impressed with the fact of such existing churches in our own age and our churches holding a high place in the religious instrumentalities of the times, and exerting an almost controlling influence over the moral, spiritual and political character and destiny of the nation, we might have felt ourselves better employed in calling attention to trials of a more practical bearing.

In this we could not have been misunderstood by our readers. And having thus equally viewed the object we had in view, it became us to re-
noire, faithfully, the field of our proposed operations, and recertain and exhibit, as we might be able, the character and shapes of the subjects with which we were dealing.

Church organization—church order—church discipline (1)—these must, of course, be understood, and be understood the delinquencies of a corrupt church—the causes of the malady, and the means of necessary reformation. This could not fail to include a review of the Christian ministry—general office—church officers (2)—the primitive model of these—the rise and progress of despotic power in the church—the scope, extent and effects of the Protestant Reformation—the always re-

maining yet to be reformed. (5) With this, the way would be prepared for looking, more directly, into the present condition of religious liberty, and the comparative strength of spiritual despotism in our American churches. (6) This could not be fully done, without an exposure of those schismatic usurpations, by means of which the unity of the church, along with her Christian freedom, has been lost in the domination of sect. (7) And to gain a just view of the arts by which the conservators of Church despotism have wedded their destinies with kindred despotisms in the State, lending the whole weight of their vast influence in favor of POLITICAL OPPRESSION, while inculcating and professing a spirituality too holy to be contaminated with the POLITICS OF CHRISTIAN FANATISM, it became necessary to examine the proper relation between religion and politics, between the Church and the State. (8)

Such, in condensed outline, is the map of the ground we have traversed. And all observers must we have been, not to have discovered and gathered something useful to us, in the high enterprise of church reformation before us.

DRAWING UPON THE SLAVE QUESTION.

Resuming our discussions at the point where we last halted, it is quite natural to inquire, at length, into the direct bearing of the facts and the truths we have been considering, upon the slave question in our American churches. A bearing they cannot but have, since church history, like all other human history, is a continuous thread running from one generation to another, a web, rather, of which the future, the hue, the texture, are commonly to be looked for among the archives of a remote antiquity—at least among the records of the distant and the past. If the churches of our fathers had been, in the full sense of the term, *living churches*—if their religious teachers had commonly been, and to the full extent, teachers of human rights, the present position of our churches respecting American slavery, (which I have been what it now is,) would have been an anomaly bidding defiance to classification—a phenomenon of which all existing theories of moral cause and effect would have furnished us no satisfactory solution. Discrepancy and anomaly may account for much, but however rapid and marked, they have, nevertheless, their successive steps and degrees, and are not all traversed in one or two generations of men. The "mystery of iniquity" that culminated centuries afterwards, was visible, even in primitive times, to the scrutinizing eye of Paul. He saw the tree in the germ; the fruit in the bud. The tree could not have been without the germ, nor the fruit without the bud and the flower. Had not a spiritual religion been displaced by a sensual one, the symbols and memorials of the former could not have transformed into the perverted and idolized rituals of the latter. Without these, the simple teachers of a pure religion could not have been superseded by the sacerdotal priests of a blind superstition, nor the equal brotherhood of the Christian family broken up by the erection of a clerical caste. Without such a caste, there could have been no such artificial hierarchy, and without such an hierarchy, there could have been no infallible Pope—a trembling and degraded populace—no slumber of the dark ages—which it needed a stormy reformation to break up.

GENERAL CAUSES AND EFFECTS.

These causes, and nothing short of them, can produce the effects. This maxim is not more true

in the natural world than in the moral. The dark ages, as we call them, knew nothing darker than the Protestantism that can tolerate and sustain chattel slavery in America. The darkness of the nineteenth century, like that of the sixteenth, must have had a cause. And the same causes that produced despotism in the Roman church could not fail to produce the same effect, wherever else they may be permitted to operate.

We have seen in a former Lecture,* that the chief causes of the spiritual despotism just now mentioned, and operating in the first three centuries of the Christian era, have not been wanting, nor inactive, nor inoperative, among the churches of even Protestant dissenters, both in England and America. And we have hinted that the proslavery position of our American churches might be traced, in no small degree, to the operation of those causes. Thus it must be, unless moral causes have ceased to produce moral effects. Why should they be the champions of the colored man's freedom, who have been trained to the work of setting fetters for the minds and consciences of their white brethren, with whom they would more readily sympathize? Why should they favor lay discussions of human rights, who claim and have held by long usage, the exclusive monopoly of all ethical discussion? Why should they open their pulpit doors to lay lectures on negro emancipation, whose predecessors would not permit the "regularly ordained" Whitefield to address the parish yeomanry, the hardy cultivators of their own soil? Why should it have been apprehended that a laity who had been unaccustomed to claim and to exercise the right of free speech, in the arrangement of their own church creeds and church polity, should seriously feel themselves aggrieved because the same free speech was not accorded to them by their church rulers, who they wished to plead for the rights of the enslaved? And why, or for what good reasons, should men marvel or make strange faces, because an elevated caste of men, who, with few exceptions, from the days of Constantine to the present hour, have sedulously moved in conjunction with the potentates of the earth, did not, all at once, and contrary to venerated ecclesiastical precedent, turn a short corner to reprove iniquity in high places, to identify themselves with the poor, to plead the cause of the despised, to thunder anathemas against the framers of mischief by a law, to denounce political tyranny, and range themselves among the proscribed and hunted advocates of progressive human freedom? To have expected any such thing, would have been as unphilosophical as it would have been to have anticipated the rise and growth of slavery, along with the prevalence and triumphs of a LINCOLN LOVING RELIGION—as unscriptural as to have expected grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles. It is high time to follow the directions of the Savior, and either make the tree good and its fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt. No man, in his senses, and who understands the connection of moral causes and effects, can believe for a moment, that such an artificial and unnatural system as that of American Slavery could ever have been planted and reared, among a civilized people, without the concurrence of the prominent and leading teachers of the current religion of the country. Without their concurrence we know it was not done, and we shall have occasion, in its proper place, to record, more definitely, the historical fact. Now the Savior's rule

(1) Lectures I. (2) Lectures II. (3) Lectures III. (4) Lectures IV. (5) Lectures V. (6) Lectures VI. (7) Lectures VII. (8) Lectures VIII.

(1) Lectures I. (2) Lectures II. (3) Lectures III. (4) Lectures IV. (5) Lectures V. (6) Lectures VI. (7) Lectures VII. (8) Lectures VIII.

requires of us, that when we see corrupt fruits, we should infer a corrupt tree. And well knowing, as he did, the common backwardness of mankind to apply this rule faithfully, in the case of the religious teachers they have been accustomed to venerate, he adds the remark that if they hesitate to do this, they are bound, for consistency's sake, to cease calling the phenomenon which annoys them, *corrupt fruit*! They were bound, in common honesty, if they still maintained that the tree was good, to admit that the fruit was good, likewise, and cease their complainings! "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt." Matthew xii. 33. Call the effect good, and the cause good, or else call the effect bad and the cause bad. Make an intelligible statement of the matter, one way or the other. If you call slavery corrupt, then call its causes and its promoters corrupt. But if you will have it that the known causes and originators of slavery are pure, then, in the name of common sense, (the same common sense that forbids you to look for figs upon thistles) make slavery pure, likewise—make it a bible institution, if you make its originators and supporters bible Christians!

Such, as applied to the subject in hand, are the plain and pointed teachings of the Savior. And we know that he himself applied this same rule of judging the tree by its fruit, to the case of religious teachers. [Matthew vii. 15—20.]

USAGES AND ARRANGEMENTS.

But whatever allowances we may make for the men by whom the introduction of slavery, in its incipient stages, was tolerated, and who, (unlike their successors,) might plead their ignorance of its character and fruits, we are not called upon, by any considerations of charity, to spare the usages, the habits of thinking, or the arrangements, in the church, or in the ministry, or elsewhere, that can now, in the light of history, be clearly identified as the causes of that ignorance or disregard of human rights from which slavery had its origin—or which can now be numbered among the obstacles in the way of its peaceful overthrow.

Whatever may have been right in the religion of our fathers, that certainly was wrong which cut up the church of God, and consequently the human family, into castes—and conferred upon a favorite few the exclusive monopoly of religious teaching—of ethical discussion—thus paving the way for that silence and servility on the one hand, and that arrogance and usurpation upon the other, by which free discussion and free speech first smothered in the Christian brotherhood, the church, was of consequence, and almost of necessity, blotted out in the state, in the national councils of a nominally republican people!

MORAL SOIL OF FREEDOM.

We need not spend time or space in vindicating or illustrating the truism, that liberty in the State is dependent upon the condition and tone of liberty in the Church. We all know that the doctrines of the American Revolution were first taught in the churches of puritan New England—that consequently the revolution had its origin in New England, and not among the Romanists of Maryland, or the Episcopalians of Virginia and the Carolinas. The same may be remarked of chattel slavery. The corruption of religion in some of the commercial cities of the North, at a very early date, or perhaps, more accurately, we may say that (in some cases) the irreligion of the commercial colonists who first settled some of the northern cities, (a class of adventurers widely different from the Plymouth rock pilgrims,*) gave rise to that active participation in the slave trade, with

which the North is so justly reproached. But New England, and the other northern states, did not present the moral soil in which chattel slavery could so suddenly and so extensively strike a deep root, as at the South. The religion of the puritans, faulty as it was, and at this very point, was, nevertheless, in the comparison with the then current religion of the South, a religion that knew something—taught something—and had had something, in some directions at least, to do with human rights. Its form of church government—not then a mere lifeless form—knew something of the doctrine of human equality and common brotherhood—not enough, alas! to exclude slavery from the church and from the soil—but enough to hold it somewhat in check, and to originate movements for its expulsion. A somewhat similar, and yet more honorable record is to be made of the Quaker colonists of Pennsylvania and their successors. New York, hemmed in between them, received influences from each, and from other sources, of a not dissimilar character. For the emigrants from Holland must have brought with them some of the sentiments of that republican and somewhat honestly protestant land, that had furnished a temporary shelter for the puritans.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCHES.

These historical allusions are made, in this place, to corroborate the doctrine that the slave question in America is mainly a question of the prevailing and current religion. Where the religion of any section of the country, in any degree, interposed a check upon the ingress and progress of slavery—when it did this, whether among the Puritans or the Quakers—just then and there, and no where else, or at no other time, was it ever checked! And the religion of the country always and wholly prohibited chattel slavery, that abomination never could have been introduced or gained foothold in this land. Whenever, at any period of our history, from the arrival of the first slave ship on our strand, to the recent arrival of the Amistad, the prevailing and current religion—the prominent religionists of the country should have interposed a decided and determined veto to the practice of human enslavement, that moment the practice would have ceased.

What little the religion of the country has, attempted against slavery, has been crowned with a success fully corresponding with the effort put forth, and we are warranted in the conclusion that the continued and hearty effort would have resulted in a success equally complete. On the current religion and the prominent religionists and religious teachers of the country, then, may we lay the responsibility, and charge the blame of the condition of things we now witness.

THERMOMETER AND SOIL OF SLAVERY.

Equally evident is it, from the historical allusions just made, that those elements of spiritual despotism to which we have so often referred, furnish a thermometer by which we may test the position of any religious community in respect to chattel slavery, as well as of other despoticisms in the church and in the state. The delusions of baptismal regeneration and eucharistical sanctification, the idolized ritual—the revered priest—the monopoly of sacramental administration by a clerical caste—these, and their kindred hallucinations, as we well know, had effectually banished and displaced a spiritual Christianity, in the southern states. In Virginia, in Maryland, and further South, scarce a vestige of the "pure and unadulterated religion" of the apostle James was to be found. Human rights, human equality, human brotherhood, the executing of justice between a man and his neighbor—what lessons in this direction were to be expected—or were to be heard—from the Romish priesthood of Maryland—from the jovial and profane clergy of that period, in Episcopal Virginia! A mere ritual religion never yet taught human equality, and never will. A clergy

who made merchandize of their high calling, and of the souls of their flocks, could have no serious objection to the chattel enslavement of the negroes. The enslavers of the souls of men—how could they co-tend with the traffickers in human bones and sinews? If the priest might do the former for hire, why might not the people do the latter for profit?

PHILOSOPHY OF A KNOWN FACT.

If the Quakers and the Puritans had escaped, in any good measure or degree, from the deep sensualism and brutality of the religionists farther south, it was chiefly, if not solely, because, in the same good measure and degree, they had not become the dupes and the victims of a sensual, a formal, a mere ritual religion. It was because less of priestism and more of Christianity had entered into their creed and worship. This we know was the fact; and the knowledge of such a fact, beforehand, might have enabled any man of spiritual discernment, without the miraculous gift of prophecy, to have predicted the results that now belong to history. Such a one might have known that—of all the then existing religionists of the country, the Quakers and the Puritans, with all their imperfections and misdoings, would have furnished the men, if any were to arise, who should have first lifted up a standard against human chattelship, in America. A Benezet, a Woolman, a Hopkins, and an Edwards, were among these men. No one in his sober senses, would ever have looked for such men among the artful conservators or the stultified victims of a ghostly superstition. The soil wholly overgrown by the thorns and the thistles of spiritual despotism, brings forth no such grapes and figs of Christian humanity.

ILLUSTRATIONS NEARER HOME.

Connecting, just at this point, the past with the present, as well as the effect with the cause, we may notice (what, in chronological order, might have been reserved for a future lecture) that the now pending contest between liberty and slavery, has exhibited, for the last ten years, not less clear and striking illustrations of the great truth for which we contend, namely, that a spiritual religion is the vital principle, the congenial atmosphere of freedom—that a religion of idolized ceremonies, of deified priests, and of ecclesiastical usurpation, is evermore the handmaid of despotic power, not excepting the despotism of chattel enslavement. Where, in what section of the country, and among whom, did the existing struggle against slavery originate? In what school were the pioneers of the enterprise trained? Who were they that most readily fell in with the movement? I insist not to know in what denominational connexion they were found—or whether in any at all. But under what religious influences were they trained? What views had they actually imbibed? Was religion with them a bundle of imposing observances? Were the teachers to whom they had listened, regarded by them simply as teachers, or were they regarded as priestly mediators between the worshipper and the worshiped—the official and exclusive channels of dispensation of mystical gifts? To propound questions like these, is to answer them.

And though denominational boundaries do not accurately define the limits between carnalism and spirituality—between superstitious servility and free worship—it may nevertheless convey instructive hints, to urge a few inquiries in that direction. Some religious communities become more distinguished than others, either for the idolatry of forms on the one hand, or for a rational worship on the other. Each sect has a character more or less distinctly formed, in these particulars. More than this, each sect, at present, has its latent subdivision—its high church and its low church—its old school and its new school*—on this very point

*The puritans, no doubt, had sins enough of their own to account for. But this is no reason why they should be charged with the sins of the commercial adventurers, who settled in Boston, and Salem, and Newport—who were never puritans at all—but exchanged their E. despotism for Congregationalism, for political reasons, after their arrival; some of their clergy making the same change.

* I do so, mean to affirm that "New Schools" are always new.

And it may be worth while to inquire which of them are most readily enlisted in the cause of humanity—those that live most or live least in the atmosphere of a formal or ritual religion. In this country, at present, how is it? Do we enrol many of the Romanists among the advocates of abolitionism? Who or where are they? And how is it with Episcopians? A few specimens we have from among them—splendid specimens, too, some of them. But are they not few—exceptions, rather than specimens? Are any of them from among the zealots for “high church?” Or from among the Puseyites? Do we number any except laymen? And so we might examine Presbyterianism and other sects. Presbyterian abolitionists we have, and among Presbyterian ministers, too; but are they the ones that are engrossed and delighted with the idea of high Presbyterian power? Congregationalists, Baptists, and even Quakers, have their “high church” conservatives—the men who love extended ecclesiastical sway—who live in the atmosphere of prescribed forms—who are scrupulous in the tythe of mint, anise, and cummin—who are rigid in the requirement of “sacrifice,” but do these prefer mercy to sacrifice? Do they honor the “weightier matters of the law?” If they do, moral cause and effect must have found new channels, since the times of the Pharisees.

FARTHER CONFIRMATION.

In England how is it? How has it been? Wilberforce belonged to the “establishment,” but his religious writings show whether he was an idolator of its dead rituals. English bishops, too, are quoted on the side of emancipation, and have made their anti-slavery speeches—some of them heartily, we will hope; but our Waylands and Lyman Beechers could be good abolitionists enough on the east side of the Atlantic. It is popular, there, so to be. On the whole, the weight of the modern, the successful anti-slavery struggle England, has rested mainly upon the shoulders—first of the Quakers, second of the other dissenters, chiefly those whose church government is local and democratic.

So true is it in fact, as well as in theory, that the cause of the oppressed has to be pleaded by those who love and enjoy the blessings of religious freedom—by those, in other words, whose religion is the religion of philanthropy, of love; not a religion of conventionalisms, of mere outward forms; which commonly supposes a ruling priesthood, an ecclesiastical hierarchy—an imposing, a showy worship—a fluttering nobility—a cringing, servile population.

And the converse of this proposition is equally true. The worst opposition encountered by the advocates of the oppressed, comes always from the leading ecclesiastics of a ritual religion, especially from those whose ambition is chased by the aspirations of the people of their charge, after freedom. This latter consideration is by no means to be forgotten. It reveals to us why the clergy of the Romish and Protestant Episcopal sects in America, have exerted themselves less to counteract the anti-slavery excitement, than their brethren of the same rank, and of kindred aims, in the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist communions, in which the lay element is known to be more restive under clerical control—more inclined to assert and to exercise, in religious affairs, the prerogatives of Christian freemen. In these sects, the fire of abolition, easily kindled, (if the torch of free discussion were once permitted to be applied,) would not be so easily extinguished, until its “incendiary” blaze should have consumed the kindred despots of the church. And so, while in self-

defence, (as they instinctively convey,) the ruling clergy among Methodists, Presbyterians, and (so called) Congregationalists, and Baptists, had to beat themselves, the Romish and Protestant Episcopal priesthood might afford to look on calmly, or sleep! They were in no danger; for, under their more efficient and thorough incubation of a ritual religion, the spirit of liberty, identical with a spiritual religion in the breasts of the common people, had been effectually smothered. A Wilberforce, an O’Connell, a Madden, in Europe, and a Jay, a Brown, and a few others, in America, might indeed show themselves; but there was little danger that the masses in those communions would be roused.

If further confirmation of our doctrine is needed, it may be found in the religious history of this country, in connexion with the known position of the churches and ministry in relation to the slave question, for the last fifty or sixty years. During that period, the decline of solid, scriptural piety, an equal decline of the spirit of abolition, and of a common brotherhood in the churches, have kept constant and equal pace in America. And simultaneously with these exhibitions, have been witnessed the corresponding growth of a showy, ostentatious, boastful, formal, ritual religion—the consequent and increasing ambition of the clergy—the rise and progress of extended ecclesiastical power—a forgetfulness of the ancient landmarks of freedom—the approximation of Congregationalism to Presbyterianism, of Presbyterianism to Episcopacy, of Episcopacy to Romanism, till, at length, the leading journals of Episcopians and Presbyterians are occupied with the grave controversy and the standing problem, whether Presbyterians can be kept out of Episcopacy, and Episcopians out of Romanism! And this period in our church history, is the precise period in which “the American churches are become the bulwarks of American slavery,” known and recognized as such, throughout Christendom!

AN OBJECTION, AND THE ANSWER.

Not are these conclusions (identifying the recent growth of a formal religion in this country, and the consequent progress of ecclesiastical domination, with the decline of anti-slavery feeling and the development of contrary sympathies,) to be set aside by any complaints and declamatory eulogies upon the onward progress of the age—the increase of revivals of religion—and the benevolent enterprises now on foot and finding popular favor, for the evangelizing of the world. These do not disprove the fact of internal rottenness and decay, any more than the rapid growth of a tree, proves that a worm is not at its heart or its root, beginning to reduce it to powder. Human affairs, under the good providence of God, have their progress, whether men will or no—whether the churches slumber or wake—whether their watchmen are faithful or faithless. And that very progress of which they so causelessly boast, may be the seal of their own condemnation, may require and secure their destruction, may prove them without excuse, and may make it necessary that other and more appropriate instrumentalities should be employed in their stead. Our benevolent enterprises—our efforts for the conversion of the world, and our revivals of religion, were they faultless, might require, for their continuance, the removal of the causes that would counteract and impede them; and those causes might include the evils we have fostered and sanctioned. The churches and the ministry are not to take to themselves the credit of all that God accomplishes in spite of them! Still less are known and undeniable abominations to be washed into innocence and comeliness, by the beauty they have been permitted to corrupt and to mar! As well might the Israelites in the wilderness, rebut the charge of having rebelled in setting up a golden calf for an idol, because God

! A fact noticed and lamented by the late Dr. Estlin, “the last of the Pharisees.”

had brought them out of Egypt and was conducting them toward Canaan! As well might they claim (as they stupidly did claim) that their molten image was the God that had delivered them from the house of bondage! The churches and ministry that can boast their growth and their progress in proof that God blesses them in their sins, are only acting over again the tragedy of those whose carcasses had to be wasted in the wilderness, before the real church could be purified and led into the promised inheritance.

SHALLOW RELIGIONISTS.

There is a farther view to be taken of this matter. The successful propagation of a religion, whether at home or abroad, proves nothing in favor of its purity or trust-worthiness. ’Twere well to ascertain whether this simple proposition will be controverted, or attempted to be disproved! How shallow must be the philosophy—how corrupt the theology, that could teach otherwise! And yet, how confidently is it every where taken for granted, that success, growth, and progress, proves our American religion to be Christianity—nay, (though we commonly dread the thought of perfectionism,) to be faultless! We have propagated our religion among the heathen—at any rate, with the help of funds wrung from unrequited labor, we are preparing to do it! How profane, then, to charge upon us the guilt of making heathens of home! We have had great revivals of our religion, all over the country—at the south as well as at the north—the religion we cherish, multiplies its proselytes incessantly, or at least at oft returning periods of popular excitement; therefore it is the religion of the Bible, though its converts as well as their teachers continue to trample upon the poor, to forbid the Bible, and to blot out the institution of marriage!

Such in substance, such in reality, and drawn out into intelligible expression, is the plea every day heard from the lips of long-visaged religionists in our midst. But what is such a religion worth when weighed in the balances of the sanctuary, or when scrutinized by manly common sense? That is the question.

SPURIOUS EXCITEMENTS.

In connecting the past with the present, and tracing moral effects to their causes, we must not shrink from the scrutiny (however profane it may be deemed) of that which has long passed current for a highly spiritual religion, among thousands and tens of thousands who feel confident that theirs is not a religion of dry rituals—a religion of mere outward forms. A religion of the heart, as it is called, in distinction from the religion of idle ceremonies—a religion of deep emotions, of strong and overpowering sensations, of terrors succeeded by transports, of tears and of shoutings, of rejoicings and sometimes of trances—who will venture to put such a religion upon the same low level with the idle mummeries of Romanism, the absurd sacramental regeneration of the Puseyite, the High Churchman, the dull prosy reading of prayers, or reciting of catechisms and creeds? Must not a divine energy be recognized in a religion like this, though it flourishes in forgetfulness of the poor—though it numbers unrepentant oppressors by thousands, among its converts?

In a former lecture we made some suggestions on this topic, which we cannot repeat farther than to say, that Romanism, in the very midnight of its “Dark Ages,” abounded with these indications of rapture and of transport—that, in our own day, its priesthood have known how to excite and to wield them—that the very mummeries of their rituals, so meaningless and rapid in their modern and ordinary exhibitions, were originated (as all

* Formalism is not confined to the reading of prayers and the observance of set forms, nor is it necessarily connected with them. Raptures and rhapsodies present some of the most repulsive specimens of formalism that have ever been witnessed, while in the very act of declaiming against the stupidity of a few obsolete and worn-out words.

spiritual men “Old School.” But the terms are used here as convenient to designate the sects within a sect, that often arise and acquire character of some sort. If a ritual religion is not great a religion that the rituals but a religion that is virtually made to consist chiefly in the religion in which the form comes to be substituted for the substance, or piled upon to secure it.

superstitious observances were] amid the frenzy
of those religious exercises—their the ardor
enthusiasm of the second and third centuries gave
rise to those absurd notions of baptismal regen-
eration and sacramental sanctification which form
the basis of the superstitions and the despotisms
of Rome—that the Protestant of which we
are now speaking, however, chiefly in the revival
of this ancient enthusiasm, restoring its youthful
vigor to the heart of “the beast,” and leading thou-
sands of the most ardent of modern Protestant de-
votees into its meshes, under the delusion that
overwhelming sensations constitute the power of
[its influence]

That true religion, often occasional, nay produces, overwhelming sensations and strong excitements, need not be questioned; nor need such sensations and excitements be condemned. But from this it does not follow, that nothing else except true religion, produces deep sensations and strong excitements. Still less does it follow, that true religion consists in them! Human nature, and especially corrupt human nature, loves excitement, an unusual, extraordinary, and spiritual (pretendedly spiritual) excitement. All these, alike, and almost equally, drown sober reflection, deaden the moral sense, and render tasteless and insipid the pure and unadorned religion of visiting the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and keeping unspotted from the world.

Vain, indeed, and useless, were it to attempt a restoration of that religion, without expelling the counterfeit that has taken its place and its name. Among the mortal causes of the multichordal effects we now witness—among the connecting links between present apostasy and past dereliction, we should do our subject great injustice, should we overlook or attempt to conceal the sad designs [having this salient even that can hardly be employed] of those multifarious pretents of religion that have characterized our American churches, since the age of Whitfield to the present time. Heaven forbid that we should indiscriminately condemn or praise them; in the aggregate. To do the former, would be to cast away the life and soul of true religion, the only remaining hope of Christian liberty and of universal freedom. To do the latter, would be to fold to our bosoms the serpent that has blighted our Eden, the false religion that is like an incubus upon the breast of smothered humanity and Bible religion. Alas! that things so opposite should be so artfully blended by the Arch-Deceiver, so stupidly confounded even by Christians! that the religion that makes men abolitionists, and the religion that hardens the hearts of slave holders, should pass for one and the same religion! should worship in the same temple! should sustain the same preacher! should be bound up together under the same ecclesiastical arrangements! should hold protracted meetings in company, and enrol converts in co-partnership! and sit at the same table of communion! (Horrible to think of!) Incredible, were it not undeniable! Till the master-plans of such treachery are so exposed and broken up, while hope of an embroiled world's freedom!

But this can never be done, so long as we first to scrutinize with a patient eye, and to lay bare, with a faithful and steady; and, the delusions that have been, for a full century past, propagated among us, under the name of, and in connection with, revivals of religion. A volume might profitably be devoted to the subject. Suffice it to say here, that any "revival preaching" that does not reprove a people for the specific sins of which they are collectively guilty—that does not reprove Americans for the hatred of their colored brother, for refusing to execute judgment for the oppressed, for sustaining the workers of iniquity who frame legislation by a law, deserves to be looked upon with suspicion—to be held at arms' length—to be dismissed as unchristian and unhelpful; that any repeated conversions to God that do not produce the love of

humanity, and spontaneously and irresistibly impel the converts to open their mouths for the dumb and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor (so soon, at least, as the facts are presented to them, which the faithful revival preacher will of course do)—reputed conversions, we say, that do not produce these fruits, but leave their converts as cold, as dead, and as prejudiced against their injured brother as ever, should be as promptly repudiated, and the attempt to introduce of such converts and of such a religion into the churches, as vigorously repelled, as any other attempt to engraft a false religion upon Christian institutions—in the the idolatry of Jehovah with the ordinances of the Messiah—the idolatry of Moloch with the worship of Jehovah. And "revivals of religion" in the age of Whitefield and from that time onward, been defined and guarded by simple Scriptural tests of this character,* American slavery long ago would have been num-

One of the most hurtful and shallow mistakes of the age, is that which places the dead, formal, ritualistic, ceremonial, sleepy, scholastic religion of the "High Church" Presbyterian or Episcopal into the one scale; and all the zealous, aggressive, loud, stormy, anxious, enthusiastic, "revival" religion of the unimpoverished inquiry room into the other, counting the one dross and the other gold, without farther inquiry. The truth is, there is no formalism more deadly than that which often hides itself amid the noise and words of a reputed revival of religion. All the imposing paraphernalia of the Protestant meeting become, not unfrequently, a mere lifeless form, more noisy, it may be, more showy, but not therefore more truly spiritual, than the worship of the most listless liturgy-readers in the church, or non-church-ers of the Catholic. The "sacraments" of the modern revival, viewed with the "sacraments" of the more ancient enthusiasm, are often perverted and abused, instead of being rationally used—the "inquiry room" becomes as sacred as the "altar," the "anxious seat" as efficacious in the production of supposed regeneration as the "baptismal font," in a word the fanaticism that mars the modern revival, lays as broad a foundation for superstition, and opens as wide a door for priestly imposture and spiritual domination, as that of the second and third centuries, which ripened into Ro-

PHILOSOPHY OF A KNOWN FACT.

And this accounts for the phenomenon, so perplexing to many, that the age of unwonted religious excitement among Protestants, is the age of unwonted tendencies to Romanism! Not only so, the same regions, the same communities, the same cities, that are easiest roused, entranced, delighted, to-day, with the preaching of evangelizing revivalists, become easiest enamored with surplice and rosaries to-morrow, and, in the course of six or twelve months, will require all the efforts of the very journals of revivalism, (the N. York Evangelist at their head,) to keep them from the Catholic cathedra! In vain will be their remonstrances, while satism is left to operate, the effects of which cannot be changed! These revivals that do not call their converts in the name of the oppressed, are revivals of mere enthusiasm and fanaticism—and of pure and unadulterated religious fanaticism can be more fanatical than religious hopes and transports that do not bring their subjects into conformity, at vital points, with the revealed, the self-evident will of their Creator! But all fanaticism tends to superaddition, especially among a people too constitutionally phlegmatic to be long retained in a state of intense fervor. The boiling mael of fanaticism, once cooled, becomes the hard, impenetrable image of dead formalism, with such a people, more readily and certainly than with those of a warmer temperament. The power

of man may be defied to prevent the people of York, and particularly of N. England, from becoming High Churchmen and Romanists, if their staid habits of thought and feeling, can but be first broken up by the religious excitements that rouse the passions without bringing the active powers into intelligent harmony with the divine requirements. Bishop Brownell may misunderstand this in his indiscriminate censures of religious excitements, as his opponents may in their indiscriminate approval of them. We could point the Bishop to Episcopal churches in N. England, built up by the very process, composed of the very materials we have been describing. First comes the declamatory evangelist, the stormy excitement, the roused community, the crowded auditory, the tide of overwhelming emotion. Next come the reaction, the dead calm of weariness and repose. Uninstructed in their relations, and the duties growing out of them, what remained of their religion, after the excitement had gone by? To do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with God, to visit the widows and fatherless in their affliction, to keep themselves unspotted from the world, to plead the cause of the oppressed, to execute judgment, to do the work of men in God's world—*this*, alas! their eloquent and fervid revivalist had not taught them! He had only stirred up the deep fountains of emotion; and emotions they could not always command. What could they do? They must be religious in some way; for to be religious they had plighted themselves before the community. One thing they could do. With the help of a Common-Prayer Book and a Rector, they could read prayers! This was a genteel way of being religious, and would wipe out all the disgrace of having been fanatical. And so the matter was accommodated very readily. Such communicants could have no objection, in a few months, to hear their parson preach against fanatical excitements. They could bear him witness that there was nothing enduring or substantial in them, at least in such as they [and perhaps he] had had experimental acquaintance with! The converts of a false revival, with a little training, make excellent Bishop Brownells, and better Catholic priests! The process is altogether a natural one.

For want of an anti-evangelical Episcopal church readily at hand, after one of these spurious religious excitements has subsided, some of the more respectable and orderly Presbyterian churches in our cities—particularly those in which a high state of conservatism is maintained, where the negro pew is erected, and the cause of the crushed can no longer be heard—will answer the purpose of a half-way house from spurious revivalism to Romanism, almost equally well. Congregational, and even Baptist churches, there are (to say nothing of Methodist Episcopal chapels) that are in a fair way of aspiring to similar ones. Who does not know that there are those, in abundance, built up to a great extent, with the subjects of religious excitements, whose pastors and leading members speak, indiscriminately, of all religious excitements with the utmost contempt? And who does not know that the most flamingly zealous converts very willingly exchange their raptures for the coldest of all dead formalities, the moment they become members of these churches? The fact is one of common remark; but the philosophy of the phenomenon is but little understood; because the natural connection between a blind zeal and a dead formalism, and the almost necessary transition from the former to the latter, has been seldom considered.

"ALL HINGO AS YU IS HINGO."

But whether fanaticism maintains its own proper shape, or slides into the quiet region of a mere ritual religion—it is, *all one to the crushed slave!*

The complaint of Methodist preachers, that Abolition is an
 subject, and their fear, that the community will become
 certainly among the most remarkable symptoms of

Neither the one nor the other have any sympathy or relief for him! What needs he care (or what difference does it make to the interests of sacred humanity and of vital godliness) whether it be a wild phrenzy or a calm formality—whether it be Revivalism or Romanism, Presbyterianism or Puseyism, Methodism or Mormonism, that sits like an incubus upon his vitals—that plants its leel upon his heart-strings?

All religions that do not obey God and succour his poor, are equally abominable in his sight, whatever Protean shapes they may assume.

We have dwelt the longer upon religious excitements and revivals, because in the popular mind, at least among the common people, there is, at present, a greater predisposition to confide in them without scrutiny, and to give them credit for being "the great power of God," than there is to honor the more cold and apparently lifeless exhibitions of a ritual religion.

SICKLY EVANGELISM.

We should leave the discussion of this matter incomplete, were we to overlook one of the main sources of corruption, not only of the religious revivals, but of the ordinary exhibitions of what is currently denominated *evangelical religion*—and what, aside from the corruptions and distortions we speak of, might be deserving of the name.

Those who first sought, a century ago, to revive evangelical religion, amid the monuments of mere ritual formalism, were wont to descend (as doubtless they had occasion to do) upon the dangers of *legalism*, and of trusting to an external morality, without a radical change of the heart. The expressions, however, of such men as Whitefield—if his sermons are correctly reported (and similar thoughts meet us on the pages of Horvey)—may well be considered unguarded. These expressions, so constantly repeated, and perhaps with less caution, by the imitators of Whitefield, before and after his demise, have undoubtedly had the effect to divorce, in the minds of many zealous evangelists, that close connection between a *sound morality* and a *spiritual religion*, which is every where insisted upon in the Bible. Morality has been comparatively and unwarrantably decried. Antinomian theories have, at the same time, given little force to the requirements of the sanctions of moral law. Evangelical piety has thus been stabbed at the vitals—has been wounded at the very fountain of her life-blood. The rejecters of evangelical doctrine have not only perceived this fact, and to use it for their own ends. But while they have affected (perhaps should say, labored) to elevate the claims of morality, their otherwise defective system has doctored morality of its nutriment—its spirit. Between the three classes, therefore—the ritualists who overlook both spirituality and morals, the legalists whose morality is a mere outward shell, the Spiritualists or Evangelicals who might not be charged with inculcating a piety without morality—the "pure and undecayed religion" of the Bible, it is to be feared, has found, after all, a feeble hold among the rival religionists of the last hundred years, either in England or America. There certainly has been but little living justly, loving mercy, walking humbly with God, visiting the widows and fatherless in affliction, and keeping unspotted from the world.

SERVILITY AND CORRUPTION.

There is one topic more to which, in this connection, we must again briefly recur, before we fully compare the present with the past—the position of our American churches, on the slavery question, with the moral causes that have superseded that position.

From the considerations already suggested, and especially from those last, under review, it will be perceived that the American churches have not under a course of training calculated to

to make them efficient in rebuking giant crime, in expounding and enforcing fundamental morality, in pleading the cause of the crushed.

And this will appear the more clearly, when we remember, that in order to do this, in the case of the *enslaved*, it would be necessary to oppose legislative opposition, to rebuke iniquity in the high places of the nation; and when we remember, too, that the work of reproving civil rulers, whatever they might do, (except for persecuting themselves,) is a work to which, with rare exceptions, religious teachers, for fifteen centuries past, have been almost totally unaccustomed—that, on the other hand, it has been their almost uniform policy and practice to identify themselves as closely as possible with the ruling power of the State—to smile upon, or to cringe before, the reigning potentates of the earth, whatever their moral characters might be, and whatever injuries they might inflict on their defenceless subjects, upon the poorest of the poor.

This charge, we know, is a grave and a severe one, placing the teachers of religion, for that long lapse of ages, in a most unenviable contrast with the Hebrew prophets, as well as with the Divine Founder of the Christian religion, and his immediate successors.

A bare appeal, however, to the prominent facts of European history, ecclesiastical and civil, were sufficient to settle the question. We shun content ourselves, here, with the testimony of a writer whose denominational connexions, as an Episcopalian, will relieve him from the suspicion of having looked upon this subject with a prejudiced eye, or of having touched upon it with a disorganizing intent. Our limits permit us to do little more than refer our readers to the admirable article of JAMES BROWN, Esq., on the "MUTILATIONS OF MODERN CHRISTIAN CHRISTIANITY." This writer fixes upon the era of Constantine as the period in which the Christian church and ministry adopted the policy of affinity and co-operation with civil rulers, and consequently ceased, almost totally, to rebuke their abounding iniquities. According to the same writer, (as well as the Episcopal author of "Spiritual Despotism," whom we quoted, to the same point, in a former lecture,) the Protestant Reformation, so far from having corrected this abuse, very manifestly strengthened and aggravated it, by conferring upon the reigning monarchs of Europe ecclesiastical powers which they never before held. And he bears witness, likewise, to the undeniable fact, that the separation of the church from the state, in our American Republic, has, by no means, cured the long-standing habit of clerical obsequiousness to political corruption. A few paragraphs we will quote.

"This [Constantine] was the first monarch that ever approvingly recognized our religion, and from that day to this, (with the exception of Julian the Apostate,) I am not aware of a potentate in Christendom that has not been clothed, in some form, with ecclesiastical honours and authority, given in barter by the church for political protection and secular patronage." (P. 66.)

"It does not appear to have occurred to that bishop [Rusebius] or his contemporaries, or to their successors in office, if the religion of Christ was not designed by its Author as a substitute for Paganism, in drawing attendance at the courts of an earthly potentate; and yet the results of evangelizing the Roman empire was to place Christianity under the wing of political power, and have it move in the same secondary orbit round the throne of Cæsar which Paganism had previously occupied." (Ibid.)

Having contrasted Paganism with Christianity, the writer adds,

"The subsequent history of Christianity, from that day to this, shows that the one of these religions slid into the same niche previously occupied by the other. If there be any difference, in point of loyalty to Cæsar, or obsequiousness to his nod, it is in the more dapper and

"The unpretending, but really learned and profound disquisition is appended to a pamphlet on "American Slavery, in its Moral and Political Aspects." Printed by Geo. Henry, Orange, 1832. See Lectures V.

pliant spirit with which Christianity not only truckles to political iniquity, but lends it her mantle, and baptizes her ministers with her titles of "Defender of the Faith," "Most gracious Majesty," &c. (P. 67.)

"Never, since Adam substituted the counsels of expediency, taught him by the wily serpent, for the commands of his God, was so lamentable an error committed." (Ibid.)

"The Delilah of human expediency enticed him, [i. e., the giant Christianity]; and while dreaming of earthly bliss, and unimpaired of his consecration vows, permitted the razor to come upon his head, and his seven locks to be shaven. From that day to this, he has been the sport of the worshippers of a political Dragon." (P. 68.)

"It is generally supposed that the Protestant Reformation restored the church to its pristine integrity. This, to my mind, is an error as egregious as it is popular, among Protestants." (Ibid.)

"In renouncing the errors of Romanism, the ecclesiastical power exercised by the Pope, as the supreme head of the undivided Western Church, instead of being abrogated, or vested in the reformed churches, through their bishops, their presbyters, or their congregational authorities, were cantoned out to the territorial sovereign, in his political capacity. This, instead of being a reformation, was, in reality, a sacrilege." (P. 70.)

Again, in speaking of the six Quakers who met in London, "to consider what steps they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave trade on the coast of Africa," our author says,

"This was the first war waged by Christianity against political iniquity, since she had access to the ear of Cæsar, and is an epoch deeply niched in the chronological tables of eternity." (P. 96.)

Of the position of our American churches and ministry the writer thus speaks:

"The unspeakable advantages resulting from the divorce of church and state have never been appreciated by the American church. Christianity has so long truckled to political power, that her ancient gospel claims seem to have been lost by prescription. She has been so long employed to work the engine of state, that an opinion has grown venerable with age, and pious for uniform sanctity, that it is a part of her vocation, and that she must, at all events, harmonize herself with the powers that be—that a spirit of concession must be cultivated, which seems to be considered as interesting a virtue between church and state as between husband and wife." (P. 72.) "It is often said, that a man born in slavery requires preparatory training to enable him to enjoy liberty. I fear it will require a much longer time to prepare the American church to resume the full exercise of that liberty wherewith Christ has made her free, and of which she has been so long bereft." (P. 73.)

"To say nothing of our slavery laws, how many citizens are there, who profess to believe the Bible and to recognize the orthodoxy of its ethical principles, that are honestly of opinion that the war now waging against the Seminoles Indians does not meet the approbation of the Prince of Peace? Probably as many as ninety-nine in a hundred, of both clergymen and laymen. And yet, however the different denominations of our clergy may disagree on other points, they all agree in letting this sin go unrebuked! The same Jesuitism that guides the councils of European potentates, and is there restricted to a narrow and exclusive circle of courtiers and placemen, is here diffused, and even broadcast among the mass of the people. It is, in fact, worse here than there. At an European court, vice is gilded, and iniquity is refined; but here, the very idea of the ballot-box brings with it the moral offensives of every conscientious man—the rankest compound of villanous smells."

"While the good man in the pulpit observes a knowing silence, and prudently avoids touching 'the exciting subject' from a fear that he may commit the unpardonable sin of fostering a party organization which he well knows to be corrupt to the core." (P. 74.)

"Very true. So far from this, the divorce has been effected against her wishes, to a great extent, and against the earnest remonstrances of her ministers! Witness the struggle in Connecticut, scarce thirty years ago, to abolish the legislative enactment for the legal support of the Congregational clergy. In Massachusetts, the divorce has been still more recently effected. If it be, in fact, completed in full, and many of the most liberal of the Congregational clergy—as they claimed to be—the Unitarian were among the last to forego, with a good grace, the pecuniary advantages of a church-and-state, or church-and-parish, arrangement, regulated by law! We have heard it said, that even such men, among the laity, as Judge Hilly, were by no means collectors for the change.—Editor.

Such a Christianity the writer eloquently contrasts with that which, while it says to "the penitent" in the lower walks of life, "Go and win no more," subjects for its most scathing denunciations—those who sit in Misses' seats, when the phylactery of official rank is enlarged to cover iniquity—when widows' houses are devoured, or grievous burdens laid on men's shoulders.

"Notwithstanding the high places they disgorge, the greetings they receive in the market, and the uppermost rooms at feasts, or the chief seats in the synagogues, that public opinion may assign them; notwithstanding they are called of men 'Rabbis'—the tramples all their dignity beneath her feet, and, with withering contempt, says to them, 'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?' (Mt. 23.)

If such, in the contrast with Christ's Christianity, be the religion of America, what marvel that American religion and American slavery enslave together in loving brotherhood and harmony! How manifest is it that human salvation requires something vastly different from mere "revivals" of such a religion—that earth's redemption lingers for something else besides the multiplication of proselytes to the current, the commonly prevalent religion of America—that what we want, and must have, for the purposes of individual, personal sanctification, as well as for social reform and the emancipation of the enslaved, is (to use the very lowest and feeblest term that may be employed) a reformation of religion, radical—thorough—effective; such as neither the sixteenth century, nor the last past sixteen centuries, ever witnessed—the DISPLACING of a false Christianity by the RESTORATION of the true—the now-current religion of America, for the holy religion of the Bible.

Christian Investigator.

HONEYOYE, OCTOBER, 1843.

AMERICAN BOARD.—We attended, for a short time, the sittings of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in September, at Rochester. In the abstract of the report, which was read, in our hearing, it was stated, distinctly, that, during the past year, some of the principal cities on the Southern Atlantic Seaboard; Charleston, Savannah, &c., had been visited, for the object of presenting "the claims of the Board, and exciting an interest in its behalf." It was stated, likewise, that, in some parts of New England, the contributions to the funds of the Board were not so large as formerly, and this statement was followed by another, apparently thrown in, as an offset, to wit, that, from the country "South of the Potomac" the contributions were on the increase!

The position of the Board, we think, is in process of being defined, to the public satisfaction, if it is not already, notwithstanding the "two-faced policy" of its leading friends, for which, (as being advocates of the Colonization Society,) they are so eminently fitted, and in respect to which there has been so much discussion lately at the east. It will do little good for the editor of the Vermont Chronicle to write artful letters of inquiry to Mr. Secretary Greene, or for the latter to write smooth responses which shall convey the impression at the north, that their slave-holding missionary is about to be, or has been recalled, while the N. Y. Observer, which circulates at the south, shall labor for southern benefit, to correct the false impression made by the statements of Mr. Greene, and to disclaim, on behalf of the Board, their endorsement of the assertions or implications of their Secretary. All the benefits to be derived from this evasive and vacillating course, will be temporary and short lived. The constituency of the Board, northern and southern, (or rather, perhaps, we should say the contributors to the Board, for as self-created and self-perpetuated Committee, the said, strictly speaking,

have no constituency to whom they are amenable, or by whom they can be, by a popular election of the contributors or members of assemblies, displaced,) the contributors, we say, northern and southern, will feel entitled to know, and will know, before long, the real position of the Board. If, as the Albany Patriot affirms, their slave-holding missionary is still in employ, and if, as their own "reports" (in corroboration of another statement of the Patriot,) give us to understand, the southern Atlantic cities are still visited by agents, officers or members of the Board, for the purpose of advocating its claims and obtaining the price of blood for its support; if, as we heard at Rochester, with our own ears, the decrease of northern support is coolly and complacently balanced, in their "reports" by the increased contributions from the country "south of the Potomac," the position of the Board cannot long remain problematical, with intelligent men, whether Abolitionists or otherwise.

Southern support, to be sure, would be of little pecuniary consideration to the Board, were it understood that the retaining of it would forfeit or hazard, to any great extent, the support of the north, and a "calculation of consequences" (the only mode of moral investigation known among Anti-Abolitionists) might be expected to bring them, nominally, to the liberty side of the "exciting" and "vexed" question, then.

But while the great mass of northern contributors to the Board, especially the wealthy and the honorable, so far from desiring any such change in their position, would probably, be as much annoyed by their taking a definite stand among the advocates of the plundered poor, as would be their slave holding brethren of the south; and so long as pseudo-Abolitionists themselves can so easily be gulled with evasive, deceptive and half-hearted explanations, with concessions of abstract principles never disputed, instead of "works meet for repentance"—so long, we apprehend the Board will not feel themselves called upon, in the application of their accustomed principles of action, to make any real change in their policy. Instead of this, we should expect them, in their own quiet and cool way, to throw out intimations now and then, (sufficiently incidental and side-wise to create no excitement, yet sufficiently significant to be understood in their own ranks, and by their own kin,) that by due prudence and management, they can afford to spare the contributions of that class of northern Abolitionists, (not many of them capitalists,) who cannot easily be cajoled, by the increased contributions of the opposite class of wealthier citizens, northern and southern, who can be but gratified by their going on in the old way, taking care to compliment the "southern Atlantic cities," and "the country south of the Potomac," as increasingly liberal in their contributions of late. Should slave labor, as begins to be rumored, become profitable again, for a time, at the South, (i. e. upon the old plan of drawing upon the north, at the end of another ten years, for a few hundred millions deficiency) who can tell whether such a policy, on the part of the Board, might not be most available for the present supply of the Treasury after all?

Of one thing we may be certain. The National Ecclesiastical and Political Parties, will move no further in the direction of truth, righteousness, and liberty, than they are driven. Their well known and ascertained character and policy warrants us in saying thus much. It is equally plain that upon the Ecclesiastical, as upon the political parties, Abolitionists, at the present time, and after all that has taken place, can exert no salutary influence but by coming out from among them, and refusing them co-operation and support. Every dollar and every cent cast by an Abolitionist into the Treasury of the American Board, is, in effect, just so much contributed as a PRÆMIUM, to induce them to continue in their present guilty position. It is saying to them, by significant and unequivocal acts, (more emphatic than mere

words)—"go on, as you are, and as you have been!—Go on, with the price of blood in our hand, to the work of converting the heathen! Go on, with your slave holding missionaries, to preach the gospel of deliverance to the captives—the same gospel that you recognize in our 'southern Atlantic cities' and in 'the country south of the Potomac!' Go on, and be assured of the co-operation of such Abolitionists as we are!" Such, and such only, is the "influence" that Abolitionists can exert upon the Board, by remaining in connexion with it, and contributing to its support.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN RANKIN.

Permeate there is no Presbyterian minister in the United States, as well qualified, in every respect, to judge of the present position of that denomination, in respect to slavery, and of the prospects of its change, its position, as the Rev. John Rankin, of Ohio. He was once a minister in the slave States, and has been, for many years, a minister in Ohio. His written testimony against slavery, is of older date than the most anti-slavery excitement. His writings were of such character that no one could accuse him of fanaticism or extravagance. It has well been remarked of him, that he is "too well known throughout the Presbyterian church, for sobriety," and soundness of judgment, and has had too much experience, to be suspected of acting with rashness. Yet, Mr. Rankin, it will be seen, deliberately come to the conclusion, that there is now of a change for the better, in either branch of the Presbyterian church, and that the time has fully come for secession from both the Old School and the New. This sentiment, we happen to know, there are increasing numbers of the Presbyterian ministers, in this State who are inclined to concur. Correspondence and consultations have been had, in reference to some such organization, as that proposed by Mr. Rankin. The question of secession from the existing pro-slavery is rapidly becoming a settled question among the Abolitionists. Many who dread the alternative, and to say, that it must be grappled with, before long the main point of hesitancy is that involved in the question "In what form shall we re-organize?" Shall we take the example of the Wesleyans, and thus organize a dozen new sects? Or shall we look for the proper model, and organize churches on the broad basis of Unitarian character, and of a common Christianity?" At the last there is a strong tendency to this latter, and particularly in favor of local church independence in preference to those Presbyterian arrangements which are becoming distasteful and unacceptable to the in general, particularly to Abolitionists. Mr. Rankin and other Anti-Slavery ministers in the Presbyterian church, would do well to consider these things, they fix definitely upon their new organization. Let us hear Mr. Rankin:

LETTER FROM MR. RANKIN—POSITION FOR A NEW ORGANIZATION.

Ripley, June 3, 1843.

Dr. Bailey.—Through your paper I to present to all anti-slavery Presbyterians and New School, the following questions:

"Ought not all anti-slavery Presbyterians withdraw from the present branches of the Presbyterian church in the United States?"

"The Bible enjoins upon us to withdraw every brother that walketh disorderly. An injunction is, 'Have no fellowship with the fruitful works of darkness.' These injunctions are, in fact, a part of the constitution of the branches of the Presbyterian church. Scriptures are declared to be 'the only rule of faith and practice.' We already the slaveholder communion in our churches be walk disorderly? But if the slave walks disorderly, does not the man the mixes with him also walk disorderly?"

not disobey the injunctions just mentioned? Are not those ministers and elders, in the free States, who receive slaveholders to communion, in despite of all the light that has been thrown upon the subject, worse than slaveholders themselves? Are not both General Assemblies more criminal, in the sight of God, than even slaveholders? One of them tramples down, at once, the right of petition and the liberty of speech; the other gravely bears testimony against the sin of dancing—discusses, during several days, the enormous sin of slave-holding, and then solemnly "Resolves, that the Assembly do not think it for the edification of the church to take any action on the subject." Then it is not for edification to tell those Presbyterians who hold men and women as property, and use them for raising rice, hemp, sugar, and cotton, that they are sinning against God! Will not the blood of souls be found with such men? One special duty of the General Assembly is that of bearing testimony against prevailing sins; and what sin prevails like that of slave-holding? and what one is so enormous in its robberies, both of God and man? It is pregnant with almost every species of crime; it outweighs all other mal-practices. Its doctrine is a most damnable heresy in the land; beside it, all other heresies are mere dwarfs. This, indeed, de-thrones the Son; but that dethrones the Father, and Holy Ghost. It makes the temple and throne of God a mere article of merchandise; it is God of the immortal beings he has made, and man of all that is dear to him on earth, and is his never-dying soul for the agonies of the second death. And yet it is not for edification to take any action on the subject! Now let it be asked, that this is a decision by a body of men whom the sin of slave-holding has been proved in almost every possible form. It is used to wait longer; nothing is to be hoped but that slave-holding is to be tolerated. It is easy to make a fixed determination to hold the slaveholders in the cords of union, without the least symptoms of reformation—and the abominations too, if can be done. A large body is one prominent defect in view. As it was before the decision, so it now is—its support of slavery will divide the church; and slavery was the instrument by which the Old School party were enabled to exclude the Free Church, and now the same evil is to be charged upon them; and another slave-holding church is to be built upon a similar basis of oppression. I will venture the propriety of the anti-slavery movement, and the propriety of the Free Church, will be maintained, with all additional articles, excluding all slaveholders, and all who commune with them; and also styling the church, when organized, the American Presbyterian Church.

The Presbytery of Ripley, at the last stated session, passed a resolution, unanimously, to disown every slaveholder in the General Assembly, in case the one in 1843 should refuse to bear testimony against that sin in all their words and actions.

It is well, that the majority of the Assembly are not slaveholders; and it is well, that the sin against the light is just as much greater, and so much deeper, was the dissent, with those Abolitionists who have solemnly pledged Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; and who in the General Assembly did not so much as say slavery is a sin. I have sympathy. With such men, I desire to have nothing to do.

I hope that anti-slavery brethren will continue to press freely on the subject of the organization of an anti-slavery presbytery, from both North and South, on anti-slavery principles, as far as practicable. I some time since received a petition on the subject, from an Old School minister, and also was requested to give my views on the subject of an organization. I then was

waiting the decision of our Assembly. The decision is now made, and I consequently give my views as requested.

"JOHN RANKIN."

SECESSIONS' CONVENTION.

Read attentively, and ponder, the call for a Christian Convention, at Syracuse, in December. Of 68 names promiscuously appended to this call, 11 (or nearly one sixth) are "regularly ordained" ministers of the gospel, originally of different sects.

A significant sign of the times! The hue-and-cry of "attacking the ministry" will be sufficiently stale, ere long.

"WHY ARE YOU NOT A CHURCHMAN?"

Tendentes in Latium.
We are moving towards Rome.

Under the above caption, (which seems quite appropriate,) a writer in the New York Evangelist, of August 10, who says he is a Presbyterian, (probably a minister,) communicates a number of interesting particulars which Presbyterians and many others would do well to ponder.

"This question"—"Why are you not a Churchman?"

(I. e. an Episcopalian,) he says, "has been put very often, and to all classes of dissenters, but especially to Presbyterians." "The writer has been several times questioned in that way."

"It is sometimes said, 'he will be one soon.'" "Some Churchmen say—'Why, in fact he is a Churchman now, only he don't know it. See how orderly his congregation is—how decent—how respectable! Yes, he is, in substance an Episcopalian—if he did but know it.'"

"And there are some who say, and long have said—'nevertheless, keep up an influence on him. You will lead his mind and win him before long. Tell him how all our Clergy respect him.' Yes, indeed, if he were only a Churchman! But never."

The whole country are becoming Churchmen. All things look that way. We have twenty bishops, now, and our clergy have been multiplying, mainly by accessions from the ranks of Presbyterians, for several years, astonishingly. We shall soon sweep the land. And then, how glorious the Church, in her comprehension, as well as in her unity!"

"Some, too, use this argument—'Why, Sir, all gentlemen are Churchmen—almost, or soon will be. All the bloods of the city, all the intelligence and the fashion, and almost all the wealth of New York, are Churchmen. It is the only path to distinction, and honor. The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

"According to every view, we are moving, Americans, in the leading line of our times, and ever, for ever, we are moving. And how happy it then, that Presbyterians, who are so much in contact with this happy, and this glorious people, should not be so much in contact with the leading line of the times, and ever, for ever, we are moving."

"The writer adds—this question, 'Why are you not a Churchman?' has of late been asked, and is often answered, by the dissenters, in a series of articles to give an answer to the inquiry. And he concludes by saying—"

answer it intelligibly—and in such a manner as to leave Presbyterian unregarded. Congregationalists, too, we should think, would be somewhat "sensible" with the question. Such Congregationalists as are coming in fashion now-a-days. We were withing, in Boston, above a year ago, the immense expense which

Congregationalists, there, had been recently incurring (in these "hard times") to build huge Gothic church edifices, after the mode of the exemplary sixteenth century, to resemble, as nearly as possible, the Episcopal and the Romanist! We could not help speaking out, aloud, as we walked along Bowdoin street, in almost or quite the very words so current now in New York city—

"Why are ye not Churchmen?" Why not be Churchmen and Romanists, and have done with it since ye have such an evident itching after them? The proudest prelate in England might covet a pulpit in one of those puritan (??) conventicles—and without taunting the polite worshippers there, (in English clerical phrase) as "damnable barn-goods!" Not Not! He would find "the congregation decent—orderly—respectable!" No more of free discussion and free speech there, no more attempt of Christians to "speak often one to another," than at St. Pauls in London, or St. Peters in Rome!

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you discard baptismal regeneration and eucharistical sanctification? Is it? Go then, open your doors of church-membership to all Christians, irrespective of their "sacraments!" Will you do it? If not, you may well be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you cannot admit that the people are "dependent" for the benefits of "sacraments" administered by a certain order of men—a dependence which would "lay a broad foundation for despotism—both spiritual and temporal?"—[Vide New York Evangelist, Aug. 10.] Is it? Then abjure the idea of a clerical caste—a clerical monopoly of the administration of the sacraments—embody your faith in your acts! Will you do it? If not—no wonder you are "annoyed" by the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you deny the claim of apostolic succession in the ministry? Is it? Then cease to reject ministers, because they are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

"Why are ye not a Churchman?" Is it because you are not clerically ordained. Cease to sneer at lay ordinations. Cease to deny the validity of Church organizations and Church ordinances, at which "regularly ordained ministers have not officiated." Cease to maintain those arrangements by which ministers affect the monopoly of licensing ministers, and deposing them from the ministry. Do this—or expect to be "annoyed" with the question.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Vol. I—No. 10,
Whole Number 10.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y. NOVEMBER, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODRICH, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built up again, and the wall, even in the breach, shall be repaired."—Isaiah lii, 18.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

Twelve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the half year, in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy of the volume. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

COPIES OF ANY PARTICULAR NUMBER WILL BE SOLD, SEPARATE FROM THE SET, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Single copy, 50 cts. Fifty papers, \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for \$1 00 One hundred papers for \$3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM

LECTURE IX.

RELIGIOUS GROWTH AND PREVALENCE OF MODERN CHATTEL SLAVERY.—POSITION OF THE REFORMATION OF MODERN EUROPE AND AMERICA, RESPECTING IT, DOWN TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

What has been said, in the preceding Lecture, concerning the connexion between American religion and American slavery, the connexion between the past and the present, and between the moral causes and their legitimate effects, stands confirmed by the HISTORICAL FACTS connected with the origin, growth, prevalence, and continuance of the African slave trade. The connexion is fully and clearly established. A wider field of application. We may affirm the close connexion between modern religion, in Europe, (as well as America,) and the modern system of chattel enslavement, with which the last three centuries have been so deeply disgraced.

When we say this, we wish the distinction to be borne in mind, which we have, all along, made, between the current, the prevailing religion of a country—that which moulds the national polity, which controls the reigning statesmen, and the majority of the men of influence and power, both in church and state, and the religion—(of a totally opposite character it may be)—that, at the same time, may take refuge among the humble, the despised and the poor. A religion there doubtless is and has been both in Europe and America, which if it could have been, or could now be, disconnected entirely, and in all its social and ecclesiastical arrangements, from the religion of aristocracy and oppression, could not have failed, and would not now fail, few and despised as its disciples may be, to influence felt, and its voice heard, in defence of the outraged and the crushed. That unnatural and unscriptural amalgamation between light and darkness, in all the religious communities of modern Christendom, which it is the principal design of these Lectures to expose and to break up, must stand charged with the introduction, growth and present existence of slavery, among nations professedly Christian. In vain have good men, in most if not all the different religious sects, protested against the abolition of slavery, while, at the same time, their goodness has been so weak and defective as to permit them to hold religious communion with those whose conduct, according to their own conceptions and account of it, has

marked them rather as fiends than as Christians. And never until the worship of the God of the oppressed can be separated from the worship of Moloch, may we expect to witness the power of the true religion, in combatting successfully impurities and the cruelties of the false.

THE SLAVE TRADE.—EPI OF ITS ORIGIN.

Our educational partialities, as Protestants, would have led us to locate the origin and introduction of slavery, in the midnight of Romanism, in the dark ages that preceded the reformation of Luther. And the dawn of that bright era, we should have been led to hail as the jubilee of emancipation to the oppressed. Instead of this we are astonished, on inquiry, to find the rise of chattel slavery in its present shape, so identical in its date with that of the commencement of the Protestant reformation. Stranger than this:—the participation of England in the slave trade comes chronicled among the principal events that soon followed the overthrow of the Papal power in that land of our fathers!

"The year 1517 is generally assigned as marking the era when the Protestant Reformation was begun by the German monk of the Church, Martin Luther."—[Goodrich's Ch. History, p. 136.] "In 1517, the Emperor Charles Fifth, granted a Patent to one of his Flemish favorites, containing a privilege right of importing four thousand Africans into America."—[Clarkson's History, page 26.]

CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

We need not wonder that the false principles of the reformation did not extend to the Catholic Church of Rome. But what shall we say in behalf of the Protestants of England?

The overthrow of the Papal power in England, about the year 1534, [took place] through the influence of the reigning monarch, Henry VIII, in consequence of the refusal of the Pope to grant that prince a divorce from his wife, in order that he might be espoused to another person."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 146.]

The Pope was undoubtedly right in refusing to sanction the wicked divorce of that profligate monarch, and how much true religion gained (except in reality) through the "reformation" in England, we may gather from the following:

"The first importation of slaves from Africa, for the purpose of being sold in the West Indies, in the year 1562."—[Clarkson's History, page 33.]

"During the reign of Elizabeth, Protestantism was firmly established in her dominions, and was favored by her in the parts of Europe."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 202.]

Whatever else was "firmly established" very early in the reign of Elizabeth, and in consequence was not. Otherwise the African slave trade could not have been legalized and extensively prosecuted under its authority and sanction. It avails little to plead that Elizabeth was imposed upon, and that she protested against bringing off cargoes of wretched Africans to the West Indies. The characteristic shrewdness, "energy, sagacity and prudence" of that princess are not to be denied. Her suspicion of hypocrisy, and places the plea made in her behalf, by the side of the more modern pretence of colonizing the colored people of America to Africa, "with their own consent." Elizabeth was an ardent tyrant, well skilled in the work of covering up deeds of despotism with professions of regard for justice and humanity "in the abstract." Of the character of the "Protestantism" that was "firmly established" during the reign of Eli-

zabeth, some idea may be gathered from the following statements of the same historian. "Although Elizabeth was in favor of the reformation, she proceeded with caution in her measures which may be thought to have been excessive. For a time, few changes were effected; the English priests kept their livings and continued to celebrate mass, while such of the Protestants as began to use the service book of Edward were forbidden, and even preaching was prohibited, until the meeting of Parliament." "Although Elizabeth was among Protestant monarchs, and did, in several particulars, favor the cause of the reformation, she evidently had no small regard for the Catholics, and in respect to her own supremacy, the true spirit of popery. Towards the Puritans she showed no favor. Preaching she despised, and would suffer but little of it during her reign. She loved pomp and splendor rather than simplicity, and regarded with a jealous eye, the spirit of liberty to which the doctrines of the Puritans tended. Real religion during her reign was low, and at the close of it, things in the church were scarcely, in point of Protestantism and Reformation, equal to what they were in the latter part of the life of King Edward."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 203.]

Agulha! The Queen, instituted the Court of High Commission, which, in respect to the Puritans, was the most oppressive of the English courts.

zabeth, some idea may be gathered from the following statements of the same historian.

Although Elizabeth was in favor of the reformation, she proceeded with caution in her measures which may be thought to have been excessive. For a time, few changes were effected; the English priests kept their livings and continued to celebrate mass, while such of the Protestants as began to use the service book of Edward were forbidden, and even preaching was prohibited, until the meeting of Parliament. "Although Elizabeth was among Protestant monarchs, and did, in several particulars, favor the cause of the reformation, she evidently had no small regard for the Catholics, and in respect to her own supremacy, the true spirit of popery. Towards the Puritans she showed no favor. Preaching she despised, and would suffer but little of it during her reign. She loved pomp and splendor rather than simplicity, and regarded with a jealous eye, the spirit of liberty to which the doctrines of the Puritans tended. Real religion during her reign was low, and at the close of it, things in the church were scarcely, in point of Protestantism and Reformation, equal to what they were in the latter part of the life of King Edward."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 203.]

Agulha! The Queen, instituted the Court of High Commission, which, in respect to the Puritans, was the most oppressive of the English courts.

Elizabeth appointed a commission of eleven to reform King Edward's liturgy, and to make such alterations as might be necessary. The commission was so constituted as to be offensive to the Pope should be stricken out, and that nothing which could favor the Puritans should be admitted. "The liturgy, as thus settled, was less in spirit than that of the reign of Henry VIII. At that time, the surplice only was required, but now, the cap, the tippet, and other garments were added. This gave dissatisfaction to the Puritans, who were already dissatisfied by the appointment of the Court of High Commission."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 204.]

From this picture of the current and prevailing religion in England, in the time of Elizabeth, we cannot wonder that the African slave trade should have been legalized and extensively carried on under her reign. What was there to forbid? Look at some of the characteristic features of that religion. 1. 'Professing to be reformatory, compromising, full of expedients, worldly policy, and gradation. 2. Service and right bills opposition in church and state. 3. Aversion to free discussion, forbidding men to preach. 4. A love of pomp and splendor, rather than simplicity. 5. Hostility to the spirit of liberty. 6. Bounded with the 'new of conformity' in the rituals and forms of worship. 7. 'Asserting the Supreme authority of man, as paramount to the authority of conscience and of God. From such a religion, what has humanity, or what has the demand of equity and mercy to expect at any time? Why should it have prevented the introduction of slavery, nearly three centuries ago, any more than it has prevented its growth and prevalence since, or its continuance at the present hour? Who does not see in the religion of Queen Elizabeth, the substantial ingredients of the same religion with which the cause of human nature has to contend, in our own country, now?

PURITANISM AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

But the Puritans, how was it with them? Their principles "tended" to "the spirit of liberty," and therefore it was that Q. Elizabeth could not endure them. But what did the Puritans do? What did they attempt: to prevent the introduction and extension of chattel enslavement?

The year 1554, is distinguished for the rise of the Puritans, at Frankfurt in Germany. They at first, commenced in England, and in the year 1554, they were introduced into America, where they, as it were, filled themselves of the opportunity of carrying the reformation further than the

British court had hitherto allowed. They abandoned several parts of the survised book of King Edward, with the surplice and the responses, aiming at a still greater simplicity in their manner of worship."—Goodrich's Church History, page 202.

This was eight years before the first importation of slaves under Queen Elizabeth. So that the Puritans, as a religious sect, were fairly in the field, during the rise and early progress of the slave trade in England. But do we any where find the statement that among the distinctive peculiarities of this sect, so ready to dissent from the forms of worship prescribed by the reigning monarch, and suffering persecution for their non-conformity in that respect, the Puritans as a body, were ever characterized by their constant advocacy of the continued and unmodified slave trade?

They saw the propriety "of carrying the reformation farther than the British court had hitherto allowed" in the matter of the "surplice and responses." They could readily detect the remains of Romanism in the English Episcopal Church. "The square cap, the tippet, and other garments" of the Papal Beast, they devoutly loathed, and could by no means consent to retain. With these they would contend even to the death. And certainly there was a "tendency" to liberty in all this! The right of worshipping in accordance with the dictates of conscience, even in the matter of "caps, tippets, surplices, and other garments" was a right by no means to be displaced. A principle was involved here, and the Puritans whose position served to bring that principle into notice, lived not in vain. As admirers and successors of the Puritans it would be nevertheless a gratification to us if we could point to some proofs that the early Puritans were the enemies of the slave trade. But among the signs of intolerance and bigotry which they so readily detected in the English church, it had sometimes occurred to them that the withholding the hire of the laborer, and the buying of men, women and children, in the market—nay, seizing them on the coast of Africa by force, and dragging them on board prison ships, and selling them in a distant clime, was a matter deserving quite as grave rebuke, and as earnest a dissent, as "several parts of the service book of King Edward, with the surplice and responses"—quite as reprehensible a practice as the use of "the square cap, the tippet, and other garments," in places of worship. Had the contest between Puritanism and Prelacy involved the question of human enslavement as well as the question of rituals, garments and forms of worship, the records of the struggle might have embodied still more of moral sublimity than they now do. But biased as protestant dissenters are, in common with protestant episcopacy, then was, with "square caps, tippets, surplices," with "surplices, tippets, and square caps," it is not wonderful that "the weightier matters of the law" should have fallen into comparative forgetfulness with both parties.

The Puritan religion—the religion of Protestant Non-Conformity—became the prevailing, the triumphant religion in Britain in 1649. The English monarchy was then dissolved, Episcopacy was abolished. Presbyterianism in the person of Oliver Cromwell declared itself "Protector of the Commonwealth," and became "the established religion of the land." All sects, however, except the Episcopal and the Catholic, enjoyed the favor of "toleration," though Cromwell found it difficult to withstand the clamorous demands of the prominent Presbyterian clergy for the suppression of Congregational Independency among that portion of the Puritans, who were partial to that democratic form of church polity. Even

Dexter is said to have been dissatisfied with Cromwell on this account.

"The famous Assembly of Divines at Westminster" had cooperated with parliament, in introducing this revolutionary change, and introduced the Episcopal form of government, and introduced a directory for public worship instead of the liturgy"—had published "the Westminster Confession of Faith"—"the Catechism known as the Westminster Catechism was also their work." [Vide Goodrich, p. 212.] This was the period of that "large number of pious, learned, sober minded, and laborious ministers, among whom were Drs. Goodwin, Owen Manton, and Bates, and Mr. May, Royal Chaplain, Poole, Hays, and Baxter." Page 214. This, however, was the period of "John Davenport's dissent." He did not believe that ever England had so able and faithful a ministry, since it was a nation as it hath at this day, and I fear that few nations on earth, if any, have the like." This period was also signalized by the various manifestations of the prevailing and current religion of the times, not only in "the unprecedented circulation of the scriptures—the various efforts to propagate Christianity in Wales, Ireland, and among the American Indians, the publication of learned theological works, replete with evangelical doctrine and practical piety," but in such legislative enactments as showed that there was no particular squeamishness, then, about letting the religion of the country, (whatever it might be) reveal itself in the statute book of the state. There were "statutes which enforced the strict observance of the Lord's day"—there was also "the legal prohibition of theatrical exhibitions." [Page 214.]

But where, in the historical records of that reign of the Presbyterian religion in England shall we find any notice of "the legal prohibition" of the African slave trade—of buying and selling the image of God in the shambles—of enforcing labor without wages—of reducing the immortal soul of man to the condition of a chattel—a brute? That infamous traffic had been the disgrace of England for nearly seven years, when Presbyterianism displaced Episcopacy, and mounted the throne of power. The cruelties and abominations of the traffic were perfectly unknown. Nor had the voice of remonstrance, nay, of compunction and of remorse been, until that day, unheard. The same Emperor, Charles the Fifth of Spain, who had licensed the traffic in 1517, had lived long enough to repent of what he had done. In 1542, twenty years before the cessation of the traffic in England by Elizabeth, he had "stopped the progress of African slavery, by an order that all slaves in his American islands should be made free." This order was executed by Pedro de la Gama. Martinus took place as well in Hispaniola as on the continent. But on the return of Gama to Spain, and the retirement of Charles into a monastery, slavery was revived. [Clarkson's History, page 28—9.] Queen Elizabeth herself had declared that if the Africans should be carried off without their consent, it would be detestable, and call down the vengeance of Heaven upon the perpetrators. And Cromwell could not have been ignorant, (even if Elizabeth might have been,) that the Africans were carried off without their consent! "Louis the Thirteenth of France," too, "was very uneasy when he was about to sign the edict, by which all Africans coming into his colonies were to be made slaves, and his uneasiness continued, till he was assured that the introduction of them, in this capacity into his foreign dominions, was the result of the principles of the Christian religion." [Clarkson's History, page 28—31.] Is it credible that ignorance, in Cromwell, both of correct principles and of the facts of the case, could excuse him in imitating the example of Louis? Pope Leo the Tenth, more than eighty years before the death of Cromwell, had declared "that not only the Catholic religion but the nature of

man cried out against a state of slavery." [Clarkson, page 29.] Other testimonies to the same effect, there must have been, even at that comparatively early date. Richard Baxter, himself, the co-temporary and supporter of Cromwell, "says expressly that they who go out as pirates and take away the poor Africans, or people of any other land, who never forfeited life or liberty, and make them slaves and sell them, are the worst of robbers, and ought to be considered the common enemies of mankind; and that they who buy them, and use them as mere beasts, for their own convenience, are fitter to be called demons than Christians." [Clarkson, page 33.]

Our grandfather, with his noble and generous heart, is said to have been the first to see that it was unavailing for the benefit of humanity during the nine years, from 1649 to 1658, in which the Presbyterianism of England, the religion supported by Baxter, administered by the government of that country. We cannot but inquire with astonishment how it could have come to pass that such an administration as that of Cromwell should never have discovered the culpability of "executing judgment between a man and his neighbor"—of "proclaiming liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof?" And we are forced to admit that whatever else was and wrecked by the restoration of Charles II. 1660 to the British throne, the cause of the stolen African and of the crushed American slave, was not to be reckoned among the precious things that were then sacrificed. The horrors of the middle passage, and the rigors of plantation discipline went on, unchecked, and neither the tyrant nor his victim knew nor cared whether Freely Non-Conformity wielded the scepter of England.

QUAKERISM AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, was born in 1646, and died about the same time. Long after him, and dying about the same time. He left his testimony against the wicked trade. When he was in the island of Barbadoes, in the 1671, he delivered himself to those who attended his religious meetings, in the following manner: "Consider with yourselves," says he, "if you were the same condition as the poor Africans and what strangers to you, and were sold to you as slaves; I think it a hard measure, yea, and very great bondage, cruelty. And therefore consider seriously of this, do you for them, and to them; as you would willing have them, or any others do unto you, were you in like slavish condition, and bring them to know the will of Christ." And in his Journal, speaking of the advice which he gave his friends at Barbadoes, he says, "I stirred also, that they would cause their overseers to deal mildly and gently with their negroes, and, at the same time, as the manner of some has been, and is, after many years of bondage, they should make them free."—[Clarkson's History, page 50.]

This language of the founder of Quakerism, and his disciples, was definitely directed against slavery itself, and less pointed against the enslavement of the Africans than against the enslavement of the Indians, who calls the slave traders pirates, the worst robbers, and the common enemies of mankind; and that the slave holders are fitter to be called demons than Christians. Instead of this, the language of George Fox conveys the impression that he was chiefly anxious about their religious condition and moral progress. He intended to convert them, in connection with their emancipation at some indefinite future period. Though he intimated that their condition was that of "a very great bondage and cruelty," he advised a future abandonment of the system.

These defective views were not peculiar to George Fox. They characterized most of the early testimonies of religious men on the subject. And to this cause, very much, may be traced the tardy and partial effects of their testimony. The tree of slavery was thus pruned instead of

* Goodrich's Church History, pages 212—14.

† The toleration thus allowed, excited loud complaints among the Presbyterians. In imitation of disappointed Catholics they were supposed, as persons whose religion was then, but not now, the established religion, who had been wronged and oppressed, the leaders of the Presbyterians, gathered a full assembly at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1644, page 14.

Other words of English Non-Conformity, in connection with the government of the Commonwealth, and the restoration of the monarchy, are given in the same work.

up by the route. And its growth under such treatment is a sufficient comment upon the policy and the ethics of such religionists.

It cannot be claimed for primitive Quakerism, all its glory, that it struck a definite, a decisive and effective blow at the slave system. Whether the princely reign of George Fox and Quakerism, instead of Oliver Cromwell and Presbyterianism, had they been in the ascendant from 1649 to 1658, would have been the reign of justice and mercy for the enslaved, is a problem which we cannot, with absolute certainty, determine. The language of Fox cannot help us to make such a decision in their favor. Denunciations of the slave system, fit more & finite and pointed, might be quoted from many professed Christian statesmen who cannot be persuaded to withdraw from the sanction of national legislation.

Thus much, however, we do know. The Quakers held the government of Pennsylvania during the first sixty years of its provincial history. But among the many bright and glorious characteristics of their reign, we do not recollect to have it claimed for them that they prevented the introduction of slavery into their dominions, or that the members of their society were either restrained or dissuaded from becoming slave holders.

We shall cease to wonder so much at this, when we learn from Clarkson that "for some time after the death of George Fox, and of his associate, William Edmundson, (who also suffered against slavery) no other individual of the society was found moving in the same cause."

The same authority we learn that not until the first resolution of the whole society, on the subject, at their yearly meeting in London, in 1688, was found on record. It reads thus: "It is the sense of this meeting, that the importing of negroes from their native country and relations, *Friends*, is not a commendable or allowed practice, and is therefore censured by this meeting."

Not altogether "commendable" for Quakers, in 1688, to kidnap men, women, and children in Africa, to chain and spike them down, in the hold of slave ships, and carry them across the Atlantic, tell them! Sixty years after, the origin of the it was concluded to say so—and that the practice was "not allowed." The effect of this very mild censure may be inferred from the repetition of a similar remonstrance with members of their body, by the Quakers of 1759, at which time, would seem, the practice, in that society, had increased. Hitherto they had proceeded no further than to "seriously warn all those in religious session with them, against becoming concerned in this trade."

But in 1761, they came to a resolution to "deal with all such as shall persevere in conduct so rep.achful to Christianity, and to warn them, if they desist not therefrom." In 1763 they endeavored to draw the cords still tighter, by attaching criminality to those who should "abet the trade in any manner." They based the argument on "the natural rights of man." [Clarkson's History, pages 50-52.] The first century of English Quakerism thus passed away, before it became efficiently Anti-Slavery in its character.

BAPTISTS AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

The year 1609 appears to have been the date of the first separate organization of the Baptists in England. This was 40 years after the rising of the "Church of England" had identified itself with the traffic of the African slave trade. But we find it is a record that this "mark of the Church of England" of the dominant Church, was not until 1688, when the Baptists in England were expelled to America, in the face of persecution, and that they separated themselves from Independents or Congregationalists of England with whom they had worshipped. But the

Independents and the Church of England, were guilty of baptizing or sprinkling their infants. The English Baptists therefore sent over some of their number to Holland, to be duly immersed by the Dutch Anabaptists. Thus qualified to act the part of reformers, "they claimed to be the only true Church, and through the Waldenses to have descended directly from the Churches planted by the Apostles."—[See Goodrich's Church History, page 287.]

Nor do we find that during the entire period now under review, or for more than 160 years after the distinct organization of their sect, the English Baptists ever claimed, or were ever entitled to claim, among the distinguishing honors of their sect, that in the matter of chattel slavery they were as a sect, the advocates of the crushed poor. Baptists shared in common with other Non-Conformists, the responsibility of administering the government of England, during the commonwealth, the Lord Protector Cromwell promoting many of them to stations of power.

REVIEW OF THESE FACTS.

Of the subsequent course of these various sects, we propose to speak in the proper place. We now have to do with the prevalent and current religion of modern Christendom during the origin of the African slave trade—the introduction of slavery, and the establishment of the slave system in the colonies of Continental America and the West India Islands. On a review of that period, we find only few and isolated testimonies of individuals against the traffic and the system, and these chiefly of a vague and moderate character. We find nothing, either in Catholic or Protestant Christianity, in any of their authoritative or organized manifestations to oppose an efficient, or even a determined or a definite barrier to the ingress of the abomination.

Or if we would confine our attention to the religion of our English fathers, in its bearing upon the rise and extension of the traffic, throughout their dominions, our investigations forced upon us similar results. From the first English importation of slaves, under Elizabeth, in the year 1562, and so onward for a century and a half, or even for two centuries, what do we witness? We have seen the monstrous iniquity entrenched and expanding itself, unchecked, unretarded, nay, unproved—so far as the various religious sects and communities are concerned, with the single and limited exception to be made towards the close of this period, in favor of the Society of Friends. Neither in English Prelacy, nor in English Non-Conformity, as such, (Puritans, Independency, or Presbyterianism,) did the cause of humanity, the cause of the poor, find an advocate during this long and tedious period. The Baptist domination was equally silent. Nor can Quakerism, as a whole, be claimed to have spoken a word, until 1727, sixty years after the origin of the sect, or thirty seven years after the death of its founder; not definitely and decisively, till thirty-four years after that. If the Church of England, the Puritans, the Independents, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Quakers, may not be taken as a fair specimen of the prevailing and current religion of England, during that period, in which religious body or bodies may we look for that specimen? What other sects, then existing, can be cited, as better exemplifications of the prevailing religion of England, at that time? Or which of them can exhibit the records of their earnest advocacy of the claims of the enslaved—their bold remonstrances against the legalized piracy of the slave system.

Alas! there were none! and we must settle the matter, definitely, in our minds, as a fact instructive, though painful, that among all the organized and showy religions, prevailing in Europe, from the simultaneous beginning of the Protestant Reformation, to the present time, there was not one that

formation, and of the African slave trade, in 1517, up to the time when the principal Protestant sects, along with the legalized plunderers of Africa, were in the noon-tide of their glory—there was no embodied religion that recognized, as a part of its mission, the work of proclaiming deliverance to the captives, or pleading the cause of the plundered poor.

This, too, at a time when religion busied itself much with the affairs of the state, with the business of legislation, with the policy of cabinets and courts, and when the various sects were sufficiently ready to seize upon and to magnify whatever they deemed defective or objectionable in their rivals.

A suitable impression of this fact may serve to modify, somewhat, the extravagant admiration so commonly indulged of our several and favorite religious sects, particularly at that period of their history which we are wont to consider the era of their original purity and integrity, and from which it is commonly conceded they have now declined. Not one of them, originating early enough to give us an opportunity to judge of them in this respect, can claim to have ever been better than passive and quiet spectators of the origin of the slave system, its extension, and its introduction into its own bosom! As though they had been foster sisters of the chattel system, they grew up by its side, without the consciousness of anything like even a family jar between them. Such, in their palmy days, have been the Church of England, the Puritans, and even Quakerism itself. Something more than a return to the pristine vigor and growth of these sects will be necessary for the mitigation of bleeding humanity, manacled and scourged! Other work than to invoke the return of "High Church," and "the golden days of good Queen Bess"—other service than to idolize the Puritans, or the early Friends, or to bring back from their sepulchres the honored forms of Oliver Cromwell or George Fox, does the cause of "pure and undissolved religion"—the cause of Christ's Christianity, require at our hands! Other and nobler enterprises invite us than dancing attendance at the doors of the conservators of the existing sects, imploring them to become as just and merciful as their fathers were! All that was noble in those eminent men we may continue to honor. All that was truthful and righteous in their teachings or example we may gratefully receive and emulate. But other standards we must follow, if we would attain to the stature of mature Christians.

Somewhere else must we look for the model of a purified Christian church. Before the presence and power of such a church can be realized, we must dig deeper and stretch further to lay its foundations than "the service-book of King Edward," or even the "Westminster Directory." We must not only "avail ourselves of the opportunity to carry the reformation further than the British court had hitherto allowed," but further than the founders and conservators of the seventeenth and eighteenth century sects have projected. To have effected a reformation in "several parts of the service-book of King Edward, with the surplices and the responses," he "square caps and the gloves" may have been very well. And if this could not be fully done without the enactment of strict dress coats and broad hats, even let the bill pass without demur—with acclamation, if needful. But let not the testimony of Thomas Scott be undervalued!

"The language of Isaiah is coming upon Rome, and the golden gates, and the marble columns, though still standing, shall be of no use to her in herself, for the glory, majesty, ornament, and beauty is the people of God, his servants, his witnesses, and his chosen people. These are the things which have been revealed to the prophets, the things which God requires, and the price for which he will reward them. Let us, therefore, and let all of us, that are called by his name, be ready to give up all that we have, and all that we are, for the sake of the Lord, and for the sake of his people."—Scott's Commentary on Isa. xlii.

If this admonition be trustworthy, what business can we have, or what safety can we find, in the sects that could silently witness the rise and growth of the African slave-trade in their own communions—especially if their present position be little better (sometimes worse) than their first beginnings?

The review to which we have invited our readers may reveal to them the secret of their success in attempting to engraft the principles of humanity and justice upon the policy of the principal sects. It was asking the introduction of other elements than those that had been contemplated by their contrivers. It was in the matter of "square caps and tippets," "the surplice and the responses," that they had sedulously perfected themselves. Here they had laid out their labor. In other things—in the simple, vulgar concerns of "justice between a man and his neighbor," they had never been emulous of distinction.

INDIVIDUAL TESTIMONIES DURING THIS PERIOD.

The list presented by Clarkson, of "forerunners and co-adjutors in the cause," is eloquently brief in its incidental testimony to the condition of Christendom during this long period—especially when we notice that so questionably a "co-adjutor" as Queen Elizabeth, whose words so strikingly contrast with her enactments, is honored with a position among them:

"The Emperor Charles V., Pope Leo X., Queen Elizabeth, Louis XIII. of France, Godwyn, Baxter, Southern, Primatt, Hutcheson, Foster, Atkins, Wallis, Fox, Edmundson." In the same list he includes a number of honored names, of a more recent date, whose labors, from 1765 and onward to 1785, throws them, more properly, into a later period than the one now under consideration—viz., "Warburton, Lisle, Sharpe, Wesley, Day, Porteus, Ramsey, White, Chubb, Tuckey;" to whom Willberforce and Clarkson should, of course, be added. And then, in another class, he mentions Burling, Saniford, Lay, Woolman, Benozet, Sewall, Whitefield, Russ, and a few others.

So here we have the landmarks of two and a half centuries! Admitting the enumeration to be defective, it is a sufficient comment upon our modern, our Protestant Christendom, that such an enumeration should have been attempted! And let it be remembered that many of these, while contending, as they did, against the African slave-trade, could not be prevailed upon, by the eloquence of Grenville Sharpe, to attack slavery itself!

AMERICAN RELIGION AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

The introduction of slavery into British America, and the position of the then current religion of the American Colonies, (now United States,) presents another, and a distinct topic of inquiry.

Among the heaviest charges, introduced by Thomas Jefferson into his original draft of the Declaration of Independence, against the King of Great Britain, was the crime of purchasing cargoes of slaves to be introduced for sale by his subjects into the colonies. But what shall we say of the churches of America, that not only permitted the crime to pass unrebuked, but, in their membership and ministry, participated early, eagerly, and largely in the same crime, by becoming the purchasers and the enslavers of stolen Africans?

EPISCOPACY AND PURITANISM IN AMERICA.

Where were the Episcopal clergy of Virginia? Where were the Puritan ministers of New England, when the first slave-ships visited their coasts? A warning voice against dreaded innovations they were not unable nor ungentle to lift up. They were not unconscious of the power of making themselves heard, their opinions reverberated, and their influence felt. In the matter of colonial legislation, they were not backward nor loathful to interfere. In Massachusetts and Connecticut, the State was distinctly and emphatically what they made it. The statute-book was the exponent of their creed—the instrument of their

good pleasure. Let them have, as has been claimed for them, the credit of moulding "our free institutions!"—so far as they were or are free—in accordance with the principles of freedom. This honor cannot, and should not, be wrung from them. What the people were, for better or worse, their prevalent religion, and the teachers of that religion, (inattentively,) had made them. But along with the honor of the good, in the character of primitive New England, they must take a share at least of the dishonor of the bad. How happened it that religious persecution, and especially that cruel slavery was so readily introduced among them? Extensively introduced, indeed, upon New England soil, it was not. Thanks to New England sterility, and to the congenial virtues of puritan thrift and industry, for that. But human chattelship was, nevertheless, quietly introduced. The heresies of Quakerism, whatever they might be, could be promptly and authoritatively repelled and ejected. The story of Roger Williams assures us that they understood, perfectly well, the *modus operandi* of ridding the commonwealth of those whose practices or principles marked them as turbulent, troublesome men, or as pestilential intruders. How happened it that the slave-traders were not banished from the colonies, if they were really regarded as a nuisance, or, if their traffic were odious and abominable in the eyes of those liberty-loving men, who had sought in the western wilds an asylum from tyrannical persecution—a sanctuary for free Christian worship?

How long a time had elapsed, after the landing at Plymouth—what depopulations had taken place—what new materials had been introduced into the population—what proportion of the active men were of a new generation, ill-deserving a place with their fathers, before or during the successful introduction of slaves into New England, we cannot, at this time, very correctly determine. The same may be said of the Quaker colony of Pennsylvania. One outstanding fact meets us, however, on the face of our colonial history, and that is, that slaves were purchased, in all the colonies, at an early day—not excepting New England and Pennsylvania.

QUAKERISM IN AMERICA—THEIR SECT.

"The Quakers in America, it must be owned, did most of them, originally, as other settlers there, with respect to the purchase of slaves. They had lands without a sufficient number of laborers, and families without a sufficient number of servants for their work. Africans were poured in to obviate these difficulties, and these were bought promiscuously by all."—Clarkson's History, page 57.

No marvel that, in the presence of such facts, the Quaker government of Pennsylvania legislated to prohibit the slave-trade; and to abolish slavery. A similar statement would suffice for the Puritans of New England. The Dutch settlers of New York could not be expected to exemplify a pious Christianity less than that of Quakerism and Puritanism. Presbyterians in America was the daughter of Presbyterianism in England. Of Episcopacy, as then exemplified in Britain and America, human nature had little or nothing to expect. The first Baptist church in America was formed about the year 1639, at Providence, by the celebrated Roger Williams. The increase of the denomination, for several years, was small. About the year 1741, however, many churches in New England embraced their sentiments. (Vide Goodrich, p. 68.) We do not know that they were distinguished from the Congregationalists by any other peculiarities than that indicated by their name. Though Mr. Wesley preached in Georgia as early as 1734, yet Methodism in organized form was not introduced into America until 1766, in the city of New York. The history of its position we reserve, as belonging to a later period than that under review.

If the annals of Rhode Island may be consulted, Roger Williams himself was an enslaver of Indians.

SLAVERY IN NEW ENGLAND.

"In the early part of the 18th century, Judge Sewall, of New England, came forward as a zealous advocate for the slaves."

"The celebrated Phillis Wheatley was the slave of a respectable merchant in Boston. This was in the time of Whitefield; and slave-holding does not appear to have been commonly regarded as a disreputable practice, in the churches of New England, then. It was rather a mark of respectability, as being a badge of the gentry, who employed slaves as their family domestics, particularly in the cities and large towns. With exception of a few extensive landholders, the farmers of New England, from the causes before hinted at, were not commonly holders of slaves. Inured to hard labor themselves, they had little temptation to resort to the use of slave labor. But in almost every country parish, the professional gentlemen—the lawyer, the physician, and the minister, were commonly the holders of one or two slaves, as domestics. President Edwards the elder (father of the Jonathan Edwards who wrote against slavery) was a slave-holder. The treatment of slaves in New England and Pennsylvania is claimed to have been milder than at the south, where little labor was performed by white persons. The various laws and customs, well as the facts, prove that slavery at the south and at the north was substantially the same thing. Slaves reared in the families of distinguished ministers were frequently, if not commonly, permitted to learn men and women without having been learned to read. Severe and brutal punishments of men and women by whipping, and for trivial and even imaginary offences, were not uncommon. A slave, in the eastern part of Connecticut, belonging to a professor of religion, was severely whipped, and suspended by a rope all day, with a rail between his feet, on suspicion of having set fire to a barn; but it afterwards appeared that the fire was accidentally lighted by the son of the master, while sporting with a musket. In the same parish, the female slave of the minister became the mother of several children by different slave fathers, without being married to either of them, and without any seeming suspicion, on her part, or by the parishioners in general, that there was anything improper in negroes doing so. In an adjoining parish, about the same time, a minister was the owner of two slaves, male and female, both residing in his family. They both became hopelessly pious, and were admitted by their clerical master to be members of his church. They were married together, by him, not long afterwards. Having an opportunity, however, after a while, to sell the woman to another minister, some fifty or a hundred miles distant, he did so, retaining her husband, notwithstanding the united remonstrances of the husband and wife. Heart-broken by this treatment, the slave husband sickened and died. Some good people thought the case rather a hard one; but no church action, or associated clerical measures, followed the affair; and he died as he had lived—a Congregational pastor in good standing. Such was slavery in Connecticut about seventy years since; and the rectitude of it may go far towards affording us a solution of the position of the present clergy of New England, many of them, and gradations of slave-holders. The subject they continually dream an exciting one, with which the churches should not be disturbed."

We have now brought down our historical sketches to the period of the American Revolution. The writer, like many others, appears to confound Presbyterianism with Congregationalism; but in this case the error needs a correction.

lon, when, from various causes, the advocates of Emancipation were greatly increased. The testimony of Hopkins, Wesley, Edwards, and others, and especially the position now assumed by the Quakers, gave a new impetus to the cause of the enslaved. Of these, and of the subsequent position of the American churches, (including the Methodists,) we propose to treat in our next lecture. On the present occasion we content ourselves with a brief recapitulation and review of the facts we have collected, and the ground we have gone over.

RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.

The Protestant Reformation, and the African slave trade, (including the modern system of chattel slavery,) commenced at about the same time.

They grow up together, side by side, without coming in harsh collision—the latter having never been essentially or perceptibly checked by the former; the former having never been directly or avowedly arrayed against the latter.

We do not mean to say that the principles involved in the Protestant Reformation were not favorable to liberty and hostile to slavery; nor that the fact of the Protestant Reformation had not a strong tendency toward that state of things in which opposition to slavery would naturally spring up, and find an open field for its activity and success. Such results, and such fields, are now witnessed in this country and in England.

What we mean to affirm is, that the early Protestant Reformers and their successors, for more than two hundred years, during the rise, growth, and general extension of chattel slavery, and up to the commencement of the American Revolution, (with few and rare individual exceptions,) did not understand and apply the principles of liberty as to oppose either the slave trade or the slave system.

Nor does it appear that, during that time, there was any perceptible difference between Romanists and Protestants, so far as the support of slavery and the slave trade are concerned.

Of all the Protestant sects of that period, there was not one that was distinctly known as hostile to slavery and the slave trade—not one that is known to have been unhesitatingly with the guilt of it, in their own members, during the early period of their history—the period commonly regarded by their ancestors as the period of their primitive purity, and more distinguished spirituality of character.

If it be claimed that an exception in favor of the Methodists should be made in respect to this last statement, (we know not whether it could be claimed,)—it should be remarked that their origin, almost at the close of the period under review, and the then fewness of their numbers, makes their case a very small exception to the general statement we have made. How long the Methodists retained their integrity, if they commenced right, we shall consider in our next lecture.

The number of individual testimonies against slavery, during this period, and from men of the most adverse sects, is sufficient to show that the delinquency of the sects themselves, as religious communities, with their governing men, was not the sin of inadvertence or ignorance; as might otherwise have been claimed.

The religious sects in America, during the period we have specified, were not essentially different from the sects of the same names in England, except that they were more commonly and extensively involved in the guilt of kidnapping and enslaving their fellow-men.

The statements just made apply to Romanists and to Protestants—to the Church of England (with her Episcopal daughter in America) and to the Nonconformists—to the Puritans and to the Quakers—to the Presbyterians and to the Congregationalists, or Independents—to the

Baptists and to the Peco-Baptists. To what sect of the period specified do they not apply?

We conclude that the prevailing, the dominant, the current religion of England, from 1517, (and of America from its first settlement,) down to the year 1774, was a pro-slavery, and not an anti-slavery religion. Such at least was the position of the prominent sects—except, perhaps, the Quakers since 1703, and the Methodists for the short period they had then existed.

We conclude, too, that if these showy and pretentious sects are not to be abandoned, now, without incurring the charge of schism, it must be on account of some redeeming qualities they have exhibited since 1774, and of which we can better judge after an examination (in our next lecture) of their history since that date. No claims in behalf of those sects, predicated on the superior spirituality and purity of their primitive days, will find much favor with those who have learned that "the righteous considereth the cause of the poor: but the wicked regardeth not to know it." The good men, more or less, connected with the various and contending ecclesiastical combinations of Protestant sectarianism, do not sanctify the combinations themselves, nor prove them to be, as such, and on the whole, true churches of Christ, and faithful to the interests of humanity and mercy—any more than good men, more or less, in the Roman Catholic Church, before the time of Luther or afterwards, can sanctify the Catholic communion, and prove it to be faithful and sound. Nor can the deeper and more universal corruption and apostasy of the Romish Church, suffice to certify us that the Protestant communions are faithful. On the contrary, the lower the Romish communion has sunk, and the farther it has departed from the solid ground of Christian fidelity and truth, the more reason is there to apprehend that those sects that have separated from it, while they may have renounced many of its grosser errors and abandoned many of its abominable practices, may nevertheless be far removed from the ground that must be occupied by a faithful Christian church. To be less abandoned, in some particulars, than the Antichristian Babylon of Rome, is rather too equivocal a testimony to be confided in, one would think, by those who have the Bible in their hands, and profess to take its teachings for their guidance.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, NOVEMBER, 1843.

GERRIT SMITH AND THE SABBATH.—We have been puzzled to know what is meant by the new outbreak of opposition that charges Gerrit Smith with a violation of the Sabbath, for preaching, on that day, the religious and political duty of "proclaiming liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." On inquiry and reflection, we are unable to fix upon anything in the movement of Mr. Smith that is new, except it be the holding of Sabbath meetings out-of-doors when the clergy would not admit him into their meeting-houses. Similar meetings have been held in the meeting-houses, and on the Sabbath, for nine or ten years past, without any objection from professed friends of the anti-slavery enterprise. If Sabbath-breaking consists in out-door preaching by laymen, without leave of the regularly ordained clergy, let us know it, and the reasonings upon which the sect is founded.

By-the-by, we notice that a *Warren* Editor is in great trouble because two respectable clergymen of that village, a Baptist and a Methodist, permitted William Goodell to "preach politics" in their pulpits, lately, on the Sabbath. The "desecration" of the Sabbath, in this instance, consisted in giving expositions of Matt. xxv, 31-46; and Isaiah i, 1-27, and other portions

of Scripture. If it be a desecration of the Sabbath to preach the truth out of doors, as some of our clergy would have it, the *Warren* Editor cannot be much blamed for inferring that it was equally a desecration to preach the truth in the meeting-house.

Another thing we should like to have settled. If "the whole counsel of God" may not be preached on the Sabbath without a desecration of holy time, we should like to have a list made out, by due clerical authority, of the portions of Scripture that may be explained and expounded on the Sabbath, without "Sabbath desecration."

SLANDEROUS REPORTS.—Those professed friends of the enslaved who think to crush the "Christian Investigator" by circulating false reports and vague suspicions concerning the Editor, will find it a losing game in the end. The clerical gentleman who lately published, in the Albany Patriot, his statement that William Goodell is, or has been, an Universalist, and very probably discards the commonly-received doctrine of the atonement, in favor of Socinian views—has been written to, (by mail, post-paid,) in which letter William Goodell explicitly denies both the allegations, and demands of the gentleman a prompt retraction of his charges, or a proof of their truthfulness, on pain of standing convicted of slander.

CHURCH AT HONEOYE.—The following document is published in response to the somewhat extended inquiry concerning the faith and order of the new church recently organized at Honeoye, by seceders, chiefly from the Methodist Protestant and Presbyterian churches. Misapprehensions and misstatements in respect to the views and position of this church have prevailed, and are still in circulation, which it seems desirable to correct by an authentic statement. The readers of the "Christian Investigator" may receive it, too, if they please, as the Editor's answer, so far forth, to the inquiry sometimes propounded to him, in print and otherwise, "What would you have us do?" "What plan of church organization do you propose?" The Editor had indeed hoped that his laws had already been made plain; but he is willing to very the form of explanation, and give him upon him.

In drawing up articles of this kind, two methods present themselves for selection. We may either study a comprehensive brevity, selecting fundamental generalities, after the model of the so-called "Apostles' Creed;" or, if deemed needful, we may enter into greater minuteness of detail. In ordinary times, the former mode may be best; but the brethren at Honeoye felt called upon to define their position by a more extended statement of their views, both with respect to the topics commonly made prominent in church creeds, and the topics on account of which they had thought it their duty to secede. In both these matters they were liable to be misunderstood. It will be noticed, that the "Covenant" is made to include the "Creed" and the "Constitution of Church Order"—all three being blended together in one. By this means it was hoped that the statements of doctrine, and rules of discipline, would appear more attractive and practical than in a more didactic form. Far enough from being faultless, and not claiming to be a model, it may serve as a hint, if not as a specimen, of what should and will be.

STATEMENT OF THE COVENANT, FAITH, AND CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF GOD AT HONEOYE, ONTARIO COUNTY, N. Y., as mutually agreed upon by the Members, at its organization, October, 1, 1843.

1. We, whose names are here enrolled, unite ourselves together in covenant obligations, as a Christian assembly, or church.

2. In doing this, we individually and unitedly avouch the LORD JEHOVAH, FATHER, SON, and HOLY SPIRIT,

* Since the above was in type, we learn that the printer of the Patriot mistook the copy. It should have been Universalist instead of Universalist. So the gentleman has one slander the less to account for.

one only living and true God, our Father, our God—our sovereign King, our Defense, our Ruler, our Lawgiver, our Redeemer, our Sanctifier, our Everlasting Portion and Rest.

3. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments we gratefully receive, as the truthful, accurate, and unerring records and revelations of the Divine Will, the Statute-Book and Charter of our Sovereign Lord, given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

4. We worship our God as eternal, without beginning, without end, self-existent, independent, unchangeable, everywhere present, almighty. We adore him as infinite in knowledge, wisdom, holiness, purity, benevolence, righteousness, goodness, truth, faithfulness, loving-kindness, tender mercy, compassion, and every conceivable perfection. We bow down before him as the Creator and Preserver of the Universe, the Father of our spirits, in whom we live, and move, and have our being, on whom we completely depend for all that we have or are, and to whom we must give an account for all that we think, say, or do.

5. In the law of our God we recognize the expression of his Divine will, the exhibition of his own moral character, binding on all moral beings, and consequently on man, formed in his own image, made a little lower than the angels, and crowned with glory and honor. This law we feel to be holy, just, and good, demanding supreme love to our supreme God, and equal love to our equal fellow-men—thus impartially guarding the inalienable and equal rights of all, and showing that the ways of the Lawgiver are equal—that his statutes are right.

6. We receive the Divine testimony that God made man upright; that Adam and Eve, our first parents, tempted by Satan, fell from their integrity by transgression, forfeited the Divine favor, and involved themselves and their race in the disorders we now witness.

7. We confess and lament the sinful character and lapsed condition of our race, alienated from God by wicked works, inasmuch that they are all gone aside, and together become filthy, and, without the regenerating grace of God, there is none that doeth good—no, not one.

8. We adore and magnify the abounding mercy of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in sending his equal Son, our Savior, to be a propitiation for our sins—and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world.

9. We adore and magnify the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ ("who thought it not robbery to be equal with God") that "he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham," and "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" "he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities—the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed;" "for the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all."

10. We joyfully bear in mind his triumphant resurrection, and his glorious ascension to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us, and where he is exalted to be a Prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

11. We rejoice in the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment to come; to regenerate, to sanctify, and to restore, from the ruins of the fall, an innumerable company of lost sinners.

12. The salvation of the gospel we prize as a salvation from sin—a deliverance from the righteous condemnation of God's violated law, a renewal of God's moral image, and a revival of divine life in the soul, bringing man into a loving harmony with the will of his Maker, and a hearty and habitual compliance with all the Divine commands.

13. The benefits of this salvation, we are assured, will be realized by all those, and those only, who in the present life, (the only state of probation) repent of their sins, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, accept the free offer of mercy in the gospel, consecrate themselves wholly to the service of God and mankind, and, by a course of patient endurance, and self-denying duty, grow in grace, and persevere unto the end.

14. We confidently look forward to the period in which this earth, as a state of probation, will come to an end, when the bodies of all the dead will be raised from their graves and reunited with their spirits, when the Lord Jesus Christ shall come in his glory, when before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats—when the wicked shall go away

into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.

15. In joining ourselves, together, in a Christian assembly or church, we agree—that a Christian church is an assembly of Christian believers, a congregation of faithful men; that Christian believers are those, and those only, who are regenerated by the Holy Spirit, who repent of their sins, who embrace the Lord Jesus Christ by a living faith, as their Savior, rely on his atoning sacrifice for free pardon, whose faith is made manifest in the fruit of good works, including the fruit of the lips, in their daily conversation and cordial profession of the fundamental truths of the gospel, and especially in loving their neighbors as themselves, allowing mercy to the poor, considering and defending their cause, doing justly, loving mercy, walking humbly with God, visiting the widows and fatherless, in their affliction, and keeping themselves separate from the world; that all true Christians, not only, are entitled to membership in Christian churches; that the essence of church organization is the fellowship and union of Christians worshipping together in one place, watching over each other, bearing one another's burdens, combining their energies in doing good, and excluding the faithless and apostate from their number. We further agree,

16. That evidence of Christian character, and nothing else, is the qualification for church membership; that for the sake of Christian character, and nothing else, can warrant exclusion.

That all the members of a Christian church are equal brethren; that they have an equal and mutual right to admonish and exhort each other, but that none of them, whether officers or private members, have a right to lord it over their brethren, or to insist authoritatively upon a uniformity in anything not essential to sound Christian character. (See Rom. xiv.)

That the rules of discipline laid down by Christ, in the 18th chapter of Matthew, are binding on all church members; that the decision of the church in all cases of discipline, is to be final, there being no Scripture authority, warrant, or precept, for the existence of any other ecclesiastical body, to whom an appeal could be made, or for the transaction of any other church business whatever.

That all acts of a church, including its acts of church discipline, are to be the acts of the entire body, "assembled together," in open church meeting, "in one place," and not the acts of the church officers, or other select body, in convocation, or acting by themselves, in the place of the church. (See 1 Cor. v.) Still less are they to be the acts of any ecclesiastical body, distinct from, or over, the local assembly or church.

That all the officers of a church, including its pastor or pastors, must be members of the church, on an equal footing with their brethren, subject with them to the same church discipline, by the whole body, and not holding themselves amenable to any other ecclesiastical tribunal.

That all the officers of a church, including the pastor or pastors, are to be chosen by its members, and to hold office during the consent and good pleasure of the church.

That the election, appointment, ordination, or installation of all the church officers, including pastors and teachers, is the proper duty and prerogative of the entire body—a duty that (like all other church duties) they have no warrant from Christ to transfer, by delegation or otherwise, to the decision of any other man or body of men.

That the admonition to "beware of false prophets" is addressed to all Christians, and therefore they have no right, either as individuals or assemblies, to receive teachers on the mere appointment, recommendation, or ordination of others, but are "bound to know them by their fruits," according to Christ's directions; and hence all arrangements for "stationing preachers" among the people, by delegates, conferences, bishops, or otherwise, are to be rejected as usurpations over the people, or as contrivances by the people to rid themselves of the obligations and responsibilities resting upon them.

That since there is no Divine warrant, or example, for organized clerical bodies, or assemblies of ministers, apart from the mass of their brethren, and since experience proves the bad tendency of such organizations, they ought to be discontinued, and laid aside, by the friends of Christian liberty and primitive church order.

That freedom of speech and free discussion should be maintained in all Christian churches, and that the unnatural monopoly of the right of speech in the church, by a part of their officers or others, to the suppression of the same right on the part of the other members, is to be carefully guarded against, as of primary necessity, in order to the preservation of religious freedom.

17. The positive institutions of religion we honor, as the appropriate and Heaven-appointed means of high spiritual and moral ends; to be used for the sake of promoting those ends, not idolized as possessing inherent virtue or efficacy in themselves, or made a basis of contention among Christians.

Believing that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, we would use it for the objects of its original institution—in promoting the best interests of man.

In respect to water baptism, and the Lord's supper, the founders of this church, though they unanimously agreed in receiving them as of Divine appointment, and in practicing them according to their own best individual knowledge, and understanding of their primitive form, yet they were not, in their intercourse with each other, in church relations, or in the reception of new members into the body, lord it over the faith of their brethren, enjoin uniformity in modes wherein Christians are known to differ, or make anything, in addition to the evidences of saving faith and Christian character, essential to church membership.

18. We associate ourselves together as a Christian church, that we may enjoy the society of the faithful, escape from the evil communications that corrupt good manners, watch over and admonish each other in love, unite our testimony in favor of truth and righteousness, and concentrate our efforts in doing the work of Christian disciples—the work of Jesus Christ—the proclaiming of the gospel of emancipation to the captives—the opening of the prison doors to them that are in bondage—to bind up the broken-hearted—to set at liberty the crushed—to preach the jubilee of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God.

We unite in the worship of the God of the spirits of all flesh, the impartial and benignant Father of all men, who has made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth. We thankfully cherish, therefore, the sacred tie of that common humanity that binds us to our equal brethren of all nations and colors; and, by the grace of God, we will spurn and trample under our feet that cord of caste that would separate us from our kindred, and make void the law of our Creator.

As we worship the God of the oppressed, the Refuge of the helpless, we will, in his strength, in his name, and by his Spirit, plead the cause of the oppressed, shelter the outcasts, execute judgment for the spoiled, and labor to realize and give expression to the leading idea of the gospel of Christ—to wit, the elevation of the poor.

As a Christian church, we will labor, in Christ's strength, to plan, devise, attempt, carry forward, and complete whatever needs to be undertaken and perfected for the restoration and onward progress of our species, for the regeneration of lost sinners, for the reformation of public and private morals, for the enjoyment of holy freedom, for the downfall of all despotisms, (whether in the church or in the state,) for the eradication of every vice, for the promotion of temperance, chastity, purity, and every virtue; for the evangelizing of the world, for the dissemination of Divine knowledge, for the increase of holiness, for the perfecting of the saints, for the restoration of this revolted world to the sway of its lawful Sovereign.

Believing that wars and fightings come of men's lusts that war in their members; that when the Prince of Peace shall reign on the earth, the nations will learn war no more, and that the church of Christ will be instrumental in introducing that period, we will endeavor to learn and discharge the duties devolving upon us, in reference to the prevalence of universal peace.

Repudiating and abjuring those false notions of religion by which men are encouraged to hold the truth in unrighteousness—to admit the claims of rectitude in the abstract, and neglect them in practice—to serve their Creator on the Sabbath; and themselves during the week—to worship God in the sanctuary, and Mammon in the market-place, and Satan at the polls—we solemnly and unitedly consecrate ourselves, soul and body, at all times, in all places, and in all our activities, to the service of God and of human nature, which is our reasonable service; promising, that whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, in our houses or on our farms, in our shops at the ballot-box, or at the altar of communion, we will do all to the glory of God. This, in the name and in the strength of our divine Redeemer, we unitedly and individually covenant and promise, before God, angels, and men, imploring the divine mercy and aid of our covenant-keeping God, through his Son Jesus Christ, and the influences of the Holy Spirit, for the performance of these promises.

It is unanimously agreed and understood, that amid the light now shining in this community, the use, manufacture, and traffic in intoxicating drinks, and the licensing of the traffic—as well as the holding of slaves, spoli-

ogizing for the practice, enacting pro-slavery laws, refusing (when clothed with legislative power) to repeal them, and sustaining such law-makers at the polls—high crimes against God and human nature, inconsistent with the Christian profession and the spirit of these

10. While we hold the spirit and intent of this Covenant to be irrevocable and for ever binding, we do not so tie ourselves to the letter as to preclude alterations in this instrument, by additions, corrections, subtractions, or an entire new statement. A motion to this effect, from any member of the church, may at any time be made; and it will then become the duty of the church to consider and act in reference to the proposed change. We have deemed it important to make this statement of our faith, covenant, and church organization, at the commencement of our united labors as a church. Other statements, from time to time, may be made, as occasions may arise; but in receiving new members, or retaining members in our connexion, what we require, and all we require, of the individual is, not a subscription to this, or to any other instrument of writing, but evidence, in some form, of a cordial reception of the fundamental truths of religion, of a regeneration of heart by the Holy Spirit, and the fruits of a divine life, exhibited by a consistent, habitual, and persevering, and active conformity with the Divine will.

The church was organized, on the 1st of October, 1813, by the choice of three elders, two deacons, and a clerk. It was understood by the brethren, that the Scriptural terms *elder*, *presbyter*, *pastor*, and *bishop*, were originally employed to designate one and the same office. But a preference was given to the term *elder*, under the impression that it had been less perverted, by misuse, from its original meaning, and that the employment of it would be less liable to be misunderstood, and to express an implied sanction to the prevalent but unscriptural distinction between a "laity" and a "clerical caste."

* The roll of church members, as kept on the Records, may, therefore, contain names which may not be found appended to this document.

So much has been said against the course of Gerrit Smith, in preaching politics on the Sabbath, attacking the ministry, &c., we think it will be well to record in our columns his own account of the matter, and a specimen of his warfare with the proslavery clergy of his county.

TO THE PRO-SLAVERY MINISTERS OF THE COUNTY OF MADISON.

So you are really afraid that our County will declare herself for the slave, at the approaching election! God be praised, that you have reason to be! God be praised, that the rapid progress of anti-slavery truth in it warrants the hope that the country will, so soon, stand forth for down-trodden, bleeding humanity! God be praised, that the downfall of American slavery, greatly accelerated as it will be, by this local victory, will be your downfall also!—You have the discernment to see that the anti-slavery cause is travelling rapidly towards its final and complete triumph, and to read in that triumph your own doom. Hence the multiplying demonstrations of your increasing alarm. You well know that, in the regenerated public sentiment which shall succeed—which shall have effected—the overthrow of slavery, your ministerial services will be in little demand. Your occupation then will be gone. You will then have your deserts. You will be despised, loathed, and execrated, even more than slavery itself—for slavery is not so despicable and dangerous, as is that portion of its upholders who are recognized as chosen and authoritative teachers of religious truth. Indeed, but for these corrupt teachers—these "blind leaders of the blind"—slavery could not be; and, were it abolished, there is not, so far as their power and influence are concerned, any security against its return, or against the production and prevalence of any other form of wickedness.

My declaration, that I am willing to spend my Sabbath in pleading for God's enslaved poor, has proved an occasion for a new and rich display of your pro-slavery and pharisaism. You are warning the people in your respective cages not to hear me preach politics on the Sabbath—that is, not to hear me explain how wicked and how murderous is your own pro-slavery policy. What thanks to the Divine blessing on the power of your captives, as well as those in the pro-slavery politicians' cages are, in

spite of your warning, fast breaking down the bars which have shut them in. The venerable hen clucks in vain after her brood of ducks, as they sail away from her own bosom of their favorite element. In vain, is it that you attempt to restrain the promptings of a free spirit in your parishioners. Seventy-eights of them will turn their backs, on your heartless whinnies and cantings to attend upon a ministry which has truth, and soul, and love, and humanity, and God, in it. You have influence enough with your trustees and deacons and elders to get them to refuse me the use of the Churches under their control. But, thus far, the skies have favored us, and, beneath the grateful shelter of God-made trees, we have felt no need of man-made houses.—You manifest great concern for the Sabbath; and, it is understood, that one of you is the author of the stupid, silly article in the Madison County Eagle, headed, "Gerrit Smith and the Sabbath." They must be blind as bats, however, who cannot see that this concern is the merest affectation. What care you for the Sabbath, who can consent to have millions of your countrymen robbed of it and of every other means of holiness and usefulness and happiness? And what know you of the proper observance of the Sabbath, who know not enough to improve the day in preaching and praying for the slave; and who know not enough to rebuke pro-slavery voters, and to keep pro-slavery votes out of your own polluted hands? We declare it as certain, that, in the light of the philosophy of the Bible, you cannot, whilst living in such sin, know any thing, as you ought to know, of the claims and character of the Sabbath. Where does that Book promise light to him who wilfully walks in darkness, or knowledge to him who is disobedient? No where. But the burden of its teachings is: "If any man will do his will, he shall know." "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord." They stumble at the word, being disobedient. Who so is wise and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord. "The meek will He guide in judgment—the meek will He teach his way." "The path of the just is as the shining light." To look to you for instructions how to keep the Sabbath, is as absurd as to take lessons from a thief on the extent and nature, features and elements of the crime of theft. It will be time enough to choose you for instructors, when you are seen to be performing the nearest and therefore, plainest duties. While you refuse to perform these you will, necessarily, be unqualified to judge of those which are more remote and, therefore, more difficult to be understood. Says one of Carlyle's books: "Do the duty which lies nearest thee—which thou knowest to be duty. Thy second duty will already have become clearer." Would you, perceive whether it is right for me, whose aptness to teach is, I admit, much less than my need of being taught, to quit hearing the word on the Sabbath and to turn preacher for the slave; then try what effect it will have on your perceptions if you cease to vote the bible out of the hands of the slave, and the lash upon his back, and cease to vote away his right to marry, and to vote that he shall be bought and sold like the ox.—The new light which obedience to God, in this plain case, would pour upon your path, might reveal other duties; and, amongst these duties, you might perhaps find your obligation to preach for the slave on the Sabbath, and also mine, to do so, in the event of your continuing to be "dumb dogs, that cannot bark." Then, what you now stumble at, or ignorantly condemn, might be plain and proper in your sight. Then, what your present guilty disobedience renders you unfit to judge of as a blind man is of colors, you might be able to pronounce upon in.

The extent to which you presume on the ignorance and stupidity of the people, is amazing. It was only last Winter that one of you betrayed his proslavery heart in a speech at Morrisville. The tenor of his speech made it safe to charge him on the spot with having cast a proslavery vote, at the last Fall's Election. He seemed to be greatly surprised at the charge. Whether his surprise was, that he should be suspected of having committed the crime, or that any thing which one of his holy profession does should be construed into a crime, I do not know. However that may be the charge, which he was constrained to admit the truth of, put even his ignorance to the test. If all men could utter harve of all the professions of love for the slave, with which he had interlarded his speech. You rely very much on yourself and sanctimonious manner

of slipping in your proslavery votes to exempt you from detection and censure. But the people are waking up to your disgusting and abhorrent wickedness; and your successful imposture is fast drawing to a close.

How strange, that you should flatter yourselves that the people will forever remain ignorant of the proslavery character of the National parties to which you belong! Do you think they will never find out that your National Methodist and National Presbyterian parties have bound themselves, by many and deliberate and published Resolutions, to oppose the abolition of slavery? Do you think that the people can always be kept ignorant of the countenance which Northern Baptists give to the man-stealing practised by Southern Baptists? Do you think that the people will always be blind to the fact that Northern Whigs, are pledged to Southern Whigs, and Northern Democrats to Southern Democrats, to uphold slavery? In a word, do you flatter yourselves that the people will never find out that every National party in this country, whether political or ecclesiastical, must (because the South will consent to be in no other) be proslavery as long as the system of American slavery endures?

I defy contradiction when I allege that, to please the South and keep her from breaking out of the National religious parties, the National Methodist party and the National Presbyterian party take the ground that a sin, however great and glaring, ceases to be a sin when the civil government approves of it: that the National Presbyterian party, at the very time when it is declaring that it is a high crime to move the feet to music, refuses to say that the buying and selling and featherizing of men, women and children, is in the least degree, sinful; that the National Methodist party pronounces all colored persons, whether bond or free, in the Church or out of it, to be liars: and that the American Baptist party acquiesces in the doctrine that slavery can cancel marriage and justify bigamy. Inexpressibly wicked as are these parties, you are, nevertheless, wicked enough to belong to them.

I also defy contradiction, when I allege that to please the South and keep from breaking out of the Democratic and Whig parties, these parties allow the prisons which are built with the Nation's money to be used for confining the victims of the slave trade—and persons to be licensed, on the payment by each of four hundred dollars a year, to carry on that trade even in the city of Washington—and the National flag to give protection to that trade. Under this same motive, these parties plunge our Nation into proslavery wars; thereby wasting its wealth (the Florida war cost more than forty millions of dollars) and consigning to banishment or slaughter whole tribes of Indians, whose only crime is that they have lands which slaveholders covet, and hiding places to which those slaves whose wrong hearts condemn oppression no longer are wont to fly. But blood-red as is the guilt of these parties, such is your guilt for belonging to them.

You, however, have your excuses, and speak of your good deeds. You say you do not belong to these parties for the sake of upholding slavery. It matters not for what sake you belong to them, or for what sake they uphold slavery: you and they are guilty of the crime of upholding it; and the plea that you are not is as empty as would be the plea of the highway robber, that, since he did not commit his murders for the sake of committing them, but only for the sake of getting money, he ought not to be held responsible for them.

You say that you are kind to your neighbors, and pity the poor and the suffering around you. But this is no justification for the wrongs which you inflict on those remote from you; and, since your infliction of these wrongs shows that you are not actuated by principle in your treatment of your fellow men, it is fair to add that nothing is wanting but opportunity, interest, temptation, to enlist your agency in enslaving those who are the objects of your present kindness. Contributing, as you do, to uphold the infernal system under which other men's children are bought and sold like cattle, there is no security that, in supposable circumstances, you would not lend a helping hand to extend the grasp of that system to the children of your nearest neighbors and most intimate friends. Having proved yourselves to be but mere mercenaries, we are at liberty to say that you have put yourselves into market for a price, which is the highest attainable amount of selfish gratification, for what that gratification may to the rights and hearts of others.

"You say that you preach the gospel. I doubt not that you utter many gospel doctrines. But if you mean that to declare, in an abstract form, any or even all of the doctrines of the gospel, is the sum, or any considerable part of the sum, of preaching the gospel, I widely dissent from you." To apply its doctrines—that is to preach the gospel; and he who, like yourselves, has not the courage, honesty, and self-denial, to do so, is not a preacher of the gospel. To call him a preacher of the gospel who shrinks from identifying himself with the anti-slavery cause, and refuses to press the claims of that cause on a community of slaveholders, is to dignify cowardice and treason with a name which is most significant of courage and integrity. I speak of this as a slaveholding community, and I do so with the most perfect propriety: for are not the people of the State of New York as truly slaveholders as if they were slave owners also? Are they not as truly slaveholders as are the people of Virginia? The people of New York are slaveholders in virtue of their being a party to the making and maintenance of slave laws, and in virtue, also, of their pledge to back up these laws by their physical power. And is it not in the same way that the people of Virginia have made themselves slaveholders?

I entreat you, then, in the name of truth and decency; that you no more number yourselves with the preachers, but with the betrayers of Jesus Christ; no more with the friends, but with the enemies of God; no more with the friends, but with the enemies of man;—until you shall have repented and have taken your stand by the side of those who, in the face of proslavery politicians and proslavery priests of oppressors, and of devils, are laboring, in the strength of their God and of their own good cause, to deliver the millions of their enslaved countrymen.

GERHIT SMITH.

PETERSBORO, August 10, 1843.

THE CONVENTION AT SYRACUSE—third Wednesday in December. Don't forget the day; and do not fail to attend.

BLOWING HOT, AND BLOWING COLD.—It is quite instructive to notice that whenever Presbyterians or other dissenters undertake to defend themselves against the assaults and inroads of Episcopacy and Romanism, they are driven to take, in many respects, the very positions that they are ready to cry out against as tending to "anarchy" and "disorganization," whenever they are assailed and urged (as in the "Christian Investigator," for example,) against usages and pretensions existing among Presbyterians and other dissenters from Episcopacy. The New York Evangelist of Aug. 10, for instance, says of Bishop Brownell, that "he looks upon ordinances as having a saving virtue" (when rightly administered) notwithstanding Paul has affirmed that "in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." A grave charge this, against Bishop Brownell, to be sure, but if Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists were not, essentially and practically with Bishop Brownell in this matter, and if they harmonized in sentiment with Paul, should we see them harrangue acknowledged Christians out of church membership, and thus denying them a place among the family of the faithful, when their only alleged deficiency is, that they have not been duly baptized—that the "ordinance" had not been "rightly administered," or not administered at all? And would they be making huge eyes of affright at the proposition to admit applicants into the church on the sole qualification of Christian character; whatever their views of the *rituals* of religion may be? And doing this, too, in the midst of their own loud protestation against "ritualism?"

In the same article in the Evangelist, we find the following:

"Take away from men the right of reading and understanding the word of God, for themselves, teach them that they are dependent for salvation, upon 'sacraments' administered by a certain order of men, and you have laid a broad foundation for despotism, both spiritual and temporal."

Precisely the doctrine accounted heretical when urged in the "Christian Investigator," and on account of which

Congregational and as well as Presbyterian ministers have discontinued the paper! The Evangelist uses almost exactly our own language, and states our sentiments quite as strongly as we have ever done, on these cardinal points, viz: 1. That it is an error to account the sacraments essential to salvation. 2. That when they are thus accounted essential, and when they can only be administered by "a certain order of men"—a clerical caste—there is laid a broad foundation for spiritual [eye, and temporal] despotism! 3. Scarcely less emphatic than ours, is the Evangelist's reprobation of clerical caste, and in claiming for all, "the right of reading and understanding the word of God; for themselves," the Evangelist, (if it means anything intelligible and practical,) must be understood (must it not?) to go for free lay discussion in the churches, and, of course, against the exclusive clerical monopoly of religious teaching!

All this was necessary—to be sure it was! in repelling the pretensions of Episcopals—but how will it do to wield the same principles against similar abuses and usurpations among dissenters? "Indeed!" says the lawyer, that alters the *ask!*

Some may attempt to evade this, by insisting on the wide distinction between the necessity of the "sacraments" to salvation, and their necessity to church membership in the existing sects. Well—when that distinction shall have been clearly made out, it will have been proved that the churches of those sects are based upon quite another foundation than that of the great Assembly (or church) of the saved! If it be so, the sooner the matter is understood, the better. But so long as church membership shall be commonly considered to be as closely connected with salvation as it is at present, (or even reckoned, as it well may be, among the important means of salvation,) so long it will be true, (by the showing of the New York Evangelist,) that whenever you make men "dependent for" church membership "upon sacraments administered by a certain order of men, you have laid a broad foundation for despotism, both spiritual and temporal."

The responsibility of promoting such a state of things, will rest as truly on the editors of the New York Evangelist and other leading Presbyterians, maintaining their present usages, as upon Bishop Brownell and the Episcopals. AND THEIR INCONSISTENCY WITH THEIR OWN PROFOUNDED PRINCIPLES WILL GREATLY ADD TO THEIR GUILT.

Prayers and desires—these, with the Christian, should be synonymous terms. To separate them, is to frustrate or destroy them. Prayer, without desire, is hypocrisy. Desire, without prayer, is atheism. Be careful to desire nothing you dare not pray for, and pretend to pray for nothing that you do not desire and labor to obtain.

PECUNIARY INTEREST.

The last source of sectarian discord to be noticed, is, *conflict of pecuniary interest* between neighboring ministers and churches. This principle applies to the feelings of the minister with regard to his salary, which depends in some measure on the increase of his church. In reference to laymen, it applies to their raising funds for all ecclesiastical purposes. The more their church prospers and receives additions, the more will their pecuniary liabilities be divided, the more easily will the burden rest on their shoulders. Hence, both pastors and people are tempted to envy and jealousy toward their Christian neighbors of other denominations, because the success of either party is more or less at the expense of the other. The success of either diminishes the amount of materials for the others to act on; and this is a matter of serious moment to the parties, especially in smaller towns and villages, where often twice as many ministers are stationed as are needed or can be supported.—Prof. Schumacker.

DR. LAFON, for Missionary at the San Juan Islands, and now agent of the Union Missionary Society. (Anti-slavery,) is lecturing and receiving contributions for that Society, in various parts of this State. We have had the privilege and pleasure of a short interview with him, and of hearing him lecture on the subject of his agency. We can heartily recommend him to the friends of truly evangelical Christianity. His statements we regard as trustworthy and of vast importance to those who seek the genuine conversion of the world. The manner in which he is shut out from many pulpits, and even by some ministers claiming to be Abolitionists, furnishes another illustration of the power and the poison of *sect*, and of the necessity of secession and reorganization, in order to the reformation of the church, and the support of Christian Missions.

Dr. Lafon explains, with great clearness, the power of oppression in the production of the most debasing *heathenism*. On this subject he has published a pamphlet of sterling value.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS

For the Christian Investigator, up to Nov. 1, 1843.

M. Mitchell, Shingle Creek, for C. Barker, Copenhagen, 0 50; and C. B. Hoard, Antwerp, 0 50;	\$1 00
J. Hawley, N. Milford, Pa.,	2 00
E. Strong, Hudson, Ohio,	0 12½
M. Keith, W. Winfield,	1 00
G. W. Pitts, Honeyoe,	2 00
Dr. T. Lafon, N. Bedford, Mass.,	0 50
B. Stuart, Honeyoe,	0 50
J. W. Alden, Boston,	1 00
P. Adams, Franklin, Mass., and E. W. Robinson, Freetown, Mass., and O. Chamberlain, Berkley, Mass., and J. Burbank, Dartmouth, Mass.,	2 00
A. O. Merrill, Eagleville, Ohio,	0 50
John Sawyer, Jr., Moravia,	1 00
Amount,	\$11 62½

OUR FRIENDS will see that the Christian Investigator cannot be published long at this rate. Other causes, besides the new uses for money incident to the revival of business, (hinted at in our last,) must have contributed to the smallness of our receipts this month. We were aware that a large portion of those staunch friends who promised extra assistance, nearly a year ago, had paid up their subscriptions, and we looked for some decline of receipts towards the latter part of the year, on that account. But there are some of those subscriptions yet unpaid. The brethren who subscribed will see the need of their paying up, now. To another class of our readers, too, we must make one more appeal. We mean those who have either paid us nothing at all, or who, having paid us only 25 or 50 cents each, during the publication of the former series, have received the paper ever since, and have therefore paid us only a part of the value of the papers they have received, and ought to make us another payment now, if they wish for the paper. This class constitutes a great majority of our readers. We do not like to strike off their names from our list, especially till we can complete the historical sketches upon which we have now entered; and which, we think, will include many important items, not distinctly presented in any of the current anti-slavery literature, now extant—particularly in relation to the active participation of leading ecclesiastics in fomenting the great riots of 1833, 1834, and 1835. These facts we wish to circulate extensively, but cannot do so without the means, from some quarter.

The next number, however, will promptly appear; and in the mean time, our friends, we trust, will see the necessity of giving us the needed help.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. I—No. 11,
WHOLE NUMBER, 10.

ROSEBOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., DECEMBER, 1843.

WILLIAM GOSWELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

[NOTHING]

Twelve Numbers in a Volume. To be published Monthly,
or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers,
50 cents, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward
the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy
for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have
two copies for his services:—Or, if procuring ten subscribers,
shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the
set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, \$0 50 Sixty papers, \$9 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers for 3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if require, in frank letters enclosing

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE XI.

THE CHURCHES AND SLAVERY.—SE-
COND PERIOD, FROM THE OPENING OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION TO THE COMMENCE-
MENT OF THE PRESENT ANTI-SLAVERY EX-
CITEMENT.

REVIEW.—POINT OF OBSERVATION.

We have traced, in our last Lecture, the origin
of the slave trade and the progressive extension
and establishment of the slave system, in its con-
nexion with the organized religion of Europe
America, up to the era of the struggle between
Great Britain and her American colonies—a period
extending from the simultaneous origin of the
slave trade and of the Protestant reformation, in
1517 down to the year 1774, about which time
the testimonies against slavery, and especially
against the slave trade, began to multiply and to take
the form of more direct efforts for their overthrow.
Up to this time, with a single exception, no in-
stance of permanent success, in arresting the pro-
gress of the giant iniquity, (so far as the action of
civil government is concerned,) appears to have
crowned the efforts of the friends of the enslaved.
That exception was the judicial decision in the
case of the slave Somerset, by which it was set-
tled that a slave coming into England from the
colonies, became free. For this decision the
cause of humanity is indebted to Granville Sharpe.
This was only two years before the opening of the
period we are now to consider. Some other events
towards the close of the former period may come
under notice here as more properly belonging to,
or connected with this period now under review.

The anti-slavery position assumed by the Soci-
ety of Friends, in 1763, has already been noticed.

"In the year 1774," says Clarkson, "John Wesley,
the celebrated divine to whose pious labors the religious
world will be long indebted, undertook the cause of the
poor Africans. He had been in America, and seen and
pitied their hard condition. The work which he gave to
the world, in consequence, was entitled 'Thoughts on
Slavery.' Mr. Wesley had this great cause much at heart,
and frequently recommended it to the support of those
who attended his useful ministry."—Clarkson's History,
page 45.

How far the early Methodists in England imbi-
bed the Anti-Slavery sentiments of Wesley, we
cannot positively say. As a sect, therefore, the
Friends, and those only, (so far as England is
concerned) since 1763, can be confidently set down
as Anti-Slavery in discipline, previous to 1774, or
at that time. In America the labors of John
Woolman and Anthony Benezet and others, suffi-
ced only to bring the Society to the true ground

in 1776, two years after the opening of the peri-
od now under consideration. As early as 1690,
according to Clarkson, the yearly meeting for
Pennsylvania 'advised the members of it to guard
against future importations of African slaves,'—
but said nothing against the holding of those al-
ready imported. In 1711 the same advice was re-
peated, and with similar want of effect. For in
1754 the same body issued a letter, in which, af-
ter referring to its former testimonies, it complains
that their "number [i. e. of slaves] is, of late, in-
creased among us." Yet, notwithstanding this,
58 years' experience of the inefficiency of gradual-
ism, except to the "increase" of the evil, the year-
ly meeting contented itself with a repetition of
vague generalities, condemning only "the making
slaves of our fellow creatures"—advised the Quar-
ter slave holders, "who, by inheritance have
slaves born in [their] families" to "instruct them
in the fear of God, and the knowledge of the Gos-
pel of Christ"—only hinting that such a course
would render the slaves "more capable of making
a proper use of their liberty"—"should" the mem-
bers "think it [their] duty to set them free." So
far as we know, this quiet admonition produced no
better effect than the former. The first record of
real progress in reformation of the Society was
thus:—

"In the year 1774 we find the same yearly meeting le-
galizing again on the subject. By a resolution of that
year, all members concerned in importing, selling, pur-
chasing, giving or transferring any, or other slaves, or
otherwise acting in such a manner as to continue them
in slavery beyond the time limited by law or custom,
were directed to be excluded from membership, or dis-
owned."—Clarkson's History, page 60.

"In the year 1776, the same yearly meeting carried
the matter still further. It was then limited, that the
owners or slaves who refused to execute proper instru-
ments for giving them their freedom, were to be dis-
owned likewise."—Id., page 61.

From this date forward we hear nothing of
slave holding among Quakers, though some time
may have elapsed, in bringing the provisions of the
resolution into full and universal effect.

We cannot, therefore, diverge far from the truth
in repeating our former statement, in round num-
bers, that the first three and a half centuries of
the African slave trade, and of the slavery grow-
ing out of it, carried on as was that trade, by
nations nominally Christian; by members of the
prominent Protestant churches, as well as by the
Catholics; and practised as was that slave holding
by the same description of people, encountered
no effective check, during that period; from any
of the prominent ecclesiastical organizations claim-
ing to be Churches of Christ. Whatever any of
the rival sects of Christendom may have since
done, to redeem their character from the foul
stain, it cannot be questioned that the sects origi-
nating early enough to be taken into the account
of the current and prevalent religion of that peri-
od, were deeply involved in the guilt of slavery
and the slave trade, up to the time we have spe-
cified, and that this period included that early
portion of their history commonly regarded by
their successors and the community in general, as
the time of their youthful purity and vigor—their
superior spirituality, and primitive fidelity to their
own professed principles, whatever they might be.

THE PRESENT POINT OF INQUIRY.

What then, we inquire, has been the position
of our organized Christian churches since 1774?
What was it in America down to the year 1833,
when the present anti-slavery agitation commenced?
What was it in England, down to the same
year, when the present anti-slavery agitation in

that country, which has resulted in the abolition
of slavery in the British Indies, Western and
Eastern.

The complaint is now heard, every day, that the
imprudence, fanaticism, and wrong measures of
"modern abolitionists," has impeded the progress
of emancipation and stands in the way of the
better measures that might have been successful-
ly prosecuted, were it not for their headlong and
impetuous course. This complaint, and these
pretensions are heard from the high places of our
principal protestant sects in America. Let us
see, then, what progress emancipation was mak-
ing, when they had the field entirely to them-
selves. Let us ask what measures were in op-
eration when the work was altogether in their own
hands.

That due justice may be awarded to all par-
ties, we shall take care to give a prominent place
to the records of all the real progress that was
made during the period now under consideration.
It will be needful to notice, likewise, the date as
well as the principles, means and instruments of
that progress. And if it shall appear that that
progress was in some way arrested, the date and
the causes of its decline and termination must al-
so come in for a place in the records.

OPENING PROSPECTS OF THIS PERIOD.

The commencement of the period we have
now under consideration, was marked by many
circumstances favorable to an enterprise in behalf
of the enslaved—and especially favorable to def-
inite and efficient action by the ministry and the
church. The controversy of the colonies with
the mother country had compelled attention to the
foundational principles of free government, the fun-
damental principles of human rights. The inter-
ests and wishes of the colonists inclined and thus
prepared them to see and embrace the truth on
these subjects. In the discussion and advocacy of
these truths, the clergy of New-England had tak-
en, and were taking a prominent and leading
part. The independent polity of the Congrega-
tional churches in New-England was better un-
derstood by the people than that in Germany, and
were their leading clergy then employed, as they
have since been, in the introduction of usages by
which, in some quarters, the Congregational pol-
ity has been rendered a dead letter, almost abso-
lute, and scarcely distinguishable from the Semi-
Episcopal Presbyterianism of the middle and
southern states. Nor were there, at that period,
any of those national societies of various names,
and Theological Seminaries, chiefly under clerical
control, which now give them such a dispro-
portionate and almost controlling power over the
laity. And yet the clergy of that period were
more truly independent than they are now, and
exerted a more salutary and permanent influence
upon the communities in which they moved.—
No monied aristocracy then, as at present, lorded
it over both the pastor and the flock. The ques-
tion of settling or retaining a pastor was not, then,
in the chief cities and towns of New-England, a
question of the good will and pleasure of the Pres-
ident and Directors of the city or village bank.—
The vote of the brotherhood for or against the set-
tlement or continuance of a minister was then un-
derstood to be the sober conscientious sense of the
several individuals voting, of the qualifications of
the candidate or pastor—and not an act put forth
in view of the prospect of getting or not getting a
discount or a renewal of a promissory note, at a
paper-money bank. A mutual confidence, affec-
tion and respect, cemented the union between the
pastor and the flock, and a dismissal of a clergy-

man for reproving popular iniquities, or the oppressions of the wealthy, was a phenomenon almost, if not wholly unknown. That broad distinction between the "secular" and the "sacred" that forbids the minister of religion to instruct his flock, on the every day duties of life, political duties as well as personal, family, and social, had not then been imported, from the monastery and the cloister, into the churches of Puritan New-England. A sickly evangelism and a spurious revivalism had not then dignified spiritual selfishness with the name of spiritual religion nor taught as "the chief end of man" his own personal conveyance, by the newest and most approved mechanical process, to the felicities of a future heaven, uninstructed and unmindful of his divinely appointed duties to his fellow men—his duties to the poor and the oppressed, here in this world, where his task of doing good is to be performed, if he would meet the plaudit of his Master, "well done." The doctrine of so many of our modern churches and ministers, that the enactments of civil government must be held paramount to self evident justice and the revealed will of the Creator, could not have had a very prominent place, if any at all, in the creeds of those revolutionary times. The spirit of liberty was roused and infused into the mass of the people, who, instead of parting quietly with their right of petition, for the paltry bribe of a profitable customer (provided he paid his bills) were ready to sacrifice their fortunes and their lives, rather than submit to a despotic three penny tax upon tea.

Such a time was a favorable one for the enterprise of pleading the cause of the enslaved. And there were not wanting the men by whom such an opportunity might be improved.

PIONEERS OF REFORM.

The year 1774, memorable for the sittings of the first American Continental Congress, was also signalized by the appearance of "Wesley's Thoughts on Slavery." And the year 1776, that produced the Declaration of American Independence, produced *Liberty*, (and a few months earlier) the famous dialogue on slavery, by Dr. Hopkins. The concurrent testimony of these two eminent Christian ministers, in two hemispheres, and in different sects, introduced a new era. John Wesley in old England and Samuel Hopkins in New England, the former the founder of a rising and powerful sect, who still recognize him as their leader, the latter at the head of a new school of metaphysical theology, now known by his name, and still exerting a wide spread influence among teachers of religion of different sects in both hemispheres, found time, amid their other arduous labors, to plead the cause of the oppressed—found room and fit location in their otherwise widely different schemes of philosophy and divinity, for the great doctrines of personal liberty, and the sinfulness of chattel enslavement. The same great principles of inalienable human rights were, soon afterwards, embodied by Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration of American Independence, thus pledging, in solemn appeal to Almighty God for the rectitude of their intentions, the representatives of the young republic, to the support of inalienable human rights, and of course, for the emancipation of the enslaved. Had that pledge been redeemed, as doubtless it would have been had the mantles of Wesley and Hopkins rested on their compeers in the ministry, and on their successors who garnish their sepulchres, we might be relieved from the sad task of recording the delinquencies of a lapsed church, and of urging the organization of others in their stead.

TEMPORARY PROGRESS—AND BY WHAT MEANS.

But it was not so. For a time indeed, the labors of Wesley, of Hopkins and of other good men, who taught the inherent sinfulness of slave holding, and the duty of its immediate and unconditional abandonment (for these were the doc-

trines they taught) were productive of rich fruits, and seemed to promise a renovation of the church and the redemption of a world. The church of which Dr. Hopkins was pastor, at Newport, in Rhode Island, was deeply involved in the guilt of the African slave trade, then protected by law, and quite as reputable as the American slave trade is now. Ministers as well as laymen were among the ready purchasers of the fresh cargoes brought into port, and even New England furnished, to some extent, the market as well as the capitalists for the traffic. The clergy of his own Congregational order, in his own native state of Connecticut, where he had been educated and ordained, were holders themselves, (as we have elsewhere noted,) and some times slave vendors, separating husbands and wives, even when both were church members, without giving either clergy or laity, special offence! Such was the state of things when Hopkins, like a thunder storm, came down upon the ministry and churches of New England. The voice of Wesley came over the water declaring slavery "the sum of all villainies." Not less emphatic and scathing were the denunciations of Hopkins. Nor did he linger ten long years, as the more tame and hesitating abolitionists of our own times have done, before coming to the conclusion that incorrigible slave holders are not to be treated as Christians, and retained in the church. Nor was it with him (as it is with some abolitionist at this late day,) a valid excuse for the churches that they needed more light—that "allowances must be made for their prejudices," whether of education or of interest. His theology had taught him that "selfishness is the essence of total depravity"—that pride is, itself, the very gall of bitterness, the bond of iniquity—the consummation of guilt, not the excuse of transgression! It had taught him too, that "disinterested benevolence is the essence of true religion, the sum of all virtue." That "self denial and self sacrifice, for the good of others and for the divine glory, is the indispensable condition—nay, the very definition of salvation." That the right is to be pursued, that the right is to be maintained at the cost of a wrecked universe, could the interests of righteousness ever demand the sacrifice! That repentance of sin—that submission to the divine authority, in order to be genuine, must be unreserved, unadulterated, unconditional, unpurchased, unbribed, untaught, by selfish considerations and regards!

Such was the "new divinity" of Hopkins—the "ultraism," the "fanaticism," (for such it was counted) that procured for him and his disciples from the mercenary religionists of those times, the approbrious appellation of "new lights." But fanatical as these sentiments were esteemed, they were fortified in the writings of Hopkins, by a depth of philosophy, a clearness of illustration, a force of logic, and a flood of scriptural confirmation, that silenced, if it did not convert his polemic opponents. Schools of theology, most diverse and conflicting, have received to some extent, unconsciously and in spite of themselves, the transforming influence of his pen. Like Emmons, his disciple and fellow laborer, the impress of his mind is often most visible in the writings of those, who, for some reason, take special care never to mention his hated yet honored name! A noble exception in this latter respect, may be noted in the lamented and gifted Channing, who, at the head of an opposite school of polemics, admits frankly and magnanimously that his own mind and heart had received their true and healthful impressions from Hopkins, from the very points, viz. of his philosophy that have been deemed most extravagant and severe.

But whatever they were in others, the polemical doctrines of Hopkins, were, in him, no phrenzied impulses—no dreamy imaginations—no dry abstract speculations. He held them not, as some do, "in the abstract," rejecting them in practice. To him they were living realities—fixed prin-

ciples of free and spontaneous moral action. Applied to the subject of American chattel slavery, they were the "ultraism of the immediate abolitionist" of his times, and mainly identical with those of our own. If Channing failed at some points, of fully entering into the views of "modern abolitionists," it was because, at those same points, he could never persuade himself to adopt the metaphysical and theological system of his venerated teacher, but polemical antagonist, Samuel Hopkins.

With such a man as Dr. Hopkins, belief was identical with action. Of all his theological peculiarities, this was the most peculiar—the most marked, and lay, perhaps, at the foundation of nearly all the rest. Truth once ascertained, duty was ascertained, and corresponding action, without counting the cost or the consequences, followed, of course. The doctrines he preached he exemplified. This was the true secret of his power over a slave holding and slave trading church. Not a man, woman or child, in his congregation, doubted the honesty of his intentions, the integrity of his character, or the inflexibility of his purpose. The verity of his "self evident truths" they could not and dared not call in question. When he showed them that slave holding was necessarily sinful, they not only saw that truth, but they foresaw the other truths connected with it. They understood that sin was to be abandoned at once, unconditionally, and without reservation. To talk of "difficulties"—in the way of repentance—of "other great interests," besides the interests of righteousness, in the presence of Dr. Hopkins, was a thing not to be thought of—was a disgrace not to be endured, by men of common sense and decent self respect. In the atmosphere of such a religion as Hopkins preached and practiced, a person desiring to be thought a Christian or even an honest man, desirous of retaining a place in the church or in reputable society, would as soon be caught apologising for sheep stealing, on the plea that it was more convenient to steal sheep than to rear them—as to set up any of the commonly current pleas in favor of continued slave holding! We might as well imagine honorable gentlemen avowing their readiness to be concerned with a gang of shop lifters for the profit of a sixpence—or of aspirants for public honors, (on the score of public and patriotic achievements,) deliberating publicly, on the question of turning traitors to their country, to save the expense of a minister, or making a compromise with the common enemy to avert the loss of a finger! Illustrations of their character, as polluted as those the slave holding parishoners of Hopkins knew well enough, would be presented to them from the pulpit, and that, at every street corner, the truthful mirror would present to them, their own deformed faces. When the sinfulness of slavery was proclaimed by the lips of Hopkins, it was at once understood, beforehand, that slave holding must be purged from the church with which he held any manner of connection. It was known that he would carry out his principles, consistently, and unflinchingly if he stood alone, without the countenance of any human being on earth. By his inflexible integrity he became a host. He carried superhuman energies along with him wherever he moved. One such might well become a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. It was not the power of the sermon, but of the man and the Christian. It was the power of the living God whose truthful spirit inspired and impelled him. The eyes of Israel that every where beheld the evil and the good, shining through his eyes, and indignity, cleaved, struck from the vanity and hid itself among the trees of the garden. We need a more spoken, the voice of God, who spoke and it was done, was audible in the ears of the people. When Hopkins said to the free denomination in the church to which he ministered, "come out," what could the sordid do but obey? Foaming indeed, and raving, tearing his devoted victims,

not having it himself—but leaving it, nevertheless, with what of life and health could, verify the prediction. To leave such to say that Providence blessed with the industry of men like Hopkins, slavery would be banished from them—would drive him to sanctuary in the church, it would seem to drive him to a quagmire, from the gate! More than this might justifiably be said. If the religion of Hopkins shined the church, the world, would hardly be disenchanted, and the millennium of which Hopkins so truthfully spoke, which he so gloriously described, would soon become as visible to our sight, as it was, then, to his faith. Such a millennium as he anticipated was but the demonstrable result of his creed, animating the souls of all other men, as it did his.

A nobler specimen of the moral sublime can scarcely be found in the history of modern times, than the moral achievements of a Hopkins, in the simple majesty of his benevolence and his poverty. (And it was out of the question for one living out the principles of Hopkins to incur the unspeakable and infinite hazards of riches.) To see such a one as Hopkins, we say, with no authority or power, but that of goodness and truth, fixing his eye meekly on the wealthy and lordly transgressors in his church, on whom he was apparently dependant for his bread, at a on whose luxuries he might have revolved, to hear him bid them repent of their iniquities, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance—to hear him insist that they shall do this, or no longer partake with their truthless professions the church of the Highest—to see, and hear this, and then see the mandate obeyed; this, to the seeing eye and hearing ear, were a sight and a sound not to have been witnessed at Antioch or at Warrington. Nor are the results of the victory, upon the slavery of men on this earth, and lastingly, so far, for a moment brought into successful comparison.

We have dwelt on the principles, the character, and lineage of Hopkins, not for the purpose of men worship, or the glorification of any man, living or dead. We would call no man Master. Nor would we seek Hopkins in the expense of other men, of similar character and aims, whatever their philosophical speculations may be—that we have selected him as among the best specimens (if not the very best) of American ministers of religion, honestly known and recognized as such, holding in the main, (though with deeper conviction) the direct and undivided testimony of Congregational and Presbyterian theologians in and out of New England. For the maintenance of every plea in his as their creed we do not need any words. We would infinitely prize attention to the men with whom, in an unusual degree, those religious sentiments were matters of heart and practical belief—principles and rules of action. We insist that in his treatment of slavery and slave holders we have a fair specimen of the course that other ministers holding the same theological views would inevitably take, if, like Hopkins, they believed in their own hearts, and acted out, in their own lives, the principles they make it their stated business to teach.

Hopkins was not the only one who did this. JONATHAN EDWARDS, the younger, a minister of similar if not identical theological tenets; followed hard in his footsteps. In a sermon preached in New Haven, Connecticut, September 15, 1791, "he held the following language:—*'Men stealing is a greater crime than robbery.'*" "To hold in slavery a man who was stolen, is substantially the same crime as to steal him." "To hold a negro slave is a greater sin than fornication, theft or robbery." This sermon was published and extensively circulated through the country, by the Anti-Slavery Societies then in the field.

The Dialogue of Dr. Hopkins was republished

"How hardy shall they that have fled enter into the kingdom of heaven?" "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven."

in the city of New York, in 1798, by direction of the Moral Reform Society, the President of which was the Reverend JOHN JAY. Since its first publication in 1779 it had been extensively circulated, not only in New England but in the middle and southern states, and had been instrumental, in conjunction with the efficient action in the church of Dr. Hopkins, at Newport, of exciting a very general attention to the subject. Efficient action had been the result of this excitement. In Massachusetts and New Hampshire, slavery had been wholly abolished. The draft of the Constitution of the proposed State of Vermont, had included a provision that no slavery should be tolerated there. Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and the lower counties on Delaware, had provided for the gradual abolition of slavery. Even Virginia had repealed her law forbidding the emancipation of slaves. Whatever instrumentalities were employed in these changes, it is manifest that the writings and exertions of Dr. Hopkins, were regarded, at the time, and afterward, by those most active in the cause, as pre-eminently useful in rousing the public attention, and moulding the sentiments of the reflecting portion of the community.

The reader now has a key to the causes and instruments of the early abolition of slavery in the eastern and middle states. It matters not what form or mode of abolition was chosen, nor what the direct instrument of the change, whether by constitutional provision, legislative action, or judicial decision. In either case the action had, was a response to the public sentiment, that had been formed. The formation of that sentiment cannot be traced without giving prominence to the facts that have been now recorded. A judicial decision in the case of the slave Mink, abolished slavery in Maine. So it did in England in the case of the slave Somerset. In both cases the decision of the bench was sustained by the voice of the people. The Abolitionists, and Abolitionists of New-England, as well as old England, traced here to their spiritual fathers, and read common and constitutional law with exultant eyes, when the rising spirit of liberty, fit and fanned by the true sentiments of God, and of righteousness, (Edwards or Hopkins—Hopkins or Edwards,) demanded at their hands such service. Legislators, we all understand, are the representatives of the people.

ANSWER TO AN OBJECTION.

But early abolition, it will be said, was gradual; not immediate, and "modern abolitionists" are doing themselves wrong when they say so, and wrong their work.

Was abolition, gradual, in Old England, or in Massachusetts? Five centuries before the judicial decision was pronounced, what had been done by "Gradualism" in "preparing" slaves for master for the change? At the moment the last words of the decision fell from the lips of the presiding judge, what portion of slavery remained? When the legislature of a state fixes the day on which slavery shall terminate, and the day comes, and the slaves are all free, what has the gradualism of delay added to the produce of the decision?

The gradualism of Maryland's law, or a law, leaving the manes enslaved, stands condemned by the statutes of Virginia, as equally with the prohibition of "private emancipation" within the state, after (as they say) a full trial of the policy of such a gradual emancipation.

But be it so that the abolition preached by the labors of Hopkins and Edwards, was not the immediate and unconditional abolition they preached, but the tardy, partial, limping, shuffling, unwilling transgressors, convicted, but not converted, like the Hebrews in the wilderness, stiff-necked and half-hearted, are ever slow to alterations and ages, to exhibit, instead? What then? Does that prove that a tardy, half-way, procrasti-

nated repentance and amendment ought to be preached? Or ought it to be commended in preference to a prompt and full compliance with the divine command, to "obey the judgment in the morning"—early—boldly? Or that such preaching ever produced even tardy and partial results?

Equivocate and temporize men may. It is a historical and fact that the preaching of gradual repentance, however yet produced even that some gradual repentance, in the case of slave holders or any other class of transgressors. All the gradual or partial compliance ever yet produced, whether among the religious leaders of the American slave holders, has been produced by the faithful testimony of such men as Moses and Paul, such men as Granville Sharpe, John Wesley, Samuel Hopkins, and Jonathan Edwards, the preachers of immediate repentance. The anti-slavery effort that has been effectual, has been that and that only which has been in accordance with the truth—that which has urged the duty of immediate emancipation.

SELF—SUFFICIENCY AND VAIN SUBTLETY.

We need not labor this point now. The plea of "gradualism" has almost ceased to be urged. We have drawn attention to it, in this place, that the true position of the American churches and ministry in general in relation to slavery and emancipation, during the period now under review, may be fully understood. Their creeds, preachings, and exhortations in relation to sin and to sinners in general, have all along given prominence to the duty of "immediate and unconditional repentance." This remark is emphatically true of the period of the out burst of the present anti-slavery excitement. And up to that same period, the profession has been general (if not universal) among them of a belief in the sinfulness of slave holding. The expedient of making slavery an innocent, a Bible institution, was an after thought originating quite recently, with the Doctors at Princeton, in advance of those at the south. Consider, now, with this fact, the facts just now presented, to wit, that the preaching of Wesley, of Hopkins, and of Edwards, was in strict accordance with that of the "immediate abolitionists" of our own times, that this sort of preaching and writing was that, employed, by the early Anti-Slavery Societies in this country, to produce the effects they were seeking—that these societies numbered such men as Franklin, Bush, Fay, and President Edgely of Yale College, among their officers and members—that these efforts are known to have resulted in all the virtuous in the cause of emancipation that can be claimed for the early period of our history as an independent nation—and what shall we say of the men who held their own theology to preach gradualism, and when confronted with their own creed of immediate and unconditional repentance of sin, turn a swift moment, and hear after the still sweeter of a system that they have themselves professed to abominate and loathe?

THE DECLINE AND ITS CAUSES.

The question that arises on a retrospective view of these facts, is a pregnant one. How came it to pass that notwithstanding all this early success the American clergy and churches, so early and so commonly took the ground of a gradual, a future abandonment of this giant sin?

That they did so is beyond question. And equally outstanding is the historical fact that in connection with this position, of the organized Christianity of the country, (how could it be otherwise?) the hopeful beginnings of anti-slavery reform, set in motion by the writings and labors of a Wesley, a Hopkins, and an Edwards, very soon began to relax, to decline, to take a retrograde direction—that instead of continued and increased emancipations, they almost wholly ceased—instead of legislative progress, there came legislative prohibitions of emancipation, and renewed and increasing precautions against freedom, till at length,

Such in substance, such in effect, was the political action of the General Conference at the period above mentioned. What a position for a Christian Church! What marvel that its influence over the legislation of the country was worth just nothing at all! What marvel that it went on, from bad to worse, till it became what Christendom and the world now know it to be! What marvel that a sceptical world sneers at the church! What marvel that by such political experiments, the church and ministry should have arrived at the conclusion that church and ministry had better ~~not~~ *have nothing to do with politics!* After that fashion, no more, they ought not! Doubtless "the law was made for men-stealers," and the church and ministry might be well employed, in reminding the rulers of the earth of the proper province of law—but when it would be decent, as, first, for the church, the salt of the earth and light of the

where heretofore resided in the church, adding others to the same, not only unrepentant, but lending their efforts to the support of the system, which is called slavery—a "disgraceful and infamous system, of the people's (the eighth) commandment."—[Blincy, page 20.]

This course, at a period of profound quiet, is an unequivocal testimony, not only to the downward course of the Presbyterian Church, but of its own consciousness, that the expunged paragraph was a standing reproach of its paganism—a testimony to its derelictions of duty.

"In 1813, the General Assembly adopted an *EXPOSITION OF ITS VIEWS* in which slavery is called 'a gross violation' of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature, but instead of requiring the instant abandonment of this 'violation of rights,' the Assembly exhorts the violators 'to continue and increase their exertions to effect a total abolition,' slavery; with no greater delay than a regard to the public welfare demands; and recommends that 'any Christian professor shall sell a slave who is also a member of our church, without the consent of the slave, the seller shall be suspended till he should repent and make reparation.'"

And here (so far as we are informed) ends the chapter of the Assembly's action on slavery up to the opening of the present agitation in 1837.

OTHER SECTS.

Of other sects, during this period, our records must necessarily be brief, not only for want room but because we know of little *but they said or did*, as organized bodies, on the subject in hand.

CONGREGATIONALISTS.—"Between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists of New England, a good understanding exists." In the General Assembly, the several evangelical bodies of New England, the Congregationalists are represented by delegates, to which bodies, delegates are usually sent to the General Assembly from each church. [Church History, page 244.]

We have never heard that the delegates from the Congregational bodies in New England refused the General Assembly to pursue a different course, nor that, in any way the Congregationalists availed themselves of their interference with the General Assembly, in connection with Presbyterians respecting their slave holding.

With exception of the action of the Congregational Church in Newport, (and perhaps of a few others) there was not, so far as we know, any church, acting against slavery, in the New England Congregational Churches, or in the other evangelical bodies in that country, during the period under review. Church action against slavery to any great extent did not precede the abolition of slavery in New England. For the most part, (as in other sects, in and out of New England,) church members and even ministers, with few exceptions, continued to hold slaves, as long as the laws of the states would permit them to do so.

Slavery was an important act, during the same period. Toward the latter part of it, they claimed to be the most numerous body of Christians in the country. Several flourishing colleges and theological seminaries were under their direction. Their missionary enterprise was remarkable. At the south, where they were strong in numbers, they were very generally slave holders, both ministers and people. Between northern and southern Baptists there was then, as now, a close fellowship and intimate intercourse, which was never marred, so far as we know, by any controversy about slavery. We are not aware of any church or other evangelical testimony of Baptists against slave holding, during that period. Local churches, in some few cases, may have been exceptions, but if so, they are unknown to us.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, though differing much in zeal and efficacy during the greater and especially the latter part of this period, did continue, nevertheless, to bear their testimony, in their own peculiarly mild and quiet way. And this testimony was seldom if ever neutralized by their own direct participation in slave holding. Those who looked so much on the supererogation

of this testimony, which produces no agitation or excitement, should be able to judge us in the marked efforts of this testimony.

Individuals among the Episcopalian (Presbyterian) Episcopalians and perhaps among the American Catholics, have their testimony. But they will not claim that their respective churches, were with them in their efforts, nor that slave holding was, to any extent, within the bounds of their system, abolished by their efforts, or by any other influence operating among them.

The instrumentality of the prominent sects and their leaders in conceiving, bringing forth, dressing up, sustaining and wielding, for the most unholy service, that Janus faced handmaid of prejudice and slavery, the Colonization Society, belongs to the history of the period we are considering. On that chapter of ecclesiastical Jesuitism we cannot now enter. A volume might be filled with it. An entire Lecture would only present the condensed outlines.

The churches too, in their ministry and membership, during this period, not only sustained slavery and slave holders at the polls, but furnished their full quota of slave holding Legislators, Jurists, Senators, Plenipotentiaries and Presidents, who, unrebuked by the church, framed mischief by a law! At the ballot box, as well as in the support of the Colonization Society, even the "FRIENDS" contributed to the support of the slave system.

Be it as, that in these particulars, our organized religious, with their leaders have, erred from misinformation, and from ignorance of the tendency of the measures to which they have lent their support. Their ignorance has been the result of their inattention or their prejudice. And they "remembered them that are in bonds as bound with them" their discrimination would not have been so far behind that of the "enraptured slaves and illiterate free people of color." At least, it is now evident that the interests of humanity and religion demand wiser counsellors and leaders than they are, though they claim the highest seats in the church and the nation.

To conclude.—The position of the churches at the close of the period now reviewed, at the opening of the present exciting epoch, cannot, perhaps, be better described than in the words of Henry James Bayard, M. D., of the Anti-Slavery Society, in a speech before a pamphlet published by him, in defense of American slavery. He says:

"If slavery is a sin, and a violating and a violating of the Divine law, and if the selling, selling or aiding a slave for the sake of gain, is a heinous sin and scandal, then, verily, THREE FOURTHS OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS, AND PRESBYTERIANS, IN EVERY STATE OF THE UNION, are of the devil. They 'aid' if they do not buy and sell slaves, and, with few exceptions, they have not to apprehend and restore runaway slaves, when in their power."

To which it may be added, that "with few exceptions," the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians, in the non-slave holding states, are on terms of church fellowship with these slave holders, and "three fourths" of them do not desire any interruption or discussion of the system.

So much for the restraining energies of the churches of the United States, up to the commencement of the present contest. Now, they have descended themselves towards those (including their own members) who have undertaken the reformatory work which it was their business to carry forward, and they have greeted the light poured over the community. For the last two years, we shall see in our future numbers.

By mistake, our last Editor has numbered IX instead of X, though the page was numbered correctly.

Our next number completes the volume. Those who wish for the next, should pay in advance.

Christian Investigator.

IMMEDIATELY, DECEMBER, 1837.

The *Christian Investigator*, published weekly, on Friday, Dec. 20.—We have for some time been publishing a paper, which we call the *Christian Investigator*, and open more call their attention to the importance of attending it. Discussions of the highest moment, both in respect to principles and measures, will doubtfully be held, and are anticipated, with the greatest interest, by some of the most active and vigilant in the Anti-Slavery cause. Our friends in Syracuse and elsewhere make the necessary arrangements for receiving a large Convention if the weather and traveling should favor a full attendance. May we suggest to them the utility of having the notice published, if it has not been in their country papers?

As a means of circulating the notice, we have published it on our last page, in a HAND-BILL FORM, that it can be cut out, and put up in public places. Will our friends see to this in due season?

REPORT AND PROGRESS OF THIS PAPER.—About 1700 copies of the *Christian Investigator* have been sent to the churches, for reading the *Christian Investigator* weekly, for one year. A subscription for the *Christian Investigator* was made on the spot, and something more has afterwards, by friends in different places. It was a demand of the *Whitesborough* Convention, and about that if it should prove necessary, the Editor would send some *Whitesborough* to the spot, in order to still the effect of the second effect of the Convention there is supply him with some good, fast, sturdy people, for the support of his family. This arrangement, proving necessary, the removal was made in May, last. This, of course, could not be done without considerable expense, and it was requisite likewise for the Editor to purchase a horse to supply the place of one that he had lost. By the joint aid of the *Whitesborough* subscription as increased by friends afterwards, the abolitionists received at Montoye, and some money received on subscriptions to the paper, the monthly which has been saved, the paper made and printed fortnightly (with some exceptions) without resort to the credit system, and the Editor's family, comfortably, though slightly supplied. All the money required has been procured in this manner, in the paper, including the money sent on the *Whitesborough* subscription for family support, as well as other donations and the scattering fifty cent and dollar subscriptions for the publication itself, and papers sold.

Our first number of the new series having been issued in February, it will require one number more, (for January,) to complete the volume. When that is issued, the specific object of the *Whitesborough* subscription, a year ago, will have been accomplished—the revival volume of twelve numbers will have been published, and the funds furnished to do so will have been almost used up. A little balance of the subscription remains unpaid, and the majority of readers (to whom the paper has been sent, have paid nothing during the past year. Papers of the present character are never collected, and the mere payment of personal acknowledgments to this paper, for its subscription value.

We have received the *Christian Investigator* monthly. The *Investigator*, *Friend*, and *Anti-Slavery* people have been mailed to some extent, in a very regular and select list of names from Maine to Washington. Many have gone into the slave states, and of those, not a single one has been returned or refused. The reason papers and *Christianity* have been sent more than those of any other paper than (for instance, your paper) we have been requested with, and now names are steadily coming in. These are abundant evidence that the paper is read with increasing interest. For the last number there

alms to be a demand. Between five and six hundred copies monthly, were reserved for this purpose. Of first number of the volume, none remain on hand. The remaining numbers, between two and three hundred each, (except those recently issued) are all on hand. Could we afford them at the current rates of trade, the issue could probably be increased tenfold. But this would leave us without adequate family support.

The course in which we are enlisted, the enterprise of an Anti Slavery Church Reform—of secession and re-organization, is certainly and steadily going forward. Of this there can be no doubt. If it is thought that our little sheet can be useful, either tract-wise or subscription-wise, we shall be happy to furnish it. But we must be furnished with the means. And the means will not come in the form of more newspaper subscription. The printers and paper makers could not be compensated for that. Before the Whiteborough convention a year ago, we published irregularly, two, three, or four numbers in a twelve month, as we had means. And even this could not have been continued much longer, without some better arrangement.

If our friends and fellow-laborers wish for another change, monthly, they have only to repeat over again, the operation of the past year. A similar subscription, if promptly paid, would do the same work. Or, if the Editor's support could be fully and separately provided for, and all the other pecuniary and business arrangements made, the publication might be put on a *fixed* basis, and the amount of circulation greatly increased. At the Syracuse Convention, if thought proper, this matter may be settled.

We have just entered upon some historical sketches which we should be glad to complete. The course and position of our leading clergy and ecclesiastical bodies, in respect to the Anti Slavery enterprise is but little understood, even among abolitionists themselves. The great body of our rank and file have enlisted at a comparatively recent date, and have known little of the "times that tried men's souls." The true position of the American churches ought to be known to the abolitionists connected with them, and great art and subtlety have been employed, especially of late, to falsify the facts of the case, and cover up the true issue. It is not, perhaps, too much for us to say, that the scenes through which we have personally passed, for the last fifteen years, have given us some facilities for seeing what has been done—of keeping the thread of passing events in our mind, and of connecting the things that have been with the things that still are, and that are likely to be. But while we write, we must have bread, and we cannot run in debt to the printer.

"After this work shall have been done up, it may be well to give the paper a more unobtrusive character, and record more of the movements making in the direction of church reform."

EXTRACT OF A LETTER, dated,
Nov. 20, 1843.

"DEAR BROTHER GOODRICH: Your *Investigator* at each succeeding appearance, seems to gather to itself a deeper and wider interest. So let it be in its onward course. The November number I read yesterday with great satisfaction—not unmingled with grief and mortification. You have arrayed a body of facts which, in my reading, had failed to fix my attention, or they had failed from my recollection. Our Puritans in many respects knew more, and were far better, than the masses about them. After all, man-worship in this poor world of ours is a profitable business. *Precedent—Tradition—Fashion—venerable Authority*—what iron-souled divinites they are! Relentless despots, they, who grind out de-luded race to veriest powder! After all the boasts of Quaker humanity, and stern integrity, garnered up through successive generations, curious it is to learn that Puritan Richard Baxter was far in advance of George Fox, the

non-formalist, the accredited spiritualist of his time, in the matter of man's real essence, and heaven-ordained prerogatives.

At every step we take in the work of reform, I am more and more confirmed in the opinion, not recently formed, to be sure, that you are right in striking it up at the source of the mischief. Palliatives are utterly unavailing, in such a case. Work, thorough work must be done, to exalt the spiritual of Christianity to the ascendant. If I look with true eyes, or if I get your view of the case, our current religion has allied itself with the aristocratic influences of society almost exclusively, and expended its energies upon such objects and in such directions as pride, fashion and interest may at any time have dictated. How sad to see, what I fear examination would disclose to be the fact, almost the entire *dissenting force* of England tamely consenting, if not cheerfully acquiescing in, the outrageous exactions upon the tolling and worried-out millions by the heartless aristocracy of the country. Through legislative forms, to be sure, but none the less cruel and wicked on that account. Embodied Christianity has got to face hoary abuses, however arrayed, and vanquish them, or die in the conflict.

But I took up my pen to say a word about the Syracuse Convention. I anticipate it with great interest. I am anxious the discussions should be radical and thorough, and at the same time assume a practical and efficient character. Would not the objects in view be likely to be more effectually secured by preparing reports or essays on each of the more prominent topics, which after the discussion might be published, as addresses from the Convention?

Two things I do wish, most sincerely—first, that the *Investigator* may be doubled in its circulation, the beginning of the year, and placed on a sure foundation. Second, that the friends of liberty may be aroused to the importance of doing what might and should be done, with Oneida Institute under the charge of Beriah Green. Some place we must have, to which young men may resort for education, without the hazard of losing their souls and their morals. W. L. G.

"In the influence beginning to cluster round such pioneers as Joseph Sturge, Arthur O'Neill, and Mr. Mall, (Editor of the *Non-Resistant*), we begin however, to see the dawn of a brighter day, for English Dissentism, and a pure Christianity. Editor."

BROAD PRINCIPLES AND NARROW CONSERVATISMS.

The "Non-Resistant," in some account of the recent contest of the English dissenters with the government officials, respecting the Factories Bill, (designed to bring the children under church-of-England instruction,) makes allusion to one characteristic of the struggle which is by no means peculiar to "leading men" in England, or among the English dissenters.

"Energetic" says the editor "as has been our opposition, few appear to have made out the principle upon which it is based. There was, throughout the encounter, a *sluggishness*, exhibited by our leading men, lest the agitation should run into the channel of *broad and well-defined principle*. Could their influence have prevented, no mortal would have been able to divine that the tap-root of the evil complained of, was the existence of a State church."

Just so, in this country. Our "leading men," as they would appear to be, (though they follow rather than lead,) are perpetually busied with their limitations—reservations—conventionalisms—contrivances in a thousand forms, to keep out of sight the fundamental principle of the movement they would direct.

Thus, in the struggle against intemperance, what an imposing array of dignified personages were chiefly occupied, for years, with the futile attempt to cover up, run round, or elude, the broad principle of abstinence from all intoxicating liquors! Even now, there is a

kindred sensitiveness about the application of this principle to the medical use, and thousands think it profane to insist upon it, when the *adventitious* use comes in question. We might mention, too, the still more marked exhibition of "nervous sluggishness," lest other intoxicating substances besides alcohol should come under reprobation!

Our contest against negro slavery—chattel slavery—is likewise marred, is impeded, by this same insane dread of the broad principle of human equality upon which the enterprise is to be based, or based upon nothing! How much breath and ink have been expended, by a class of abolitionists, to convince the community that abolitionists mean nothing, after all, by their abundant professions of regarding the negro as a man and a brother! And then, the "nervous sluggishness" recently exhibited, lest aristocratic conservatives should suspect an affinity between abolitionism and the vindication of oppressed white people's rights in Rhode Island! And what mighty efforts have been made and are still making, to effect an alliance between abolition and aristocratic policy—class legislation, monopolies, and artificial restrictions—instead of free principles—free policy—free suffrage—free currency—free trade! By which very wise (!) management of our "leaders," we have almost persuaded the monopolists to make use of us (under their own flag or ours) for their own purposes, and have, about as successfully, repelled the mass of the laboring population from joining our standard!

One illustration more. Not a few, in this country imagine themselves zealous advocates of church independency, who manifestly have no idea of the principle upon which independent church government is founded, and are almost frightened out of their senses whenever they hear it advocated and proposed to be carried out into practice. Were it not so, we should never hear of Associations and Conventions among Congregationalists and Baptists. We should find nothing among them in harmony with the ultra Episcopal claim of exclusive clerical ordination—nothing of arrangements by which admitted Christians are barred out of the church, and the Christian brotherhood thus split into sects. The equality of all Christians, and their equal right to manage the affairs of the church—this, and this alone is the principle upon which church independency is based. Carry out this principle, and there can be neither superiority, bodies over the churches, nor clerical caste, nor other monopolies of power within them—nor any arrangements by which one class of Christians could shut other acknowledged Christians out of the church, or lord it over their faith, in matters of "doubtful dispute-tion."

PASSING HINTS.

The spiritual world, as well as the material, has its seed-time, as well as its season of growth and of harvest.

The greatest events have often such small and apparently insignificant beginnings, that those who witness them scarcely take any cognizance of them.

The morning that Raikes first commenced a Sabbath-school was ushered in by no roar of cannon or ringing of bells; nor was the evening of that day celebrated with illuminations or bon-fires.

The kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation, said the Savior. Men shall not descry it by the bustle and parade of its progress.

When a few Christian disciples met in an upper room at Jerusalem, the monarchs and the philosophers of the whole world, had they been present, might have seen nothing of moral sublimity in the spectacle, nor dreamed aught of the effects that were to result from it.

It is quite possible that the events of 1843, as seen from a point of observation placed some few centuries afterwards may seem quite important enough to redeem the chronological calculations of William Miller from derision, even though the specific events anticipated by

him this year should still lie in the myrtle womb of the future.

In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand; for thou knowest not which shall prosper, whether this or that, or whether both shall be alike good.

It is enough that God knows what events he will bring to pass, and when they shall take place. To man he has said, "The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil, that is understanding." Do thy work, Christian disciple, and never fear that God will not, in the best possible time and manner, do his.

SUCCESS.

There is no such thing as success without doing right; and there is no possible failure of success, without a failure of doing right.

He that does right is as certain of success as God himself can possibly be. For he is engaged in the same enterprise in which God is engaged; and if God succeeds, he that works with God must, of necessity, succeed likewise.

And besides, the highest success which any man can possibly attain, or of which the human mind can conceive, is the formation of a sound character, and the consequent attainment of the Divine favor. This success is assuredly obtained by doing right, and as assuredly can be obtained in no other way.

Some men reckon it success when they only heap to themselves the accredited means of attaining the great end of their existence. They will even sacrifice the end for the attainment of the means, and call it success! Thus, men will hold on to their church arrangements, while in so doing it becomes necessary for them to sacrifice their integrity, the very end which church organizations should promote!

When the question of secession from a corrupt church and a Scriptural re-organization, comes up, the great question with thousands will be, "whether we can succeed?" That question, rightly interpreted, resolves itself into this—"Whether we can be honest and true men?—whether we can be faithful, through evil reports and good reports?" If we can, we shall assuredly succeed, for fidelity to God and to duty, is the very essence and definition of success. Higher success, an Abdiel or a Gabriel could not ask. Higher success, the Messiah himself could not, and did not obtain. He triumphed in death, because he was "obedient unto death."

"Because I live, ye shall live also," said the Savior! If we suffer with him, we shall reign with him. And will not this be success?

CHAPTER OF EXPLANATIONS.

How difficult it is to get understood! We were surprised to learn, yesterday, that the Editor of the Christian Investigator is suspected, in some circles—not of "Socinianism," but of "Old School Presbyterianism," and of seceding Abolitionists under the flag—not of "Unionism," but of rigid Presbyterianism! And some seceders from the Methodists, we understand, are anxiously waiting to see whether Gerrit Smith, Beriah Green, William Goodell, and the Syracuse Convention, will not fall in with John Rankin's proposition for organizing a Presbyterian Anti-Slavery Church! If they do, then these Methodist seceders think they too might as well stick to sectarianism, in the form of the Wesleyan movement. But if we will give up sectarianism, they will try to do the same, and join us.

Just what the "Christian Investigator" has been trying to persuade these good brethren to do. And why were we misunderstood? Why, we quoted from Dr. Miller's Treatise on the Eldership—and the Honeoye Church has its three elders, &c., &c. Above all, William Goodell is said to be an "Old School Presbyterian."

One word of correction, here, (as we are crowded for room,) must suffice. William Goodell was, in his boyhood, connected with the Episcopal Methodists—afterwards with Congregationalists; but never with the Presbyterian Church, Old School or New. If by "New School" be meant the peculiarities of New Haven and Dr. Taylor, we are not New School. But "Old School," in New England, does not mean the "Triangular" school of Presbyterians. As to the Eldership—Dr. Miller and his high authorities make it out to be the same as the pastoral office—vastly different from the Eldership of Presbyterianism! So the Honeoye Church understands it. But its course in this respect is a mere incident in its organization, and need be no stumbling-block to others. Each independent church acts as it pleases. Of the Syracuse Convention, its records must tell the story, after it is held; but we predict that neither Gerrit Smith, Beriah Green, nor Wm. Goodell, will come into any Presbyterian or other sectarian arrangements. Whatever they, or the Convention may do, seceding Abolitionists should look to the Word and the Spirit of God for their Guidance.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS

For the Christian Investigator, up to Dec. 1, 1843.	
E. Henrywell, Tobedanna,	0 50
M. Norton, Victor,	0 25
M. Wilcox, Andover, Ohio,	1 00
J. Carman, Honeoye,	1 00
W. L. Chaplain, Utica,	0 75
A. Wright, Elbridge, 0 50, W. Jilson, do., 0 50,	1 00
M. P. Hanson, Salem, Mass.,	0 50
Mrs. S. Lawrence, do. 0 25; Miss C. Phelps, do 0 25;	50
P. Field, Charlemon, Mass.,	1 00
H. Gilbert, Schroepell, for A. Gilbert and B. Brad-	
ford, Fulton,	1 00
B. F. Hurlbut, N. Hartford,	1 00
T. Tanner, Free-town Corners,	0 50
L. D. Tanner, do.,	0 50
S. Cole, Ashburnham, Mass.,	1 00
Mr. Bentley, Honeoye,	0 25
J. A. Hawks, Adrian, Mich., by D. K. Hawks,	
Honeoye,	1 00
S. Bishop, Honeoye, 0 50, A. Blue, N. Gage, 0 00, 2 50	
Contribution at Canandaigua,	3 20
Total,	17 55

CHRISTIAN CONVENTION AT SYRACUSE,

Commencing the third Wednesday in December, 20, 1843.

We, the undersigned, persuaded that the time has now fully come when Christians, who would preserve their integrity, are loudly called upon to separate themselves from those anti-Christian combinations, known under various sectarian names, and falsely calling themselves Christian churches, that still persist in neglecting to espouse the cause of the poor, to proclaim the gospel of deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound; believing, also, in the Divine institution of the Christian church, and the obligation resting on Christians to associate themselves together in church relations:

Do hereby invite a GENERAL CONVENTION of all who agree with us in these views, for the purpose of uniting in a general expression of our sentiments, and especially to discuss, ascertain, and promulgate the true principles, and appropriate form and mode, of church organization, as taught in the New Testament, harmonizing with the great principles of human equality, common brotherhood, and inalienable human rights.

Said Convention to be held at Syracuse, commencing on the third Wednesday of December, 1843, and to continue at the discretion of the Convention.

GERRIT SMITH, Peterboro'.
BERIAH GREEN, Whitesboro'.
ALVAN STEWART, Utica.
SAMUEL WELLS, Vernon Centre.
CHARLES T. TORREY, Albany.
WILLIAM GOODELL, Honeoye.
JAMES C. DELONG, Utica.
ELISHA ALLIS, Cazenovia.
ABEL BROWN, Albany.
G. W. CLARK, Victor.
W. L. CHAPLIN, Rochester.
J. N. T. TUCKER, Oondaga.
J. C. NORTON, Cazenovia.
IRA HILL, Vernon Centre.
DAVID SEIZ, Scott.
WASHINGTON STICKNEY, Verona.
SULLIVAN BRIGHAM, Vienna.
F. HAWLEY, Cazenovia.
REUBEN HOUGH, Whitesboro'.
S. P. HOUGH, Whitesboro'.
BENJAMIN F. HUNT, Stockbridge.
SAMUEL GOODELL, Lenox.
MARCUS STICKNEY, Lockport.
NORMAN MILLER, Delta.
J. J. TUCKER, Cherry Valley.
JOHN MCCARRICK, Rome.
WILLIAM P. GREEN, Ballston Spa.
WILLIAM CARPENTER, Dryden.
DANIEL PETTIBONE, Cleveland, Osw. Co.
WM. LAWSON, Florence.
WM. J. SAVAGE, Whitesboro'.
BENJAMIN STUART, Richmond.
CHENEY ABBEY, Ditto.
BENONI GREEN, Ditto.

SAMUEL HITCHCOCK, Cazenovia.
NIRAM WHITCHER, Poland.
WILLARD COTTON, Lenox.
YOUNG LEWIS, Ditto.
WARREN CLARK, Ditto.
HENRY LEWIS, Ditto.
FORDYCE RICE, Cazenovia.
F. F. BORDEN, Ditto.
PETER GOWANS, Buffalo.
JOSEPH PLUMB, Persia, Erie Co.
HIRAM CURTIS, Throopville.
SAMUEL THOMAS, Jr., New Woodstock.
GEORGE S. HICKS, Schoharie Co.
HENRY BRADLEY, Penn Yan.
CHARLES H. LAW, Cazenovia.
C. WHEATON, Syracuse.
JAMES O. BENNETT, Ditto.
JOHN W. COOK, Ditto.
E. WILLARD FRISBIE, Phelps.
JOHN MOSHER, Canandaigua.
THOMAS STRINGHAM, Ditto.
JOHN PERHAMUS, Ditto.
AUSTIN STEWART, Ditto.
EVI B. WOODWARD, Ditto.
LEVI BROCKELBANK, Ditto.
WM. W. WARREN, Ditto.
THOS. T. LAING, Ditto.
E. CHENEY, Ditto.
BENNET MUNGER, Ditto.
ORSAMUS TISDALE, Ditto.
MERRICK MUNGER, Ditto.
E. S. GILBERT, Richmond.
GIDEON PITTS, Ditto.
S. B. FRANKLIN, Ditto.

WILLIAM GOORLY, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

eth. preached, that the right to preach the gospel springs solely from the ability to preach it: and

that this ability, however highly honored it may be—upon thought with a Cardinal's hat or a Pope's tiara—raises its possessor not at all above that one level, which, in the sight of God, is occupied by all His friends—by the whole "royal priesthood" which they constitute.—*Adopted.*

During the discussions, Messrs. Smith, Green, Hawley, Lee, Judson, Goodell, Parker, and others, participated in the debates, and addressed the Convention. Several interesting letters were read. Appropriate singing led by C. A. Wheaton of Syracuse, was occasionally interspersed. After prayer, at the close of the second afternoon, the Convention adjourned, sine die.

WM. L. CHAPLIN, President.

JOHN MOSHER, Secretaries.
EMMA STILLER,

DECLARATION.

The majority of the Convention assembled at Syracuse, in the State of New York, on the 20th and 21st days of December, A. D. 1843, after mutual consultation and prayer, unite in the following Declaration and Statement:

Whenever any considerable number of Christians, inhabiting an extended territory of country, find themselves constrained by a solemn sense of duty to God, fidelity to Christian institutions, and brotherly love to mankind, to separate themselves wholly from the church organizations with which they have been connected, and to organize other churches in their stead, it seems proper that they should unite in a declaration of the causes which impel them to the separation, and of the principles and usages upon which they propose to re-organize.

I. FIRST PRINCIPLES.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Christians are equal brethren, having one Master, even Christ, to whom each one of them is individually responsible for the highest possible exercise of all his powers, of body, mind and spirit, in the loving service of God and mankind, in the pursuit of the highest possible attainments of holiness and wisdom, of usefulness and blessedness. That these common responsibilities and powers imply equal, inalienable and indestructible rights, which can be neither invaded nor impaired, surrendered or compromised, without guilt.—That for the full enjoyment of these rights, the best cultivation and exercise of these powers, the complete discharge of these duties, and the highest attainment of these ends, local Christian churches or assemblies of Christians, are instituted by Jesus Christ, and organized by his disciples in conformity with his laws, deriving their just powers from the revealed will of their Divine Head, and exercising them with the consent and by the participation of the members.—That, whenever any church organizations become destructive of these ends and cannot be reclaimed and wielded for their promotion; in other words, when they become either despotic, schismatic, or Anti-Christian, it is the right and duty of the members to secede from them, and organize new churches in their stead; founding them upon the principles, organizing them in such form and wielding them in such a manner and for such ends as shall accord with the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, the aims of its Divine Author, the character of the Christian religion, the requirements of Jesus Christ, the teachings of his Apostles, and the divinely approved usages of the New Testament churches.

Christian unity and forbearance, as well as sound wisdom will indeed dictate that Church relations should not be severed for light and transient causes, or churches abandoned as apostate without due efforts to preserve and reclaim them; and though this, many times, may have been done, yet experience hath more commonly shown that the members of a declining church are more disposed to glide quietly down the stream of its corruption than to save themselves from apo-

tacy, and religion from dishonor, by steering the tide of depravity, when the effort involves an abandonment of the forms and associations to which they are accustomed.

For while the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church universal, particular churches may apostatize—may abjure the true faith, or become corrupt and Anti-Christian in practice; and whatever they do, they forfeit their claim to be regarded as churches of Christ. The salt, having lost its savor, is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.

We, accordingly, hold and maintain: That the character of a church is the character of the members of whom it is composed; that a little corrupt leaven, leaveneth the whole lump; that the whole body acquires, of necessity, the corrupt character of the incorrigible transgressor who, by its fellowship, the church, (with a full knowledge of his character) endorses, as trustworthy; [1 Cor. v. chap.]

That a Christian church is an assembly or congregation of faithful men; that an Anti-Christian church is an assembly or congregation of unfaithful men;

That the merciful, and they only are to be regarded as having obtained mercy—that the righteous considereth the cause of the poor, but the wicked regardeth not to know it; and that therefore, the churches composed of oppressors or those who consent with them, or churches knowingly and permanently retaining such in their fellowship, cannot properly be regarded as churches of Christ;

That the Christian church militant, may be known by its aggressive warfare under the banners of Him who "was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil,"—that those who are not with him in this controversy, are against him, and therefore no church can properly be called a Christian church that does not actively oppose every form of known sin—especially the prominent and gigantic sins of the age and nation in which it exists, and to the commission of which, its own members as well as the surrounding community are particularly tempted and exposed;

That the commission of the Christian church is that of its Great Leader—"to preach the gospel of deliverance to the captives, the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound, to set at liberty the bruised, to proclaim the Jubilee of the Lord and the day of vengeance of our God;"—and hence, the church that refuses or neglects to fulfil this commission, thereby refuses or neglects to be a true church of Christ;

That, as the Son of God himself rested the proofs of his Messiahship upon the fact of his merciful regard to humanity, degraded and perishing; his good deeds to the bodies and souls of the needy, inasmuch that the blind saw, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, and the poor had the gospel preached to them;—so the churches claiming to be his, must rest their aims, on the evidences of their active exertions, according to their opportunities, in the same benevolent work;

That churches failing to maintain even a decent regard for fundamental morality, and indisposed or unable, by their teachings and discipline, to preserve or restrain its membership and ministry from outbreathing and aggravated crimes, or excluding them from their communion, so far from giving evidence of being living and spiritual churches of Jesus Christ, are not entitled to be regarded as associations of honest and moral men; nor can churches or individuals maintaining ecclesiastical relations, or fraternal correspondence, fellowship, or co-operation with such churches, be in a position to be recognized as "the salt of the earth, and the light of the world."

We believe and affirm that such delinquencies as have been now described, are fatal to the character of professed churches of Christ. But when, in addition to all these, a long train of abuses and

usurpations, by such churches, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a determination to shelter themselves in their sin, and a corresponding design to still the voice of remonstrance;—entirely, to suppress free discussion, and redound under absolute despotism the minority seeking form, it becomes doubly their duty to throw the government of such churches, and, by return to the pure institutions of Christ, provide themselves a refuge for the preservation of the integrity, the security of their rights, and the exercise of their heaven derived powers in the view of God and mankind.

II. REASONS FOR SECESSION.

Such are the delinquencies, and such the abuses and usurpations which now constrain us to sever our church relations and organize ourselves anew. The history of the prominent religious sects in America, for a long time past, and with slight exceptions, is the history of determined, fundamental derelictions of duty, of repeated injuries and usurpations, all tending directly and tally to the corruption of pure religion, the perversion of civil and religious freedom, the oppression of inalienable human rights, the promotion of infidelity, the triumph of oppression, the growth and impunity of vice and crime.

To prove this, let facts be submitted to consideration of all Christians.

Guilty of Slave Holding.

The prominent religious sects of this country and of England, where the most of them find their origin, have grown up and flourished in presence of the origin, growth, and extension of the African slave trade, of American slavery, and the American slave trade. So far from coming in harsh collision with that complicated system of the religious organizations to which we allude, through their membership, participated deeply both in the practice of slave holding, and slave trade. When wielding, in their church policy (as in the case of the church of England and the English Puritans) the civil power of state, they have either licensed the slave trade and enacted slave laws, or neglected to abrogate and repeal them. When their members wield civil power have not only neglected to "execute judgment between a man and his neighbor," have actually "framed mischief by a law," have never been visited with church censures for the practice. Not only members but ministers and religious teachers of these churches have, to a great extent, been guilty of slave holding, slave breeding, and not infrequently of the traffic. And at the recent time, there is high authority for saying that "three fourths of all Episcopals, Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians, in eleven states in this Union," are guilty of "buying, selling, or holding slaves, for sake of gain; that they hold, if they do not and sell slaves, and with few exceptions, hesitate not to apprehend and restore runaway slaves, when in their power." To which has been added that with these slave holders and traders, the religiousists of the same and kind sects, in the non-slave holding states are universally connected either by ecclesiastical ties, or by living on terms of religious fellowship, communion and co-operation with them, and "three fourths" of these, never remonstrate with their slave holding brethren, are offended if others do so, and are opposed to any agitation or discussion of the subject.

Not a Sin of Ignorance.

That this settled practice of the prominent religious sects is not the result of mere inadvertency or mis-information, and cannot be reckoned among sins of ignorance, calling for lenity rather than reproof, is evident.

Because the practice is manifestly in direct

Rev. James Smyke, A. M., of the Amite Presbytery, Mississippi.

not only of fundamental morality, as un-
derstood by all men, but of principles which our
nation, in the act of asserting its independ-
ence, declared to be self-evident;
and, from the origin of the slave trade and
these sects, there have not been wanting able
and eminent persons, in all of them, who have
justly pointed out the wickedness of the practice
called upon the transgressors to repent. And
even making no pretensions to religion, in
contemplation of this sin, have, long since,
cried for their country, when they reflected
that God is just, and that his justice cannot
be forever;

because, (in the cases of the Presbyterian and
Methodist Episcopal sects) the churches have
admitted, in times past, the sinfulness of the
trade, enacting rules in some instances, for the
exclusion of the offenders, then permitting those
to lie on their records a dead letter while
the practice was steadily on the increase, then
making excuses for their own branch of discipline,
finally changing or erasing their former tes-
timonies from their records;

because, for the most part, the leading minis-
ters and members of those sects, still profess to be
opposed to slavery in the abstract, while they
are in fellowship with those who practice it.
They profess to hate it, themselves, while "Balaam-
like," they try a thousand expedients," (by Bibli-
cal interpretation) to force from the mouth of Jehovah, a
curse in its favor "which they know the
Jehovah abhors;"

because, like other convicted, but impenitent
sinners, they angrily spurn investigation, dread in-
quiry, still discussion, and will not come to the
test their deeds should be reproved.

Early Influence against Abolition.

When the writings of Wesley, Hopkins, and
others, with the efforts of the early Anti-Slav-
Societies patronized by Stiles, Rush, Franklin
Jay, were beginning to operate successfully in
creation of a public sentiment against slavery,
manumissions were on the increase, and
legislative abolition of slavery was in pro-
gress; then it was, that the temporizing policy of
many religious sects, seeking to proselyte and
gain impenitent slaveholders in their coun-
try, was found effective in counteracting phi-
lanthropic endeavor, in retarding and checking
progress of freedom. The ecclesiastical pro-
paga of the Presbyterian and Methodist Epis-
copal sects, substituted the doctrines of gradual-
ism and postponement for the immediate pre-
vious. Under this treatment, manumissions
declined and finally came to a stand. Leg-
islative action in the direction of abolition was
checked by laws forbidding individual emancipa-
tion, and finally, the deceptive scheme of Colon-
ization, for the security of slavery, the gratifica-
tion of prejudice, and the absorption of misled
energy, artfully concocted and managed by the
heads of the prominent sects, laid the country
in the jaws of the slave power, till the
beginning of the present contest, in 1832.

Hostility to Anti-Slavery Effort.

When that struggle began, and from that time
to the present, the concentrated opposition of these
sects, has been, and still is, the most prompt,
able, subtle, and unyielding, of all the op-
posing influences with which the cause of huma-
nity and of justice has been called to contend.
Their Secularism it was that opened the cam-
paign of violent opposition, against abolition, and
the hostile flag under which the other ele-
ments of opposition, political and commercial,
more tardily, and with less steadiness and
perseverance, arrayed themselves. The servile
and the deceptive argument, of the pul-
pit of the religious press, transplanted to the
public press, to the political meeting and
legislative hall, have constituted almost the
bulk of the error, the sophistry and the mis-

representation we have been called to encounter.

Without Provocation.

This opposition to Anti-Slavery effort, on
the part of the predominant religious sects and their
leaders, so far from having been provoked by any
hostility of leading abolitionists either against
Christian institutions, or the policy of the existing
sects, was virulent and almost universal, during
the first four years of the struggle, 1832-3-4 and
5, when no prominent abolitionists were, or could
be, charged with opposition to either church, Bi-
ble, Sabbath, ministry, or existing ecclesiastical
arrangements; but on the other hand, were the
known supporters and admirers of those institu-
tions and arrangements, and, (for the most part)
members, in good standing, in the different reli-
gious sects, and each and all cherishing the most
fond and confident expectations that their favorite
ministries, churches, and sects, would speedily be
enlisted with them, in the cause of the enslaved.

The Religious Press.

The leading religious periodicals of the pro-
minent sects in the New England and other non-
slave holding states, edited commonly by minis-
ters, were among the first in the country to assail
abolitionists with violent invective, and to charge
them with treasonable and insurrectionary designs.
This work was commenced as early, at least, as
the beginning of 1833, and with the avowed object
on the part of at least one of these clerical edi-
tors, to put down abolitionists by public indigna-
tion. And it was not until the slanders of those
religious presses at the North had been copied,
first by the religious, and then by the political
presses of the Southern states, and from them in-
to the commercial and political papers of New
York, Philadelphia and Boston, (some of them ed-
ited by church members in high favor with the
leading clergy) that "the public indignation" was
roused against the abolitionists, and the country
disgraced by the riots of 1834-5-6 and 7, in the
cities of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Utica,
Cincinnati, and elsewhere. In more cases than
one, particularly during the public burning of the
furniture of a prominent abolitionist, in New York
City, in July 1834, the rioters re-echoed the false
charges first coined and put in circulation by the
religious papers of New England and elsewhere,
in May 1833.

Other Modes of Operation.

Nor were these lawless scenes enacted without
the active participation and instrumentality of
leading ministers and laymen of the principal
sects, in other ways than by the inflammatory pro-
ductions of the religious press. Colonization
meetings, got up and conducted chiefly by
agents, prominent clergymen and distinguished
laymen of the same sects, co-operating with them,
have been the well known precursors, concomi-
tants, and apologists of those sanguinary riots.
Not without these means were the great riots of
New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Utica, Cincin-
nati and Alton excited and consummated. And
smaller mobs, in villages and country places,
were commonly roused in the first place, or the
rioters shielded from censure and prosecution af-
terwards, by a public sentiment begotten and fos-
tered in a similar atmosphere. The scenes of
Canterbury, in Connecticut, may furnish a suf-
ficient specimen under this head.

Confederation with the South.

No marvel that Southern clergymen in abundance,
of the same sects, thus sustained, could boldly and
publicly avow themselves the advocates of Lynch
law, (as Rev. Dr. Hill indeed very recently did,
and approved by that body, in the New School
General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.) No
marvel that Rev. Thomas S. Witherspoon, of
Alabama, should write, to the editor of the
Emancipator, "Let your emissaries dare venture
to cross the Potomac, and I cannot promise you
that your fate will be less than Haman's. Then
be aware how you goad an insulted, but magna-

nanim people to deeds of desperation." No mar-
vel that Rev. R. N. Anderson of Virginia, could
thus exhort the West-Hover Presbytery—"If
there be any stray goat of a minister among you
tainted with the blood-hound principles of aboli-
tionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excom-
municated, and left to the public to dispose of him,
in other respects." No marvel that Rev. J. C.
Postell of South Carolina could write to Rev. Ia
Roy Sunderland of New York, "If you desire to
educate the slaves, I will tell you how to raise the
money without editing Zion's Watchman. You
and old Arthur Tappan came out to the South,
this winter, and they will raise one hundred thou-
sand dollars for you. New Orleans itself will be
pledged for it." No marvel that Rev. Wm. S.
Plummer, D. D., of Richmond should have
written—"If abolitionists will put the country in
a blaze, it is but fair that they should receive the
first warning at the fire."

In all this, Southern ministers only expressed,
somewhat more frankly, the same sentiments that
in more cautious language, had long been current
with their brethren at the North. And coloniza-
tion orators, clerical and laymen, welcomed to
Northern pulpits, were scarcely behind those of
the South, when they haranged popular audien-
ces in our chief Northern cities. Predictions of
mob violence, in tones expressive of a threat, were
heard, daily, from clerical lips. During the whole
time that these threats from the South were cir-
culating freely at the North, and when, as in the
case of Amos Dresser, the threatened violence
was inflicted by the hands of church members
and elders, and when Dr. Reuben Crandall was
incarcerated in Washington City, at the instigation
of a patron saint of the Colonization Society, and
tried for his life on the charge of circulating anti-
slavery publications, scarce the feeblest lip of
disapprobation from the religious presses of the
North (other than those of abolitionists) and no-
thing that deserved the name either of earnest re-
monstrance or of stern rebuke, were to be found
in their columns.

Aims at Proscriptive Legislation.

When the inefficacy of mob violence against
abolitionists became apparent, the religious peri-
odical press of the North was foremost in propos-
ing their suppression by the strong arm of law.
In unison with the demands of the slave holding
governors and legislatures of the South, denounc-
ing "death without benefit of clergy," to the ad-
vocates of the enslaved, a Northern "Literary
and Theological Review," patronized by promi-
nent ministers in New York and New England
and edited by a son of one of them, (since prom-
oted to a high station) declared that the "radicals"
were "justly liable to the highest civil penalties
and ecclesiastical censures." Neither among the
eminent patrons of that Review or its rivals, from
the theological partisans of its peculiar theologic-
al tenets, nor from its watchful polemic opponents,
was there a lip of censure or scarcely of dissent
heard (except from the proscribed abolitionists)
while, for a long time, a leading object of that pe-
riodical was, evidently, the legislative suppression
of Anti-Slavery Societies and their publications.
With the principal conductors of the religious
newspaper press, the Review was in high favor.

And when, for a number of months, the ques-
tion hung in suspense, whether the Southern de-
mands of prohibitory legislation at the North
should be complied with—while the measure in
various forms, was virtually recommended by
several of the governors of Northern states, while
legislative action in that direction was in progress
in several states, and in one state the prohibitory
enactment drafted and under legislative discussion,
at a time when a majority perhaps, of well in-
formed citizens, including such men as the lamented
Dr. Channing, anticipated the consummation
of that policy, involving the suppression of a free
press and of free discussion, so far as abolitionists

were concerned: at that time, the prominent religious sects of this country, through their church organizations, ecclesiastical bodies, influential preachers, metropolitan pulpits, leading ministers, lay members, civilians and editors, found no time or space to remonstrate—had no word of expostulation or entreaty to utter in behalf of civil and religious freedom—in behalf of large numbers of ex-slavery Christians and ministers belonging to their own communions, charged with no crime but the advocacy of the claims of the oppressed, and threatened with the loss of liberties dearer than life. So far from this, the atmosphere of their influence was the home of proscriptive sentiment, in all the free states. Not only Periodicals and Reviews, but elaborate and ingeniously written pamphlets, from the pens of learned clergymen, in favor of proscriptive legislation, were issued at different points of the "free North," and elicited no ecclesiastical or editorial rebuke. The proscriptive period of 1836-7 and 8 has passed away, but its record survives. To whatever instrumentalities humanity and liberty are indebted for the deliverance, that honor cannot be claimed by the organized religion of the principal sects, by their leading ministers or most honored and distinguished lay members. Their influence was notoriously, for the most part, on the other side of that question.

Baffled but not Repentant.

With the decline of the mob spirit first excited by them, and the signal failure of their efforts at legislative proscription, the temper of the leading ministers and members of the prominent religious sects was not changed. So late as the year 1839, at the anniversary of the American Colonization Society in Washington City, when Mr. Henry A. Wise (M. C.) a duelist and a slave holder, took occasion to say in his speech, that the "best way to meet the abolitionists was with Dupont's best [gun powder] and cold steel," a celebrated Doctor of divinity, of the city of New York, and at the head of influence in the Presbyterian Church, (Dr. Spring) is recorded in the N. York city papers to have "spoken with sympathy of the sentiments of the South, as evinced in the speech of Mr. Wise." To this published report of his speech the Doctor or his friends have never demurred, and for this flagrant outbreak of bloody "sympathy" neither the ecclesiastical partisans, nor the watchful theological opponents of the Doctor (so ready to detect his supposed errors) have yet administered to him; so far as is known, even the gentlest rebuke. To the present hour, the tie of ecclesiastical fellowship, communion, and religious co-operation, that binds the Northern churches and clergy to the persevering promulgators of "lynch law," is cherished as a sacred bond.

"Ecclesiastical Censures."

Attempts to silence the advocates of the oppressed by "ecclesiastical censures" since "civil penalties" and "cold steel" have not sufficed, form an instructive feature of the history of this struggle. On this topic we cannot now dwell.—The church prosecutions of La Roy Sunderland, Lewis Tappan, and E. W. Goodwin may serve as specimens of this warfare, and illustrations of the policy pursued. A general excision of all abolitionists would not answer the desired end. It would be a victory too dearly purchased. In some extensive sections, the church prayer-meeting, the Bible class and Sabbath school (to say nothing of the ministerial subscription list) could ill afford the process, though abolitionists are a minority in numbers; and seldom wealthy. The policy is, to select a few striking cases, and make examples of the most active and enterprising.

"It is to be hoped and expected that Massachusetts will enact laws deterring the printers, publishing and circulating papers and pamphlets on slavery; and also the holding of meetings to discuss slavery and abolition; to be public indictable offences, and provide for the punishment thereof, in such a manner as will most effectually prevent such offences."—Pamphlet by Hon. Wm. Sullivan and Rev. T. M. Sullivan, Boston.

that the rest may be intimidated, over awed, and kept in subjection. To a great extent, this policy has succeeded, and scores and hundreds have been held in subjection and struck dumb.

The Grounds of Opposition.

It will not, probably, be claimed that all this sympathy with lawless violence, and with attempts at legal persecution against abolitionists was elicited in self defence, or in revenge for assaults upon Christian institutions, Church, Sabbath, Ministry, or the polity of the existing sects! Such a plea would do little honor to the faith, piety, or Christian spirit of those in whose behalf it should be made. Nor would it well accord with the known and outstanding facts of the case.

These persecutions were directed against men, concerning whom no such allegations had been made, and were commenced long before the least shadow of such a pretext could have been found for them.

It was against the doctrine of immediate and unconditional emancipation, that the religious presses, and the leading ministry of the existing churches, arrayed themselves. These were the doctrines branded by them with "incendiarism"—the "wildness of fanaticism"—the "Jacobinism of the first French revolution." For promulgating these doctrines, they were characterized by their brethren, of the same sects, both from the pulpit and the press, as "cut throats," "seeking to plunge the country in the horrors of servile insurrection;" and these charges came from men who had little or no complaints to make, of the actual reign of lawless violence that has been described.

For four full years of this struggle, 1832-3-4 and 5, abolitionists, we repeat it, were, in no way held obnoxious to the charge of hostility to church and ministry, except as an attack upon slavery was construed into an attack upon them. This representation sometimes was made, and leading religious journals not unfrequently reminded abolitionists that if they really believed slave holding to be the heinous sin they represented it to be, they ought in consistency and common honesty, to abandon the churches that tolerated it, as anti-Christian.

Theological Defences of Slavery.

When Prof. Hodge of Princeton, Dr. Bangs of New York, Pres. Estlin of Middletown, Bishop Hedding and the leading journalists of the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian and Congregational churches in the non-slaveholding states, took up their pens to confute the abolitionists, it was in defence (not of Christian institutions, church, sabbath, ministry, or any form of ecclesiastical polity but) of the practice of innocent slave holding! It was to prove, not merely that abolitionists had not selected the best means of abolishing slavery, but that slavery is a Bible institution, sanctioned by patriarchal example, the law of Moses, the teachings and conduct of Paul—or that Christ and his apostles did not assail slavery, and therefore their successors should not—that some of the primitive Christians were slave holders "without violating the Christian faith or the church"—that "the same relation may still exist" without guilt—that "slavery is not *malum in se*, (sinful in itself)—that "the abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong"—that "the general rule of Christianity not only permits but, in supposable cases enjoins a continuance of the master's authority"—that "the New Testament enjoins obedience upon the slave, as an obligation due to present rightful authority"—that "the right to hold a slave is founded on the golden rule" of equal love to our neighbor!

When the religious press of the South, in response to one of the earliest of these Northern clerical defences of slave holding, declared that "the South owed to the Biblical Repository and to Prof. Hodge" of the Princeton Theological Seminary, "a debt of gratitude for the fearless argument in favor of the position that slavery is not forbidden in the Bible"—the only apparent

effect upon our leading Northern clergy, of proof that Prof. Hodge had strengthened the slave system, was the speedy and eager production of the similar testimonies already cited, as the anxious to convince the South that the religious teaching in New York, Middletown, Andover, elsewhere was not less favorable to their "infer institution" than the teaching at Princeton—that that seminary was not exclusively entitled Southern patronage and favor.

When the trustees and faculty of Lane Seminary and the principal theological seminaries colleges under clerical supervision, throughout the country, interfered in the contest, it was not to countenance any new notions of church, ministry, or Sabbath, but to forbid the formation of Anti-Slavery Societies by the students, and discussion of the slave question.

Was it for the want of Information?

When, in the early part of 1833, a series of cheap tracts were sent out by abolitionists in New York city, to all the clergymen, (and many of official and distinguished lay members of churches,) of the different religious sects, in the slave holding states, whose names and past address could be ascertained, and when a portion of these tracts were indignantly bawled, with expressions of disgust and contempt through the mails, into the teeth of those who had respectfully furnished them—it was because these publications contained any allusion upon Christian institutions—church, ministry, Sabbath, or existing denominational arrangements—for nothing of the kind, at that time, had been bronched by any prominent abolitionist in the country.

The rejected tracts consisted chiefly of authenticated evidences, collated from the journals of Clarkson and Charles Stuart, on the safety and benefits of emancipation, bearing substance of the documents presented by abolitionists to the British Parliament, and a convinced that body of "a society of abolitionists in the British West India Islands," these were added the views of Wilberforce on colonization, and extracts from the writings of Ley, Hopkins, Edwards, and other distinguished divines of former days against slavery, with marks showing that their sentiments were identical with those of "modern abolitionists," claiming, likewise, an insurrectionary design, inviting the churches and ministry to co-operate in the enterprise.

These publications were sent forth in the silent expectation that the facts and arguments they contained would shortly enlist, on the side of the enslaved, the principal ministers, members, distinguished laymen and editors of prominent sects. But their circulation was signal for a fresh outbreak of violent opposition from the pulpit and religious press. The citation of them was construed into an affront, a contumacious defiance of good manners, and an infringement of the rights of the persons to whom they were directed, to remain in the unmolested quiet of chosen repose, and unannoyed by public offensive to them! Witness, to this point, the book of President Wayland, and the effusions of the weekly religious press. And the contested legislative prohibition, as already seen, designed to prevent the repetition of such offenses.

To this we may add the complaints of the religious press, that certain abolitionists were of praying publicly for the enslaved, at prayer-meetings, during anniversary week, in New York—a practice still offensive and frowned in many of the church prayer meetings of the same sect.

Further Evidence in Point.

When the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1830, passed a resolution upon a few of their own body—it was not upon those members who had sympathized in lynch law—nor was it a censure on any nor

order of church government, or the disorganization of occasion—but the remedy was for having taken part in an anti-slavery meeting, the conference improving the occasion to say that “they disclaimed any right, wish or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave holding states in this Union.” [Adopted by a vote of 120 to 14.]

When the N. York Annual Conference of the M. E. Church, the same year, passed a censure upon Zion’s Watchman, it was for the same cause, and when they required a pledge of the young candidates for ordination, it was on this distinct point, that they should “refrain from agitating the church with discussions on the subject” of abolitionism.

It is the discussion of slavery that is still shut out from the local churches of the different sects, to so great an extent, throughout the land. To the same discussion, the leading religious journals of the same sects, in most cases, still remain closed.

Thus full and complete are the proofs that active opposition to slavery and the discussion of the subject are the offences the prominent religious sects have proscribed. And the reason is manifest. An assault upon slavery is felt to be an assault upon them; because of their settled and cherished connexion with the slave holding ministers and members of the same sects, at the South, with whom they hold fellowship, and with whom they are determined, at all events to co-operate, in their literary, ecclesiastical, and missionary enterprises and labors; also because the members of these sects, in their political and commercial connexions, find, or imagine they find, their pecuniary or political interests identified with those of slave holders. Their continued religious co-operation and fellowship with the habitual and incorrigible robbers of the poor, is a privilege which they must still retain, and this still impels them to insist that slave holding, in itself, is not sinful. That portion of the clergy not yet identified with abolitionists, but most inclined to take some action on the subject, are careful, up to this day, even in enlightened New England, to have it understood that they cannot be drawn or driven from this ground, but must be indulged in having fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, or else they cannot consent to assist in reproving them!

Departure from the Faith.

And this brings to view the theological position of the leading ministry and churches of the prominent religious sects, so evidently at war with the great truths of Christianity, embodied in their own printed creeds.

To say, as they commonly do, that slave holding, in itself, (or in all cases,) is not sinful, is to deny, in effect, the fundamental doctrines of religion.

It is to deny the supreme and unceasing authority of God over every human being. For, it claims that there are cases in which it is no sin for one human being to claim supreme and unlimited authority over another human being, to the manifest exclusion and denial of God’s claim.—

“The slave is one who is entirely subject to the will of a master to whom he belongs.” “This dominion is as unlimited as that which is tolerated by the laws of any civilized country in relation to brute animals, to quadrupeds; to use the words of the civil law.” [Stoddard’s Slave Laws, p. 22—24.]

It is to deny that the immortal soul of man, formed in the image of God, purchased by a Savior’s blood, and designed as a temple of the Holy Ghost, possesses, after all, any inherent attributes superior to brute matter, and which render it unalterably sinful to treat it as merchandize, and degrade it to a level with mere things.

It is to deny the free moral agency and accountability of every human soul, since in all cases of slave holding, whatever the “treatment” (and however innocent and even benevolent it may be deemed) the free moral agency of the slave is suspended, counteracted, held in abeyance, denied!

It is to maintain, in the face of the divine law prohibiting theft and man stealing, that there may be cases of innocent man stealing—innocent using a neighbor’s services without wages, and giving him nothing for his work.

It is to deny the inviolability of marriage. It is to maintain that what God hath joined together, man may put asunder, or that human beings may be held by a tenure making marriage impossible, and the marriage contract a nullity.

It is to affirm the lawfulness, in some cases, of sustaining by example, the vilest system of oppression and wickedness that ever saw the sun, a system inconsistent with education, annulling religious freedom, and reducing the mass of its victims to heathenism.

If, to avoid these conclusions, it be claimed that our prominent churches and ministry, not abolitionists, do not differ from them, in respect to the character of slavery, but only in respect to the means of its removal, the result will be quite as much in opposition to Christian doctrine, as the foregoing.

The rejected measures of abolitionists to, the removal of slavery are identical with those admitted to be proper for the removal of all other sins, viz: testimony against the sin, and its immediate, penitent, and unconditional abandonment.

But their opponents who propose a gradual abandonment of slave holding, while admitting it to be sinful, falsify the fundamental doctrine of immediate repentance. This has been noticed by those slave holding ministers who teach that slavery is not sinful, and they have justly called it “strange doctrine for Christian men.”

By pleading, as they commonly do, for a compensation to the slave holder, before he is called upon to repent, they deny the doctrine of unconditional repentance, and go about to hire the transgressors to abandon their sins!

They recommend other expedients, as a substitute for calling sinners to repentance. They would sooner be at the expense of removing the oppressed out of the country (so they tell us) rather than obey the divine mandate to “Cry aloud,” and show the oppressors their sins.

They betray their utter skepticism, in respect to the power of the gospel, the efficacy of divine truth, the influences of the Spirit, the sure promises (annexed to the express commandments) of God, as affording any encouragement to labor directly for the removal of this sin. Any confidence in such aid, they deride, as the “wildness of fanaticism!” As “practical men” they claim to have discovered a more excellent way.

They cry out against the “denunciations” of abolitionists, in the case of this sin, just as do those who cry out against the denunciations of Christian ministers against other sins. Admitting that they regard slave holding as sinful, they practically take the ground, (in respect to this sin) of those who deride the penal sanctions of the divine law and the retributions of eternity; and who, like themselves, complain loudly of the “vindictive spirit,” and “unchristian and vituperative language” of those who faithfully warn them to flee from the wrath to come. This altered tone of the professedly evangelical pulpit and press of this country, has already been noticed by certain writers, who exult that “denunciations” against sinners are going out of fashion, and that the “orthodox” are gradually coming over to their ground.

The same theological result is likewise, in effect, reached, whenever (along with the concession that slave holding is sinful,) it is claimed that church relations and Christian fellowship may be permanently sustained with slave holders and those who sustain or apologize for them. For, if Christian fellowship is to be maintained with impenitent sinners, then the radical distinction between saints and sinners melts away, on the slightest

est inspection, and the discriminating retributions of eternity become a fiction!

Disorganizing.

And it follows, too, that if Christian fellowship and church relations are to be maintained with impenitent sinners, known to be such, then the Christian Church, after all, is nothing essentially distinct from the World; and there remains no foundation in human character, or in the nature of things, for the maintenance of church institutions. Thus the doctrine of no-church (springing up, spontaneously, on such soil,) germinates, of necessity from the doctrine that incorrigible slave holders and their abettors, (allowing slavery to be sinful) are to have a place in the church.

Our Position.

From conclusions so heretical, from results so disorganizing, we cannot but shrink back with dismay. Our confiding reliance on the principles of Christian theology in which we have been instructed, and which reason, conscience, and scripture, unitedly teach, we are deeply solicitous to retain unimpaired. Our fealty to the institution of the Christian Church we are intent to maintain.

From the church organizations, therefore, and their leaders, by whom these fundamental principles of religion are so contemptuously spurned aside, from the churches whose annihilation of Church discipline merges the Church of the High-est in the deepest pollution of a world lying in wickedness, we feel impelled, to recede.

Not a hasty Decision.

Nor is this ground hastily taken, nor without a deep sense of the obligation resting on us to do all in our power for the reformation of the churches with which we are or have been connected, while there remains a rational hope in their case. To this very end, year after year, have we labored.—For this very work, we are accounted disturbers. To hedge up our way, in this work, free discussion in the church has been suppressed, the pulpit door closed against those among us who are ministers, for more than ten years, while freely opened to those who devour widow’s houses.—The leading presses of our own favorite sects, sustained by our funds, have vilified and misrepresented us, in most cases, allowing us no privilege of reply. The ministers we have supported, have, in most cases, denied us our rights, and closed their ears to our entreaties. “How can two walk together, except they be agreed?” If we continue to support the churches that support slavery, how can we be free from their guilt? Or, who shall give us credit for fidelity to our principles and convictions?

Tentations—Entanglements.

Church members not abolitionists are seldom known to assist in the support of ministers who are true to the cause of the enslaved. If one half or two thirds of a church are abolitionists, the faithful minister must be dismissed because the minority will not assist in his support. The result is the co-operation even of active abolitionists in the support of ministers neutral or temporizing if not hostile to the cause. A premium for ministerial unfaithfulness is thus paid by those who would be deemed faithful themselves! This is only one of many ways in which Christian integrity is compromised and wrecked, by a connexion with the churches of the prominent sects.

Robbery for burnt offering.

By their connexion with Missionary Boards that co-operate with robbers and heathen makers at home, in sending the gospel to the heathen abroad, the churches of these sects forfeit all claims to our confidence and support. And in vain shall we undertake (by a similar policy) to support the missionaries of a free and pure Christianity abroad, while we are engaged in supporting the churches of a servile and false Christianity at home.

Reformation of these sects, hopeless.

Our attempts for the reformation of those churches have all signally failed, and must forever

Rev. C. W. Howard of South Carolina—the same gentleman who so gratefully acknowledged, in the Southern Christian Herald, the services of Prof. Hodge of Princeton.

or fall, an account of those inherent vices in their structure which subvert primitive simplicity, substitute human inventions for the institutions of Christ, subject the many to the control of the few, sink the individual in the body corporate, exalt secularism in the place of Christianity, oblige men to surrender their inalienable rights to become church members—exclude acknowledged Christians for non-conformity in rituals and doubtful disputations, while men habitually subsisting by "the highest kind of theft" (but conforming in rites and forms,) are greeted as worthy brethren.

That churches thus based on usurpation, their very existence identified with the denial of that fundamental principle of church organization which unites the righteous and excludes the wicked; churches cemented by schism and founded upon disorganization, (yet proscribing, as disorganization and schism, all attempts to reform or to organize,) can never, in the nature of things, be reformed but by subversion, is a truth too nearly self-evident to require argument; but is well illustrated in the passing history of these sects.

Confirmatory Facts.

It was confidently predicted, a few years ago, that the Methodist Episcopal and New School Presbyterian sects would speedily be collied in the cause of the enslaved. But their downward course, for the last ten years, is now a matter of record. The Methodist Episcopal Church settles down on an unflinching substitution of the slave code, as her rule of conducting church trials, (wherever that code obtains currency,) in preference to the laws of Jesus Christ. The New School Presbyterian Church (claiming more spiritual life than the Old School) has nevertheless chilled to death the most vigorous of her sons and guides, who promised her restoration, and has dragged them with her, speechless, lifeless corpses, down the dark current of her own infamy; deliberately falsifying their own solemn promises of reproving oppression, for the appropriate bribe of a fresh accession of oppressors into the ranks of their sect!

If, in any portions of the existing sects, any remaining sensibility is to be witnessed, it is in those portions recently galvanized at the sight or the touch of the amputating knife of Secession.

SUBTERFUGES INSTEAD OF PENITENCE.

Ingenuous penitence and confession, most manifestly, are the only remedies, in their case. These remedies they are still as unwilling as ever to receive. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper."

When compelled, by a change of public sentiment, to change, in some particulars, their course, a frank and manly confession of error, or of wrong doing, never forms any part of their change. They ply incessantly, and by innumerable subterfuges and shifts, the profitless work of self-justification, never ceasing to search out new causes of complaint and fresh charges against those whose fidelity has compelled them, reluctantly, to change, in some measure, their ground.

At one time the burden of complaint was, the recklessness and danger of immediate emancipation. Then we were told, that if the West India experiment proved the safety of that policy, the northern churches and ministry would go with us, en masse; and few Abolitionists doubted, at one period, that such would be the fact. But since the complete success of that experiment has been conceded, and all cards on that ground have been silenced, the bitterness of opposition, pent up for but a moment, and revealing itself by inarticulate growings, gathers to itself new strength, scatches out new pleas for self-justification, and now and self-contradictory complaints against Abolitionists and their measures, still refusing to point out, or put in operation, any better measures in their stead. At one time we were told, that since it was a political subject, the ballot-box was the proper remedy, rather than the action of the church. But since the ballot-box has been resorted to, that

course is stigmatized as the grand error by which a holy cause has been polluted, inasmuch that Christians and ministers cannot now be expected to co-operate. From engaging in this political contest Christians are warned to stand aloof, but are not reproved for their activity in other political struggles, not even for their elevation of oppressors. The profanation of preaching politics on the Sabbath is urged by those who never suspected the Puritans of Sabbath-breaking in that particular—by those who freely admit Colonization agents, ministers and laymen, to occupy their pulpits, on the Sabbath, with the politics of Liberia and Basa Cove enterprises, and the political and commercial advantages to this country of founding a new empire in Africa. Churches close their houses against us, because they can be used only "for purposes strictly religious;" and in a few months, Whig Conventions can be held in them. The Anti-Slavery lecturer must not occupy the pulpit on the Sabbath, because he is a layman; nevertheless, the lay advocates of colonization (or even of Temperance, perhaps) may occupy the same pulpits on that day. And among the latest subterfuges, (and one showing the increased and inveterate habit of opposition,) we are told that Sabbath lectures (when meeting-houses are closed) are a desecration of the Sabbath—because held out of doors!

The Bible is claimed to be in favor of slavery, by teachers who complain of slander if it is inferred that they are in favor of it themselves! The same learned teacher who claims, first, to abhor slavery as much as we do, dissenting only from our measures; in order to escape the charge of recommending a future abandonment of sin, will fly back to a Biblical argument in favor of slavery. Sometimes they cannot open their mouths for the dumb, because of the heresies and faults of some who are engaged in that work. Anon, they will justify the policy of co-operating with the worst of men in what they consider a good object. In the Missionary cause, they can co-operate with oppressors; in the Colonization cause, they think it no bar to their co-operation that a slave-breeder, a duelist, and a gambler, is placed at the head of the society; and even in the Christian church they count it "schism" to refuse co-operation and fellowship with men guilty (by the testimony of the Presbyterian Church) of the "highest kind of theft" (by testimony of the Methodist Episcopal Church)—guilty of transgressing "the laws of God, man, and nature."

Ten years of experiments, in the midst of developments of opposition like these, (and of which we have only grouped together a few specimens,) should convince us that Christian integrity and godly sincerity should seek other gardens for their own growth and culture, than those watered by the ministrations of such men. Were it needful, we might advert to their course on other questions of moral reform, as furnishing proofs that their position and aims have not been misapprehended by us. But we forbear.

To the Christian Members of those Sects.

In seceding from the churches whose general position has been described, we do not forget that we leave behind us, in those communions, many men whom we recognize as Christians, and who now occupy ground which we have occupied, but from which we feel impelled to escape. To them, our invitation is that of the first Protestant Reformers to the Christians in the Romish Church—the voice John heard from heaven—"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues." (Rev. 18: 4) The crowning sin of Rome was her "traffic" in "slaves, and souls of men." And says Scott, the commentator, on that passage—

"The vengeance of Heaven is coming upon Rome, not in gestures, garbs, and ceremonies, though multiplied, ridiculous, and of bad consequence in themselves; but for idolatry, ambition, OPPRESSION, CRUELTY to the people of God, imposture, AVARICE, LICEN-

TIOUSNESS, and spiritual TYRANNY. There are the sins which have reached to the heavens, the iniquities which God cannot overlook, and the calls FROM WHICH NO MAN CAN STAND ALONE from her communion, and that of ALL OTHERS THAT RESEMBLE HER, or who shall be involved in their destruction."

III. BASIS OF RE-ORGANIZATION.

Since secession, therefore, is inevitable, and cannot longer be postponed—since the work, in a variety of shapes, is already in progress—since seceders, comparatively few and isolated in their locations, and educated in different sects, find it no easy task to "assemble themselves together" and unite their efforts—it seems proper that the true principles and proper forms of church order, revealed in the Scriptures, should be mutually sought after, that they may be duly honored and maintained.

We take it for granted that man's social nature, the social character of the Christian religion, the examples of the first Christians, and the teachings of the New Testament, unitedly point to associated and organized effort, to mutual consultation and watch care—in other words, to the gathering of Christian churches, and to church discipline, in accordance with the fundamental principles of religion, and the directions of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Equally plain is it, that the great principles of human brotherhood, Christian unity, and inalienable human rights, so much insisted on by our Savior, and so thoroughly identified with his religion, should be scrupulously regarded and honored, in the organization and discipline of Christian churches. Especially in the re-organization of churches on the present occasion, and for the causes that have now been set forth, should the Seceders see well to it that the latent errors, defects, usurpations, and schisms (with the rivalries and corruptions resulting from them) in the church organizations from which they have escaped—the very causes which have led those churches into such harsh collision with human rights, and made them fit instruments for the subversion of civil and religious freedom—should be carefully and solicitously avoided in the beginning of the reformatory enterprise before us. The scenes of the last ten years should admonish us to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ maketh his people free, and not be entangled again in the yoke of bondage."

We shall be safe in assuming that Christian churches, such as the great Head of the church instituted and approves, cannot contradict, in the details of their arrangements, the first principles of inalienable human rights, individual responsibility, and equal brotherhood—self-evident in themselves, and entering into the very definition of the Christianity of Jesus Christ. We may be certain that in church organization, church order, and church discipline, on the Divine model, the many are not to be controlled by the few, nor the individual immolated upon the altar of the many. We may assure ourselves, that on entering such a church no man is required or permitted to give up any portion of his original inherent rights, for the protection, or better exercise, or edification of the rest; but that, on the other hand, it is the proper function and duty of the united brotherhood to see that the rights, the responsibilities, and the conscientious convictions of the humblest member of the body remain untrampled, unfettered, and unimpeded. We may be assured, that in the healthful operation of legitimate church order, individual right will never need to be sacrificed, even to secure "the greatest good of the greatest number;" and for the plain reason that the "greatest good of the greatest number," to wit, its integrity—can never be secured, but must always be wrecked, by the very act of violating the humblest individual right.

Nor shall we err in assuming that the church of Christ is something quite distinct from a "world lying in wickedness,"—that it must be composed of regenerated men, servants of Jesus Christ.

children of God, showing their faith by their works—that all such have a right to church membership—that none others possibly can have.

Nor shall we err in assuming that Christ intended all his disciples to be one, as he is one with the Father—that he cannot approve of any other church arrangements by which Christian brethren, believing each other to be such, are kept separated from each other.

Nor shall we err in assuming that the Divine pattern of church organization and order is to be found in the New Testament—that all ecclesiastical organizations found there, and those only, are worthy of being honored as of Divine origin—that all ecclesiastical organizations and arrangements in addition to the institutions of Christ and his apostles, as described in the New Testament, are not to be considered with them, or treated as being any part of them.

Nor shall we err in assuming that Christ and his apostles approved of, or intended, any other church organization, and what church discipline and church order, are in accordance with religious freedom, individual responsibility, human rights, and the nature and objects of Christ's kingdom—that, therefore, all ecclesiastical organizations, arrangements, and usages, not approving themselves in the New Testament, are to be rejected, as human contrivances to supply implied defects in the Divine wisdom, as innovations and usurpations, pertaining to the Mon of Sin, which must be consumed in the brightness of the Savior's appearing.

Independence of Local Churches.

We therefore conclude and maintain—That local churches or assemblies of Christians who mutually recognize each other as such, steadily worshipping in one place, exercising mutual watch care over each other, excluding the apostate from their number, choosing their own church officers from among their own members, and combining their energies in opposing iniquity and doing good, being all the permanent ecclesiastical bodies known in the apostolic age, or described in the New Testament, are all that the exigencies of the church or the world need—are all that can, with safety or propriety, be maintained as institutions of Christ. All additional church organizations subvert local church independence, and, of course, local church discipline, by the assembly of brethren, provided for by Christ, [Matt. xviii.] and enjoined by his apostles, [1 Cor. v.] They subject the church to the law, and merge the individual in the body corporate. They frustrate the divine direction to the heathen, to beware of false prophets, and know the tree by its fruits. This act of their organization is the act of erecting rival sects, unless all of them are to be considered together by their common subjection to one universal power, as set forth in the Bible. Their tendency is in this direction, as shown by the following:

1. Association leads to connotationism. connotationism leads to Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy; Episcopacy leads to Roman Catholicism; and Roman Catholicism is an ultimate fact.

This spiritual tendency is confirmed by the present attitude of these several sects. In the Congregational sect, (with its associations and connotations,) its leading clergy and aristocracy are looking after Presbyterianism, the same church in the Presbyterian sect are with difficulty detained from the embraces of Episcopacy, and in the Episcopal sect we witness the same spiritual tendency and clergy look towards the Romanists. These facts are the strongest arguments from the church institutions of Christ.

The records of the primitive churches leave us no room to doubt that all the legitimate objects of church discipline, domestic and foreign, were accomplished by the churches in any manner of the church in the world, as described in the Bible.

This fact is confirmed by the fact, that the churches of the world, as described in the Bible, were all of the same kind, and all of the same name.

ed without the cumbersome, expensive, and corrupting machinery now in vogue, without the slightest departure, either in fact or in form, from the simple institutions of the apostolic age—from the rigidly maintained independency of local churches worshipping in one place. Occasional councils for advice, and free, open conventions of Christians in general, for mutual exhortation, prayer, counsel, equity, and discussion, might supply all the supposed defects of local church independence, provided they would limit it to each council or convention, being a popular body, assembled for a single purpose, and claiming no church authority, terminates its existence, and is resolved into its original elements, at the close of its temporary sittings.

Christian purity and freedom also require that the business of the local church be transacted by its members, "assembled together" according to apostolic direction [1 Cor. v.] and the principles of Christian democracy; instead of being committed to an oligarchy, or session of church officers, acting in conclave by themselves. And in all Christian assemblies, or churches, the right of free discussion and free expression, by the members as well as officers of the church, should be scrupulously maintained, in consistency with the order needful to be preserved in all organized bodies of men. [1 Cor. xiv.]

Christian Unity, and Discriminating Fellowship.

We also maintain, that evidence of Christian character, and being one, in the proper sense of church membership—that evidence of Christian character, and nothing else, can warrant the act of excommunication or exclusion.

But from this statement it will not follow that all who are received into church fellowship who think themselves Christians, nor all who maintain a decent exterior moral deportment, nor all who have been the subjects of strong religious emotions—alternate terrors and transports; nor all who, on questions of fundamental morality, do not prove themselves destitute of common honesty. Nor will it follow that any are to be received as Christians who pertinaciously reject the fundamental truths of religion.

On the other hand, the rule of receiving all those, and those only, who give evidence of being Christians, presupposes that the Christian brotherhood must form a judgment upon the evidences exhibited; it presupposes, likewise, that they have a fixed and definite standard of Christian character, and that they collect and consider the evidences necessary to a correct decision. It therefore throws a weight of responsibility upon them to "take heed and beware of men," to "beware of false prophets," to know the tree by its fruits, to try those who say they are apostles and are not, and find them liars—to "receive" none who bring not "Christ's doctrine, neither bid them God speed," lest they become "partakers of their evil deeds." [2 John 10, 11.] In a word, to study, understand, and apply all the rich and varied instructions of the Bible, given for their guidance, in the important and heaven-imposed duty of discriminating human character, of discerning between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serves God and him that serves his own belly. [Malachi iii. 18.] Until the entire Christian brotherhood are trained to the intelligent and faithful discharge of this duty, there can be nothing like consistency church discipline, nor significance and vitality in church institutions or church fellowship. And this can only be done until the mass of the members of local and independent churches set themselves earnestly to the work of receiving into their fellowship and communion ALL WHO, AND THOSE ONLY, who give evidence of being Christians.

It is an admitted and known fact, that the first Christians believed all those, and those only, who were acknowledged to be Christians; and that the Christian brotherhood was not then divided into sects. The erection of parties and

sects, and calling them by different names, after the names of various apostles—Paul, Apollos, or Cephas—was expressly forbidden. In matters of doubtful dispute among Christians, none were permitted either to lord it over the faith of their weaker brethren, or to allow the most gifted to judge them or decide for them.

In saying this, we only repeat the testimony of writers whose statements have been endorsed and corroborated by the most approved biblical critics and popular religious periodicals in the land.* If we have said too much, and if we are mistaken, it is only because we insist that the known and admitted principles and usages of the first Christians should, forthwith, be restored.

We recommend no compromise of principle, for the sake of union—no suppression of individual testimony on points where Christians differ. True union, and unity, can only be produced by the real unity of sentiment, and a high tone of thorough orthodoxy, among Christians—such free discussion as is not tolerated by the spirit of sect, and has no resting-place except among Christians gathered together on the simple basis of Christian character.

If Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and members of the Reformed Dutch Church, can unite in circulating religious tracts, (as in the American Tract Society,) and if the Reformed Dutch, Congregational, and Presbyterian churches can unite in supporting a Union of Foreign Missions, we see no reason why Abolitionists seceding from those sects may not unite in maintaining Christian institutions at home and missions abroad.

Seceding Abolitionists claim, that it is in an spirit of schism or of disorganization that they secede—that nothing but a departure from fundamental Christianity, on the part of the existing sects, could have driven them to a secession from them. But if they now separate from each other, and set up rival sects, while believing each other to be Christians, they will show that they are not free from the spirit of schism, and thus manifest their inconsistency, and weaken the moral influence of their testimony by secession. They will add needlessly, to the public inconvenience, and annoyance incident to the claims and presence of so many rival sects, and increase the standing reproach and scandal of petty religious jealousies and feuds. They will lose the advantages of that unity and combined effort which, in their scattered condition, they so much need. They will fritter away and waste, in unwholesome rivalries, the resources and strength they should harmoniously wield in the cause of a common Christianity, for the benefit of the human race, and the service of their one Father in heaven.

RECAPITULATION AND CONCLUSION.

Holding these views, this Convention would not even seem to trespass upon that individual and local responsibility which they would foster and not supersede, by framing and recommending for general adoption, any FORMULARY either of church order, or of a confession, creed, or discipline. The important work calls for the independent deliberation and action of each congregation, assembly of Christians who shall worship and labor together. We have presented what we consider the leading facts and considerations which call for action, and the fundamental principles upon which the Christian church should be built. A brief recapitulation may be convenient in this place. Of the things of which we have spoken, this is the sum.

1. Individual responsibility and accountability, lie at the basis of all correct organized action. No combinations or associations must impair these, or trespass upon the rights growing out of them.

* Witness the writings of Professor Schenck, in the "Practical Appeal," is recommended by the professors at Andover, and the leading ministers and religious editors in the country.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. II—No. 1,
WHOLE NUMBER, 31.

ROCHESTER, ONTARIO CO., N. Y. JANUARY, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, in advance, always in advance and free of postage.
Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward in money with it expense to the publisher, shall have one copy gratis. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies gratis. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies gratis for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,
any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
Twenty papers, \$2 00
Sixty papers, \$3 00
One hundred papers for \$3 00
Always in advance, and free of postage.

For Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing any for papers.

PRINTED AT NO. 23, STATE-STREET, ROCHESTER.

LETTERS TO THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION.

A number of letters addressed to members of the Syracuse Convention, in reference to its objects, and from persons at a distance, who could not attend, were read during the early part of the deliberations of that body. Other letters were afterwards brought in, which, for want of time, were not read. A part only of these letters were left on the table of the Secretaries, and came into our possession, along with the Minutes. On arriving home, we found another, (the one from Mr. Lockwood) which came during our absence. These communications we have felt at liberty to publish, presuming that the object of the writers could not better be attained, and believing that the publication would subserve the interests of Christian Investigation and reform. In cheering to witness the simultaneous movements of so many inquiring minds in different parts of the country, and their approximation towards a common conclusion, we could not be supposed that, on all points, a perfect unanimity could be attained at once. A mutual interchange of thought must precede this; and of course we shall not be understood as endorsing every opinion we publish; while we earnestly invite attention to the subjects presented, and express our gratitude that such evident advances are making towards the restoration of apostolical church order, and a reformed and reformatory church. We deem it quite significant and encouraging that so many of these testimonies and efforts are from ministers of the gospel whose standing in the Christian community is well known.

FROM LEWIS C. LOCKWOOD,

Minister of the Gospel, late of the Presbyterian Ch.
PLEASANT VALLEY, Ulster Co., N. Y.,
Dec. 12, 1843.

DEAR BRETHREN OF THE EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN CONVENTION, in Syracuse, N. Y.—I have anxiously desired to meet with you in Convention, to interchange sentiments in reference to the evangelical basis of church organization. But as the circumstances of the church in which I am laboring forbid my absence, I shall be obliged to remain by the staff, while you are engaged in public conflict with "the figments of apostolical succession" (to use the phraseology of a noted champion in the theological field.) But if I cannot assist you with my tongue, perhaps I can with my pen. And may I not thus be permitted, if present with you, to have a share in your deliberations? "England," said Lord Nelson, on the eve of naval conflict, "expects every man to do his duty." And in the moral conflict of the

day, HEAVEN expects every man to do his duty. And I should not feel that I had discharged my duty to God and man, if I should fail to put my shoulder to the wheel of the car of righteousness. I am happy to assure you, that there are some in this section of country who approve of the ecclesiastical position that it is supposed you will assume—viz., that of anti-sectarian, and yet evangelical Christian union. And as to myself, I can assure you that the call of an evangelical Christian convention, at this time, meets my cordial approbation. I bless God that I have been enabled to burst the shackles of pro-slaveryism and sectarianism; and I shall consider it a privilege and honor that will outweigh and outlast D. D.-ism to be identified with the cause of evangelical Christian union, with yourselves and others of kindred spirit.

About nine months since, (as you may see fully represented in an article in the Newburgh, Orange Co., Gazette of the 6th instant,) after conversation with several of the ministers in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, O., I asked and obtained a letter of good standing from the Stated Clerk—not knowing then, precisely, what course I would pursue. I subsequently, however, came to the satisfactory conclusion, that duty to God and man, and my own Christian liberty of conscience, peace, and usefulness, as a minister of Christ, forbade me any longer to maintain connection with a church, which fellowships slaveholders in its connection, and rejects evangelical Christians who cannot enunciate some of the shibboleths of sectarianism. I accordingly resigned my pastoral charge, and sent to the Stated Clerk of Presbytery my formal withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church. I had not then read your book, but the Book of books—the Bible—in relation to organic Christian union; but I resolved that I would not again connect myself with a sectarian organization. As I proceeded homeward, I found several works on the subject; and in the vicinity of home (at New Windsor, Orange Co., N. Y.) I saw the views expressed in relation to it in the Christian Investigator, and I was exceedingly gratified with the coincidence between my own conclusions and the spirit of the age. While at Pittsburg, after ascertaining that the Wesleys, though they had assumed the right ground in relation to slavery, had retained too much of the sectarianism of the old Methodist Church, I associated myself with Rev. Benjamin Smith, of that city, on the evangelical principles of Christian union that I afterwards found expressed in the Christian Investigator and elsewhere.

It has been well thought and said, that if Luther had not led the Reformation, the spirit of his age would have urged another to the task. And the spirit of the present age will inspire men for the reformatory work which it demands to be done. I believe that this year the era of the Wesleyan, Presbyterian, and General Evangelical Christian secession and union, is a signal crisis in the history of the church. I do not pretend to be a prophet, or the son of a prophet; but, without the gift of prophecy, I may venture to say that Daniel's prophecy, in relation to the "cleansing of the sanctuary," (which Father Miller supposes to mean the destruction of the earth, figuratively called "the sanctuary.") may possibly be fulfilled in the "cleansing" of the church, which is properly called "the sanctuary." Is it not, at least, remarkable that these three movements should occur in the same year? I really cannot conceive why your Convention was called in mid-winter, unless it was to fulfil prophecy.

This much, however, we can say with certainty, that this is a remarkable juncture in the affairs of the church and of civil society. There seems to be a "turning and overturning," preparatory to some great events. The curtain of the future is rising, and new scenes in the moral government of God in this world are developing themselves. In permitting moral evil to enter the world, God seems to have designed that its ugliness should be developed. He permitted it, in the antediluvian world, to develop itself in violence and other nameless forms of depravity. Since the deluge, he has permitted it, in the form of heathenism, to develop its native tendency to degrade, and worse than brutalize, our species; in the form of philosophy, (false so called,) to develop the insufficiency of the taper-light of reason to direct and influence man to the pursuit of a course of virtue here, and of the only way of salvation hereafter; in the form of infidelity, to develop the folly of those who say in their heart, "There is no God—or, admitting his existence, worship him not as God; in the form of Mohammedanism, to develop the legitimate effects of the corruption of Judaism; in the form of Anti-Christian apostasy, to develop the legitimate effects of the corruption of Christianity; in the form of unrighteousness fellowshipped in the church in partial reformations, to develop the inevitable result of not purging out all "the old leaven," and of not coming entirely out of Babylon; in the form of sectarianism, to develop the effects of man-made church organization; in the form of slavery, and in ten thousand other forms, to develop the native ugliness and the legitimate effects of "sin when it is finished." Aye, and we may rest assured that the sin of slavery will not be eradicated from this country till, like that of Egypt, "it is finished"—till it has fully developed itself. And what will become of our civil and religious institutions, in its death-struggle, God only knows. I believe, however, that it needs not prophetic vision to see, that God designs that in this country, as elsewhere, one evil should counteract and cure another—that slavery and other evils shall cure the evil of sectarianism. The love of sect is so strong, that it needs an absorbing question to counteract it. I well know, that my own mind would not have burst its sectarian shackles, had it not been for its conflict with slavery and other evils. In the progress of the conflict of anti-slavery and other reformatory principles with moral evil, none can fail to see that sectarian organizations will eventually be dissolved, and that evangelical Christians will, as in primitive times, constitute one common brotherhood of mutual correspondence, and yet with mutual allowance of liberty of conscience and of opinion in non-essentials, in church government and rites, and in doctrines, [1] to particular churches and individuals, under the common name of Evangelical Christian.

REMARKS ON CHRISTIAN UNION.

While God, then, is "shaking the heavens,"—the church, and calling on his people to come out from unholy fellowship with extortioners, drunkards, Sabbath-breakers, and others of similar character, shall they re-organize on sectarian principles? Or should they not rather return to primitive simplicity, liberty, and union, and, after Christ's model, build a church which, being unable to be shaken, will remain? If they do not heed the admonitions of Providence, they will reap the fruit of their folly. Sectarianism will divide and subdivide them, till this evil has fully

developed itself; and then, tired of splitting hairs, and in using their intricate tests, they will be prepared, like the stones which constituted Solomon's temple, to come together without the sound of axe or hammer, each to his proper place, in the one undivided spiritual house which God designs to occupy the whole surface of the earth.

Union is strength; and schism, or sectarianism, being antagonist to union, is weakness. It is a great evil in the church; it cuts the ligaments that bind her together, and thus cripples her energies. It is for a lamentation, and shall be for a lamentation, till it is removed. It has hitherto been considered an evil that is to be endured rather than cured; but, like most other evils, it can, should, and must be cured. There is a sovereign remedy. And what?—A return to evangelical simplicity and liberty of church organization. Sectarian organizations, which set bounds where Christ has set none, enclosing the Lord's vineyard with hedges which necessarily shut out some of the sheep of his flock, and thus prevent them from being, according to his prayer and injunction, one fold under one shepherd—must be abandoned. Such organizations, by compelling every member to speak according to the dialects of their respective schools, have been nurseries of sectarianism. In them the novitiate must be placed upon a Procrustean bed, and stretched if he be too short, or have his extraneous cut off if too long. A disproportioned, monstrous theology is thus produced. The respective partisans unconsciously fall into the snare of a bigoted partiality for the peculiarities which distinguish their sects. They are tempted to magnify those peculiarities, and to think more, read more about, and to make more of, the mint, cummin, and anise of their distinctive tenets, than of the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and the love of God and man. These are their badges of distinction; they are their peculiar property; they can call them *their own*: while the essentials of religion are common property. And what is more natural than a peculiar favoritism for whatever we can call peculiarly *our own*? A man naturally loves his own name, however crooked—his own phylageomy, however homely—his own property of any kind, however insignificant it may be in the eyes of others. This unnatural principle, when it operates to produce in Christians a peculiar love for the name of Evangelical Christian, and for the essential characteristics of Evangelical Christianity in distinction from the names and the characteristics of corrupt Christianity, or Antichrist, and of the ungodly world—is good, and only good, in its effects; but when it is perverted by sectarianism, and made to produce love for the *name* of a sect, its effects are evil, and only evil. Under its perverted influence students of theology yield up, in sacrifice at the shrine of party, the right of independent thought; and swallow, without mastication, what is prepared and served up for them by their professors. The sectarian pertinacity of the Baptists is resolvable to the truth which is honestly acknowledged by Fuller and others—that if the barrier of close communion and restrictive membership were removed, their church would cease to exist as a distinct body. "Aye, there's the rub." What an awful *base*! Great is the Diana of sectarianism! So will Presbyterians, Methodists, and other sectarians. They would admit to their respective *sects* as *sects* of different views on minor points in religion, if it were not for their devotion to their dear, idolized *sects*. To make the platforms of their organizations sufficiently broad to admit, in official and private membership, all evangelical Christians, and to admit particular churches into a general evangelical Christian union, with the allowance of liberty to each church to govern itself according to the pleasure of a majority of its members, [2] would destroy their existence as distinct sects. Here we clearly perceive the home and cloven hoof of sectarianism. Here we find the "root of bitterness," to which the

See the operation of these tight-laced principles in that minister of the gospel, invested with the authority of an ambassador of Christ, and commissioned to preach the doctrine that all evangelical believers are one in Christ Jesus.—Hark! he reads the hymn commencing,

"Let party names no more,
The Christian world o'erspread;
Gentile and Jew, and bond and free,
Are one in Christ their head."

After this anti-sectarian hymn has been sung, he commences his sermon, in which he discants on the blessedness of Christian union and the evil of schism. But how *extensive* is the union and what is *schism* according to his definition?—The union extends only as far as the line of demarcation of his *sect*! All must come up to the sectarian mark to be admitted to the union! As to those out of the line, he remarks that they may be good Christians, but they are not good Presbyterians or Methodists or Baptists, and that hence they cannot have a place in his church! And so it seems that he requires more than a good Christian character to qualify a person for connexion with his *sect*! And if any, forsooth, cannot conscientiously comply with its restrictions, he must leave it and be branded with the name of *schismatic*! Yes, *schism*, according to his definition, is separation from his *sect*! O consistency, whither hast thou fled! O shame, where is thy blush! If thou hadst not left the earth, thou wouldst surely mantle the cheek of one who pleads for union while he sets landmarks where God has set none, and thus necessarily prevents genuine Christian union, and substitutes in its place *party union*.

But, as we might naturally expect, the sectarian's remarks on Christian union are few and far between. Upon this theme it is not politic for him frequently or long to discourse, lest he undermine his sectarian organization. He would rather contend earnestly for what he calls "the faith once delivered to the saints," meaning particularly the distinctive peculiarities of his denominational *sect*. [2] In the pursuit of this favorite theme, he is led to support the *sect* of which he is the organ, to swell to Alpine magnitude its mole-hill peculiarities, to make them more prominent than the vital doctrines of Christianity, to condemn as heretics all who refuse to bow before the image that sectarianism has set up, and to earnestly exhort all to come and join his *sect*.

These are but a few of the deplorable effects of sectarian church organization. Need any more be said on the subject? May not an appeal be confidently made to every truly converted man, woman and child in Christendom, to determine whether improperly exclusive organizations do not foster sectarianism? Will not all give an affirmative response? And if we pray that Christ's kingdom of righteousness which hath one Lord, one faith, one baptism, may come, on earth as in heaven, where all belong to one general assembly and church of the first-born, will not all say, Amen? Shall not the past time elapse wherein abstract points of polemical theology by being made tests of membership in the church, have separated those who ought to be organically, as well as spiritually, one? Many of these tests are but chaff. And what is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord? Yet, strange to say, sectarians love the chaff best. And he who attempts to blow it away will soon find himself in trouble.—But Jehovah's breath will blow it away. What are the differences between evangelical Christians when we take out the pharisee that has fastened them to the sleeve of their sectarian creeds or theological systems? They are more nominal and imaginary than real. Ning out of ten of those in connexion with the different denominations that hold the essentials of religion, if they lay aside their "bodies of divinity" (which are frequently bodies without souls) and go directly to the word

of God and drink at that pure fountain, before has been drained off into the stagnant pool of humanly devised creeds, can come to a substantial unity of sentiment—*ay*, they are already substantially agreed!

And even in reference to minor points of dispute, there would be more unanimity if they would strive to understand each other and to show how near they could approximate to oneness of mind, instead of seeking only how they may find arguments to answer their antagonists, to widen the breach and to strive to see how far apart they can get. "O!" cries the sectarian—"It is useless to strive to reconcile these differences. The partition walls are high as heaven and the space between wide as the impassable gulf. There that abominable doctrine held by the Presbyterians—or Methodists—or Baptists!" How easy and yet how unchristian it is to set up men's straw, heap upon them odious epithets, and then fight them! The points of controversy being at strife, the language employed in reference to them is frequently ambiguous and liable to misapprehension. And if not ambiguous, it is often perverted from its intended sense by the spirit of party. A logomachy arises about phraseology employed in minute illustrations and application of admitted facts. Distinctions are made where there are no real differences. Some of these distinctions are too minute to be seen with the naked eye. The assistance of a sectarian microscope is demanded. The subtlety of Thomas Aquinas is required. And when one sees his opponent liable to stumble over a little hillock of error, he involuntarily throws himself back and falls into the slough in the opposite extreme. Each is very confident that he is right, because he thinks his antagonist wrong. All this springs from the sectarian spirit which naturally grows out of sectarian organization. If all evangelical Christians were united in one organization, they would content themselves with essential agreement in reference to the facts plainly revealed without contending in heated dispute about metaphysical questions. [4] The present state of things ought not so to be. How long shall insignificant differences keep the church divided into sects? A Christian *sect*!—a party!—a part of Christ's mystical body severed from the root. What? Is Christ divided? Or are Christians baptized into the name of John the Baptist, or John Calvin, or of John Wesley? Whereas our faith is of John the Baptist, and I am of John Calvin, and I am of John Wesley, are they not carnal, and do they not walk as men that contend with wild zeal for the ascendancy of their political party, whose principles are scarcely distinguishable from those of the opposite party, while the rights of humanity are forgotten? Who is John the Baptist, or who is John Calvin, or who is John Wesley, but God's honored agents? Are shall they be canonized and made to occupy the place of Christ? Shall we engrave the church upon their peculiarities and call it by their names? It ought not so to be.

The basis of organization while it should be sufficiently explicit and comprehensive to exclude from church organization and fellowship, radical errorist, and unrighteous persons, should allow Christian liberty in relation to things not necessary to salvation. Evangelical Christians can be in connexion now, as well as they can in primitive times. They ought to do it. And they possessed the spirit of primitive Christians, they would. And, as I before remarked, I do not see in the present conflict in Christendom, truth and error, righteousness and unrighteousness, God designs to strike evangelical Christians to unite and walk together in brotherly love and co-operation in good works. The evangelical church must become visibly one, as it was before its corruption by Anti-Christ, in order to triumph. There must be no schism in Christ's body. But the whole body fitly joined together

compacted by that which every joint suppliment make increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love. The church was originally a unit. And ought it not, may it not be so? In view of the reasons already noticed, is it not? And what other reasons need be urged? And may it not? True there are obstacles which seem to the eye of sense insurmountable. But by the eye of faith these obstacles seem first to dwindle into mole-hills and then become a plain before the Zerubbabel of the new evangelical union. Faith staggers at the promises of God, that Zion's watchmen shall see eye to eye, and that Ephraim shall not vex Judah, shall not vex Ephraim. Looking on these and other great and blessed promises, faith laughs at impossibilities and says, It is done. But, waken one, "How can these things be?" The answer is, "To man they are impossible, but to God all things are possible." The inquiry naturally arises in the mind of every Christian, What can I do, to effect the desired union of Christian union? The answer is, no out from sectarian organizations, and unite churches organized on evangelical principles. To preserve the network of Christian union in traveling, Christians must exemplify the precept inculcated by the apostles in reference to such days and meats. They must not judge another for trifling differences. If the apostles had possessed the spirit of modern sectarianism the church would soon have been divided Jewish and Gentile sects. But being deeply united with their Master's spirit, they inculcated principles which broke down the partition walls between Jews and Gentiles, united them in one church, and caused them to walk together in the unity of the spirit and the bonds of peace, notwithstanding their minor differences. Let Christians now imbibe their spirit, and like kindred drops of liquid they will unite, and the hydra of sectarianism will be no more.

REMARKS ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

In the following remarks on Church Government, I am indebted for the quotations I shall give from early writers, to Lord King's "Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Purity of the Primitive Church in the first years after Christ." I will make the remarks in connexion with a series of resolutions which I have presented to the Convention. And the passage of some resolutions of this kind, did it not be advisable to refer the whole matter to a committee, to report at another Convention, in reference to the evangelical basis of church organization. At this season of the year, many desire to be present to take part in the deliberations on such momentous questions, cannot. The establishment of any basis by this Convention would be premature. [5] With these remarks, I beg leave to offer my resolutions, with amendments.

Resolved, That the church general or universal, embraces all the credible professors of religion in the world, that being instituted by Christ to dispense all righteousness and the pillar and ground of truth, it should have no connection or fellowship with unrighteousness, and that being a church out of this world, but spiritual, it should never be united with earthly governments. [I did not make remarks on this resolution.] Resolved, That a particular church is a society of credible professors of evangelical religion, who are united in a particular place, and should have no connection with unrighteousness nor with the world.

By those who believe in infant baptism this definition need not be considered objectionable. Those who are baptized as infants are by them considered only minor members of the church, and are not considered as having all the duties of their covenant obligations by a credible profession of religion.

3. Resolved, That there were originally but two kinds of officers in the church, viz: bishops or elders and deacons; that the former were spiritual and the latter financial officers; that there were generally several bishops or elders and several deacons in each particular church, but that one of the former being elected to the presidency or pastoral charge of a church, was at first called the angel of that church, and afterwards its bishop, emphatically so called, while the name of elder, by way of distinction, was then confined to those associated with him in office, and the name of deacon still applied to financial officers, that the office of bishop and elder being the same, and the elders being assistant bishops where there was a pastor, and associate bishops where there was no pastor, they were authorized in his assistance or in his absence, to perform all the duties that he was authorized to perform, and that he might temporarily authorize a deacon or even a layman to perform the duties of his office. [6]

Remarks. There were but two kinds of officers in the church, viz: bishops or elders, and deacons, the former spiritual and the latter financial officers. That the office of bishop and elder was originally one and the same office, is evident from Acts xx. 17, 28. In verse 17 it is said, that from Miletus, Paul sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the church. And in verse 28, Paul says to these elders, "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," (or bishops) as the term overseers might be synonymously rendered. The terms elder and bishop being therefore synonymous, must relate to one and the same office.

Again, we have proof equally clear in Tit. i. 5-7. In verse 5, Paul says, that he had left Titus in Crete to ordain elders in every city, and in verse 6, he describes the proper character of an elder, and in v. 7, he assigns us the reason, that a bishop must be blameless, making the term bishop synonymous with that of elder. In 1 Peter ii. 2, the Apostle says, "The elders which are among you I exhort who am also an elder. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight (or bishopric) thereof," evidently inferring the identity of the office of bishop and elder. Clements Romanus in his epistle to the church in Corinth, sometimes mentions several bishops in that church which is either false or means elders or presbyters. Epistle ad Corinth, p. 73 and 58. In the light of this evidence, who but a sectarian devotee can question the identity of the office of bishop and elder? And who then will presume to put asunder what God hath joined together? Who will require one who has been ordained an elder in the church, to be re-ordained when elected a pastor or a bishop, emphatically so called? As to deacons, we have an account of their office and appropriate duties in Acts vi. 2-6. The office is financial. Their appropriate business is to serve tables—the Lord's table and the tables of the poor. "They dispensed to them," says Origen, "the church's money." Comment in Mat. Jour. 16, p. 443, vol. 1. "In the Lord's supper they were employed," says Justin Martyr. "in distributing the elements to the communicants." Apology, p. 67.

2. There were generally in primitive times, several bishops and elders and several deacons in each particular church. In Phil. i. 1, Paul writes to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons. There was then a plurality of bishops or elders and deacons in that church. Clements Romanus says in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, that in the apostles' churches and cities, where the Apostles preached, they ordained their first converts for bishops and deacons over those who should believe. Epis. 1, ad Corinth, p. 64. Here is also corroborative evidence of a plurality of bishops, or elders and deacons in primitive churches.

3. A bishop or elder being elected to the pastoral charge of a particular church, was at first called the angel of that church, and afterwards its bishop, emphatically so called, (7) while the name of elder by way of distinction, was then confined to those associated with him in office, and the name of deacon, still applied to financial officers. The spiritual officers in each church were called elders or presbyters, on account of their age, men somewhat advanced in age, being generally selected for this office. Names analogous are still used in reference to other officers. Some of our city officers are called aldermen or eldermen.—The name of Seigneur or Signior derived from the Latin senior, is equivalent to presbyter in Greek, and elder in English.

These church officers were also called bishops or overseers, inasmuch as they exercised the bishopric or oversight of the church. For the sake of greater efficiency one of these officers was elected to the presidency or pastoral charge of the church. (8.) This officer is called the angel (or messenger) of the church in the 2d and 3d chapters of Revelation. This name is synonymous with the name of the officer in the Jewish synagogues who presided, read, prayed, and taught in their meetings, with the assistance of elders and others. As this officer exercised a peculiar oversight or bishopric of the church of which he had the charge, he was afterwards emphatically termed the bishop of the church. Ignatius who lived in the beginning of the 2d century, applied this term to the angel or pastor, in distinction from his associate elders. In the writings of Irenaeus it is said, that "Polycarp was constituted bishop of the church in Smyrna." Irenaeus, b. 3. c. 3, p. 171. Justin Martyr says, "On Sunday all assemble together in one place, when the bishop preaches and prays." As to the use of the name bishop in application to pastors, I would remark, that every elder in the church has as much right to the title as the pastor, but for the sake of distinction it is convenient to use it, particularly in reference to him. I would have it correctly used on the same ground on which I would have the name Christian or Evangelical Christian used in application to Christians, to secure these scriptural names from abuse. The name of Christian has been abused by an anti-Christian sect that has adopted it, and though the name of bishop has been grossly misapplied to diocesan "lords over God's heritage," and the young, seeing that name in the Bible, think, till they are taught better, that it refers to such personages. Let every pastor then be called by the appropriate name of bishop, and this name will be redeemed.

As to the continuance of the office of deacon as a financial office in the primitive church, it is sufficient to say (1.) that the performance of the duties of preaching and baptism, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles was either the discharge of extraordinary functions of that office or some deacons by their "faithfulness obtained a good degree," and were subsequently ordained elders. (8.) (2.) That ecclesiastical history corroborates this sentiment.

4. The office of bishop and elder being the same, the elders being assistant bishops where there is a pastor and associate bishops where there is no pastor, they are authorized in his assistance and in his absence to perform all the duties that he is authorized to perform, and that he may temporarily authorize a deacon or even a layman to perform the duties of his office. (9.)

Remarks. In Acts xiv. 23, it is said that Paul and Barnabas "ordained them elders in every church," and in Tit. i. 5, that Paul had left Titus in Crete to "ordain elders in every city." And concerning these elders it is said in 1. Tim. v. 17, that some simply "rule" while others also "labored in word and doctrine." Yet all were ordained to one office. There was no disparity between them in reference to office. But one elder having simply the gift of ruling, contented him-

self with the exercise of that gift, while another possessing also the gift of teaching, though no higher in office than the one who simply ruled, assisted the angel of the church when he was present and officiated in his place when he was absent, in the exercise of that gift also. The angel or bishop of a church presided in the congregations and generally led the exercises. He could however, at any time, apply to the assistant bishops or elders, to deacons or even laymen, to act in his place. For evidence we appeal to ecclesiastical history. Tertullian says, "The bishop has the right of baptizing, then the presbyters (or elders) and deacons, but yet for the honor of the church, not without the authority of the bishop. De Baptism, p. 602. Ignatius also says, in reference to the Lord's supper, that it "was not lawful for any one to administer it without the permission of the bishop, implying that with his permission any one could." In reference to preaching it is said that "the bishop commanded Origen (a deacon) to preach." *Homil. de Engastris*, p. 28, v. 1. (10) In reference to the right of ordination Firmilian says, that "all power and grace are constituted in the church where seniors preside, who have the power of baptizing, of laying on of hands and ordaining." *Apud*, Cyprian, *Epist.* 75, S. 6, p. 337. (11) Bishops and elders presided together, and both (perhaps sometimes together with deacons and even laymen) laid on hands in ordination. Thus Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, (i. e.) by the laying on of the hands of the bishops and elders of the church in which he was ordained, who constituted a scriptural presbytery or eldership. 1 Tim. iv. 14. If any bishops or elders from abroad were present, they were doubtless invited to take part. In the absence of the bishop, the elders performed his duties. Thus Cyprian, bishop of the church in Carthage, when exiled from the church, writes a letter to the elders exhorting them to discharge their own and his office, besides, that thus nothing might be wanting either in discipline or diligence." *Epist.* 6, s. 1, p. 16. There is great beauty in this primitive liberty. It is proper that a bishop should have the special charge of the church, of which he has the oversight as president or pastor. But it is wrong for him to bear the whole burden of the church alone. Elders in modern churches are often nearly as useless as the elders of the field. But if they could share the pastoral duties as his associate bishops, they would often be capable of doing great good in laboring with him in word and doctrine, as well as in ruling. They might act in a sphere similar to that of local preachers in the Methodist connection, and supply the bishop's lack of service in destitute places. This is one secret of the rapid increase of the Methodist church. And it is one secret of the more rapid growth of the primitive churches. All were, under the superintendency of the bishops, and in some circumstances, without his authority, to put their shoulders to the wheel of the car of salvation and preach the gospel and perform all other duties of a bishop.

5. A scriptural evangelist was an ordained elder, sent out by a particular church to preach the gospel without any pastoral charge.

6. Resolved, That in primitive times bishops or elders and deacons were generally elected by each particular church that they were ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or eldership of the church by which they were elected with bishops or elders from the churches, who might be present, and perhaps deacons and laymen, that modern licensees to preach the gospel without ordination was unknown, (12) though laymen could at the request of an ordained person perform his duties, (13) and that after ordination bishops or elders either remained in that church as assistant or superintendent elders or bishops, or removed their relation to some other church, or served the church general as evangelists.

Remarks. 1. Bishops or elders and deacons were elected by each particular church. In choosing a successor to Judas, the multitude of disciples selected two, upon whom lots were to be cast. When deacons, also, were to be ordained, the "whole multitude," of the brethren it is said, elected them. Acts vi. 5. 2d. Church officers when elected by any particular church were ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or eldership. In Acts xiv. 23, Paul and Barnabas are said to have ordained elders in every church. In Acts xiii. 1-3, it is uncertain whether only the officers or the whole church with them, laid hands on Barnabas and Paul when they were ordained. "All power and grace" says Firmilian, "are constituted in the church where seniors preside, who have the power of baptizing, of laying on of hands and ordaining." *Apud* Cyprian, *epistle* 75, s. 6, p. 337. 3d. After ordination, bishops or elders either remained, &c.—or served the church general as evangelists. On the former clause of this proposition I need not remark. In proof of the latter clause it is said in Acts xiii. 4, that Paul and Barnabas after their ordination, were sent forth to preach as evangelists. Origen, as we are informed by Eusebius, became a presbyter or elder in the church of Alexandria, though ordained in Palestine. Eusebius, lib. 6, c. 8, p. 209.

6. Resolved, That a primitive presbytery was composed of the bishops or elders of a particular church; that this presbytery was the official council of each church; that probably its deacons and bishops or elders from abroad, but as deliberative members of this council; that this council constituted the bench of judges or the court of each church, whose business it was to oversee the affairs of the church; and prepare business for its consideration in church councils; that the whole church constituted the jury, whose prerogative it was to try its official as well as private members, and transact all other appropriate business of the church, and that from its decisions there was properly no appeal, except to the confidence of other churches.

Remarks. Upon this resolution but a few remarks are necessary. 1. We read of no other presbytery except that constituted by the bishops or elders of a particular church. In the 16th chapter of Acts it is said, that when a delegation from the church at Antioch came to Jerusalem to consult with the church there on an important matter, the apostles and elders came together to consider of this matter, (doubtless in a presbyterial council or presbytery.) After considering and preparing the matter for the consideration of the church, it was brought before the whole body and by them decided. And then it is said that it pleased the apostles and elders with the whole church to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas. This is the first account that we have of an Evangelical Christian Presbytery. As the members of a church were generally engaged in secular business, it was proper that there should be a committee to consider and prepare business for the action of the people. Such a committee was the presbytery or eldership of each church. Hence Cyprian says, that Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius and some others that had joined in the schism of Novatian, came into the presbytery and desired the churches peace; the presbytery accepted their submission and proposed it to the whole church, who readily embraced it. *Epistle* 46, s. 2, 3, p. 104, 105. The accused says he was "to plead their cause before the presbytery and all the people." *Epistle* 10, s. 4, p. 30. He also says that "whoever was excommunicated, was excommunicated by the divine suffrages of the people." *Epistle* ad plebem, s. 1, p. 92. Thus the presbyterial court, (of which the bishop or pastor was the pres-

ident judge) with the church as a jury, considered and decided every cause.

7. Resolved, That to restore primitive evangelical Christian union, each particular church in accordance with scriptural and primitive principles, acknowledge God as the only Lord of the conscience, his word as its only rule, Evangelical Christians as its only name, and credit evidence of evangelical Christianity as its only test of membership.

The Convention, to avoid splitting on the point on which the misnamed Christians, Unionists, &c. have split, should define evangelical Christianity and admit only such to the Convention. I hope you will not fellowship Universalists, Unitarians and Campbellites, nor drunkards, sabbath breakers, and slave holders, as Christians. I hope a reporter will be present in the Convention, to take copious notes of the speeches, &c., for publication, that those necessarily absent may share the benefit of them.

Yours affectionately,

LEWIS C. LOCKWOOD.

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

[1] In order to "liberty of conscience and of opinion in essentials" it will be requisite that all ecclesiastical usurpations done away, and this can only be done by restoring the usages of New Testament institutions, including Christian union and local church independence, of course. So that a difference between Christians in respect to "church government" will appear in the very process of providing for "a mutual liberty of conscience," since nothing like Presbyterianism or Episcopacy can then remain.

[2] The "liberty to each church to govern itself according to the pleasure of a majority of its members," (i. e., in obedience to Christ's rules,) is a liberty that cannot be retained, untrampled, in the presence of any ecclesiastical arrangements, however guarded, by which, with any visible bonds of organized action, "particular churches could come into a general ecclesiastical union." No fact on the page of ecclesiastical history can more fully establish than that—no system in morals can more demonstrably justify the abolition of the church or communions—just these local churches, independent, of each other, compromised, given up—sacrificed! Look at the so-called, mis-called, Congregational churches of New England, whose almost invisible, but well nigh absolute hierarchy, are glad to escape into the more tangible meshes of a "catholic" and less-dreaded Episcopacy or Presbyterianism. If that liberty had had a home in such arrangements, could the Methodist and other Episcopacies have found favor in New England? Or could the Yankee pulpit have been bolted against the preaching of human rights? No, never! The intercourse of such churches, and of Christians in different places with each other, should be free, untrammelled, uncontrolled. It is promoted, but crippled and perverted, by man-made contrivances not to be found in the New Testament, such as associations, associations, conferences, Presbyteries, and synods. They are powerless for good, and become efficient only for evil.

[3] The "faith once delivered to the saints" is best "corrected" and as occasion requires, in those churches where the Christian character alone is the test of church membership; as Christian liberty and free speech are preserved, and when original and independent thought, inquiry, and communion are not prohibited, forestalled, and allowed by the authoritative decisions of a sectarian creed, framed by fallible men.

[4] All that is valuable in metaphysical inquiry is better fed in free churches, where progression is in order, than in those where all theological improvement is proscribed by sectarianism. What room would there have been for the metaphysical investigations of Edwards, Hopkins, and Emerson, if they had not been the liberty to think for themselves, in spite of their denominational creeds? And why should not all Christians be encouraged to take the same means for growing in knowledge as those which have been claimed and improved?

[5] It will be agreed, that the Synagogue Convention did undertake the task, either of framing a scheme of ecclesiastical connection between the local churches, (which never ought to be done by us, body,) or to present a formula for the churches to organize upon, a work which each church should be encouraged to dispose of themselves, with the Bible for its sole guide.

The "early writers," or Christian Fathers, as they are sometimes called, are good witnesses as to the facts of their times and the usages and opinions that then prevailed. And these sometimes throw light on the usages of the apostolic church. But it is by no means to be taken for granted that all their usages and views of church order were apostolical; far others. The "mystery of iniquity," we know, began to work on Paul's day, and some of the worst errors of Romanism to be found in the "Christian Fathers" of the second century. "Spiritual despotism," even then, was in process of rank growth. Episcopalian writers themselves have abundantly testified, that some of the bishops were becoming arrogant at a very day. Whatever of prerogative or of privilege was then due to the inferior officers or body of the church, we may confidently and safely infer, had been transmitted to these apostolical times. But it is far from being so clear that claims of the bishops, then contended to them, were derived from the same pure original. The reverse of this must be maintained, or we must consent to take the route of Dr. Pusey in Romanism.

[6] That "deacons, and even laymen," were in the past preaching and baptizing, there can be no doubt. But the "originality" done by special leave and assistance of a ruling bishop, is not quite so clear.

[7] "Afterwards" The gradual rise of the clerical class are manifest. [8] "For the sake of greater efficiency"

innovations of the growing hierarchy were introduced; but "the end" did not "sanctify the means."

[8] There is yet another solution of the supposed difficulty. The doctrine, like the lay brethren, might have preached, without any official authority or special ordination. The disciples "went everywhere teaching the word." And if in the second century they could baptize and administer the supper with the special leave of the bishops, very possibly a hundred years before they might have done so without thinking to ask leave.

[9] [10] If Tertullian and Irenaeus understood the ecclesiastical facts of their times, it is evident that clerical usurpation, in their day, had not succeeded in wholly putting a stop to the primitive practices of lay preaching and administering the ordinances. They permitted unordained persons to do these things occasionally; but then it must be with their special consent. Very much as our "associations" of ministers "license" persons to preach who are not "ordained," only that the modern license is stated, rather than occasional.

Suppose a modern pastor of a church, about to travel for a month or two, should designate some one of the "lay elders," or deacons, or private members of the church, to discharge the duties of his office in his absence—to supply the pulpit—to baptize—to administer the supper—what a tempest of pious horror at the dissolution would be witnessed? What? Laymen preaching and baptizing? We call ourselves Protestants. We marvel at the ignorance of the Catholic priesthood. Yet at this vital point of the practical controversy we take sides with the Romanists—nay, we start back with alarm at the remaining Christian democracy of the very "Fathers" of the clergy!

[11] "All grace and power are constituted in the church," (i. e., the Christian brotherhood);—another remnant of the apostolical doctrine. And if in the brotherhood, then not in the bishop, except through them.

[12] Can anyone espouse the distinction between being licensed to preach and ordained to preach?

[13] Why not at the request of the church—the "brotherhood"—"store" all power and grace are constituted" in them?

Other reflections and inquiries naturally arise; but we must not enlarge.

Mr. Lockwood has done the cause of Christian investigation a good service by introducing these topics, and giving a specimen of the silent testimonies concerning them. His own views, for the most part, we cannot but regard as encouraging approximations, at least, towards that ground of Christian liberty which the churches are destined to occupy.

FROM S. M. BOOTH.

Anti-Slavery Agent in Connecticut.

Meriden, Dec. 16, 1843.

Bro. Goodell—Being unable to attend the Syracuse Convention, I cannot forbear writing a word, to express my sympathy with those who have called this Christian Convention. I feel anxious that the spirit of wisdom should guide you all in your deliberations, and that love and truthful harmony, should characterize this meeting. What a sublime spectacle, to see a body of Christians met to lay aside the unessentials of Christianity,—no, I will not say Christianity; but the many-colored badges which have disfigured the seamless robe of Christ, and separated the Christian world into opposing sects—and with the word of God for their guide, and imploring His Spirit to lead them into the truth, planting themselves upon the fundamentals of Christianity, manfully to inquire what is the law of Christ's house, and what the scriptural form of church organization, by the observance of which, all Christians may "come into the unity of the faith," grow up into Him in all things, who is "the Head" of the church, and attain "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ!" Will the members of this Convention have faith enough in God and in His truth, to receive His word as the rule of church organization, recognize the divine teachings with respect to the common brotherhood, universal equality, and inalienable rights of men, and to reject the traditions and commandments of a corrupt Christianity? I trust they will. I look upon this Convention as the most important meeting that has been held for years, and if its action shall be right, I am confident that the results will be great and glorious to the cause of pure Christianity. My heart is with you in this work of church reformation. Nor do those only who sympathize with you in your views of church organization, look with solicitude to the action of this Convention. The organized Christianity of the land regards this movement with deep interest. There are many in the church, who feel that there is a radical defect somewhere, and are looking and praying for light from on high to break in upon them. Such will hail with joy any movement that will tend to throw off the dead formalism and sectarian Shibboleths of the church, unite all true Christians on the broad platform of Christianity, and

exalt the spiritual and practical, above the speculations and abstractions of religion. There are not a few in Connecticut, who feel interested in the questions which have been discussed in the Christian Investigator. But the power of the clergy, always great, (and nowhere greater than in Connecticut) is exerted to prevent the discussion of such questions as have been examined in the Investigator. I know not a single clergyman in the state who would subscribe to your views on church organization, and the proper tests of church-fellowship, or who would respond to the call for the Christian Convention at Syracuse.—There may be such, but I know of none. But there are many laymen in the state, who heartily approve of the objects of this Convention, and would gladly attend were it in their power to do so. The light is spreading, and many are inquiring if it is not their duty to withdraw from pro-slavery churches. They are waiting to see if the churches and ministers will not act against slavery, so that they can conscientiously remain in their present church connection. Meanwhile, many are looking beyond the outward manifestation of unsoundness, to the root of the disease, and asking if a more radical reformation is not needed.

I hope something will be done at this Convention, to place the Christian Investigator on a permanent foundation. Its continuance, especially at the present crisis, is of vital importance to the cause of anti-slavery and religion. I will cheerfully contribute my mite for that object.

The mass of abolitionists are not yet half converted. We need free, full, thorough, adial discussion of the wide range of topics connected with the anti-slavery cause, and of the relations which Christian abolitionists sustain to the slave and to the church. Your paper has done immense good. The facts it has disseminated respecting the pro-slavery position and action of the leading religious denominations of our country, ought to make the ears of this country to tingle.

Do not be discouraged; dear brother, in your work. Though the powers of earth and hell are arrayed against the truth, yet more are they that are for us, than they that are against us.

Praying that the great Head of the church may preside over the Convention; and that each of its members may be guided by that wisdom which is profitable to direct,

I am, dear sir, your brother in the bonds of Christ's gospel,

S. M. BOOTH.

Other letters of much interest will be given in our next number.

[From the Emancipator & Free American.]

TRIAL OF ARTHUR O'NEILL.

The subject of this prosecution, in whose person and history I became much interested while in England, is one of a large number of persons, of various professions and qualifications, who are now powerfully agitating the public mind by their eloquent and uncompromising advocacy of various measures of reform. It is impossible society should ever come to a state of rest under existing evils, so long as it is wrought upon by such numerous and potent influences. The supporters of old abuses are aware of this, and are therefore watching for every opportunity to weaken their influence, to tarnish their reputation, or make the subject of legal prosecution and imprisonment.—The infatuation of those whom providence is preparing for overthrow, often appears in the measures by which the aristocracy aim to crush the rising spirit of liberty among the working classes. Nothing can be more preposterous than the expectation of allaying the popular desire for liberty, by fresh acts of oppression. King John and king Charles, and king James tried that experiment out, and their successors should profit by their example.

Arthur O'Neill, I believe, is a Scotchman by birth, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, though now ranks only as a journeyman mechanic. My impression is, that he betook himself to a trade voluntarily, out of pure benevolence, for the purpose of identifying himself entirely with the working classes, to whose improvement and elevation he had devoted

his life. In so doing, he has assumed also their condition, of poverty and privation, and cheerfully shares their scanty subsistence of oatmeal and water. Altho' he is still a young man, over four or five and twenty, his disinterestedness, energy and consistency, have given him a wide influence among those whose cause he has espoused, which influence he faithfully employs in leading them to such causes as promote their best and most permanent good. Being a Chartist in principle, he regretted that the first movements of that body, in demanding a written Constitution for the kingdom, were so much identified with men of Anti-Christian sentiments, and he set himself to counteract the tendency of things towards a perversion of the spirit of liberty into a systematic rejection of the Gospel. The efforts of O'Neill and a few other decided Christians have been entirely successful, so that now the current of opinion among the operatives in the large towns is quite favorable to religion, and the influence of the Owenites is rapidly declining. He and his countrymen became so much grieved and embarrassed at the treatment pursued towards them by the ministers and churches in Glasgow and other large towns, that they deemed it their duty to organize new churches, under the laws of Jesus Christ; and there are now forty or fifty churches of this description, some of them containing four or five hundred members in regular standing. These churches are formed on the most liberal basis, their covenant declaring that "all who believe in the atonement through Christ, and who evidence their faith by following the example and obeying the precepts of the Savior," are eligible as members. Candidates for admission are kept in classes three months, that perfect satisfaction may be gained of their fitness. They reject a paid ministry, have a plurality of ministers to each church, and hold numerous meeting places, besides their principal chapels. Among the pastors of the church at Birmingham, are several Arminians, Calvinists, Baptists, Pedobaptists, but no dissension or discord. They preach much in the open air. The preachers and others lecture much during the week on science, politics, &c. Their discipline is fraternal but strict. Since these Christian efforts commenced, about three years ago, the halls of the Socialists have become almost deserted, and some of them have been let for other purposes. The working classes have found that Christianity, when preached by men from among themselves, was not what they had taken it to be, when preached through a state-paid hierarchy. There are among them many talented preachers, orators and poets, but as they have not thought it wise to expend much of their scanty resources upon the press, very little is known of them by the public. Their fundamental political doctrine burys its Scotch origin. It is, that Christianity is the law of the world, and hence, that no Government is entitled to their allegiance which is not essentially Christian in its principles. The seditious words for which he was recently tried, were an application of this principle to the existing British Government. The words were spoken at a meeting of colliers who had struck for higher wages, on the 26th of August 1842. He was indicted immediately, but the indictment was continued by the Government, for the purpose of removing the trial to the adjoining county of Stafford, and bringing it before a special jury, as even here they did not dare to trust the common jury of the county. The special jury was selected by the Sheriff, and was composed chiefly of land-holders and their dependants.—While he was at Stafford, last fall, he held meetings every evening; and I was told at Birmingham that he would do the same again the following week, when his trial was to come on, and would continue it until the sentence of imprisonment, which he expected, and was calmly prepared for, should be put in execution. The trial came on August 12, and we published the report as given in the London papers:—

TRIAL OF MR. O'NEILL.—This case came on in the Crown court, Stafford, on Friday, before Mr. Justice Williams. The indictment charged the defendant with uttering certain seditious words to a large public meeting of workmen, at Rowley Regis, on the 26th of August, intending to bring the laws and constitution, and the house of commons into contempt, to obstruct the collection, in due course of law, of the revenue, to induce the subjects of this realm to refuse and resist the payment of taxes, and to persuade large bodies of workmen in the coal and iron trade, unlawfully to conspire and combine for the purpose of obtaining an increase of their wages, by abstaining from work, and to cause them to hold unlawful assemblies, to make disturbances, break the public peace, and resist the execution of the laws. Mr. Sergeant Talfourd stated

the case at great length, and detailed a great part of the evidence. He adverted to a handbill, a number of copies of which had been found upon Mr. O'Neill, at the time of his apprehension, in the afternoon of the day of meeting of the 28th of August, which was signed "Arthur O'Neill, Secretary," and purported to be an address from the Christian Charitable church, in which it was stated that the ruling power had taken away the last privileges of the people, (by the proclamation against public assemblies) and had no right to their allegiance; following which, in large letters, was a resolution not to obey the Government, by serving it in any capacity, and by refusing to pay all taxes. The following is a portion of the evidence of Mr. Dransfield, in the employ of the British Iron Company, in reference to a meeting of colliers, at which O'Neill was present:

"When I got to the place, the defendant was addressing the people. I heard distinctly what he said: and within an hour after the meeting I made a note of what I had heard, which was then perfectly fresh in my recollection. [The witness here produced his notes, and stated from it the following as an abstract of the defendant's speech:] 'Is this a time when trade is reviving, for masters to reduce their wages? I consider the governed as in one large room with an air pump. When the pump is first applied the inconvenience is not generally felt. At last, one near the window feels the want of air. He goes to the window and finds there a Duke of Wellington, with his great sword drawn to prevent him from opening it. He goes to another, and finds an Arch Bishop of Canterbury, who keeps out the air with his surplice. He goes to another, and finds a lawyer, who stops it with his wig. The whole system is corrupt. The House of Commons is rotten, and what does it care for the misery of the people?—Sir Robert Peel is a man of most callous heart, and he, with the Duke of Wellington, for the purpose of butchering the poor Chinese and Indians, must levy an income tax. Is this tax paid by the workmen? Not directly. It is put on the masters. But in this neighborhood there are 76,000 workmen and the masters having to pay seven pence in the pound for income tax, take off sixpence a day from their workmen's wages, so that they make a good profit of it. I call upon this meeting to stand out still longer. I am sure you can do it for six weeks. The price of iron is rising; the iron-masters cannot do without coal, and if you remain out, the masters will come to. The colliers are nearly all out. In South Wales, they, as well as the iron-men, have struck. In Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire, they are out. I have the pleasure to tell you that next week, they will be out in Derbyshire, where I have been endeavoring to effect this. Only yesterday I had a deputation from the Moria Pits, which assured me that they would immediately strike, as would those at Clay Cross. The most important of all is, that the people have no voice in the representation of the country, and no good will happen till they have the charter. Of what is the House of Commons composed? Of lawyers; do they care for the people? Of cut-throat gentlemen—I mean the paid military; do they care for the people? Of fox-hunting gentry; do they care for the people? I have declared, and do declare, that I owe no allegiance to the Government.—It is a usurped Government. I am a Christian, and a man of peace. It is a bloody (or warlike) Government. [The witness could not say which was the word used.] I will pay no taxes in any way. I have not drunk any intoxicating liquors for two years, nor have I had any tea, or coffee, or other excisable articles for many months."

After the examination of various other witnesses, Mr. O'Neill rose to address the jury, and gave the following interesting sketch of his life:—

"He stated that he had passed a year in the Mediterranean, at Corfu and Malta, and subsequently spent three years at Glasgow University, where he passed through the usual course of study. Believing he was called of God to preach the Gospel, he entered the divinity class in that College, and while there became strongly convinced that Christianity had but little practical influence on mankind, from the indifference of its teachers, or the mass of evil in themselves, and in all human institutions, which they allowed to exist untroubled. He had done all that he had done, and uttered all of the sentiments expressed in the speech which the indictment complained of, purely and simply from strong religious conviction. This made him indifferent to any punishment which might be inflicted on him; and as he did not deny that he uttered the words spoken to by the witnesses, he would have readily pleaded guilty to the indictment, but for the malicious interpretation which would have been placed upon such a step. Having uttered them deliberately, calmly, and

with a conviction of their truth, he would joyfully support and justify them. After stating his fondness for botany and ornithology, and his acquaintance with six languages, as studies not calculated to make a man turbulent or sedition, he proceeded to give an account of his introduction to, and connection with the working men in Staffordshire.—He had come among them as a preacher of the gospel; and, believing that all human institutions were dangerous and hurtful, unless based on Christianity, he had found it necessary to denounce existing Governments (especially that of England) as founded on war, violence, and fear. A body was formed who joined in the belief he entertained; they have large churches in Scotland and several in Staffordshire. He became the initiator, and established many Sabbath and day schools among them. He naturally, therefore, became their adviser in temporal matters as well as spiritual, and when the wages were reduced and the strike took place, he was consulted by his people, and explained to them that the reduction was the consequence of the income tax. Matters of trade and commerce cannot be separated from political events, since it is the acts of Government which regulate and influence commerce. Indeed, the late deputation from the iron-masters to Sir Robert Peel, showed that it is not the lower classes alone who see the connection between the two. When he came among the Staffordshire colliers, he found them familiar with brutality and violence; he had known, during the late disturbances, several instances of intended assassination, and had the greatest difficulty to meet and overcome such intentions, by incalculating peace and love. In North Staffordshire, there had been riots and loss of life and property, but if their had been Chartists in such proceedings, they were not Christian Charitable as he was. In South Staffordshire, on the contrary, there had been no property destroyed—no life lost, except, indeed, two poor fellows drowned in attempting to escape from the soldiers. The result had been very much owing to his exertions, and yet this prosecution was the ungrateful return of those whom he had endeavored to benefit."

He then proceeded to defend his conduct in reference to the present proceedings. The first charge against him was for attending a illegal meeting in defiance of the Queen's proclamation. But this charge was subsequently abandoned, and the present charge preferred. The attempt to put down such meetings was most impolitic, for the meetings held by him since his apprehension, had been twenty times larger than they were previously. He repeated his story, as the circumstances of his apprehension, as if given him an opportunity of repeating and vindicating his principles.—He then proceeded, in a series of eloquent and eloquence, to explicate upon the condition of the country.

"Let the poor have recourse to them, the birthright of their race, of which Parliament had robbed them, and alienation would cease. An amicable union would spring between the rich and the poor, and would daily widening, and would rid the middle and lower classes from all the Government by whom they were oppressed. We will no longer support you if you will be a Government, grant yourselves no more longer any more taxes. It had been said that the meeting at the 28th of August was calculated to excite riot and alarm. Well might it be said! The blood had been shed before.—Patriotic men would ultimately rule the world, and political systems would only be supported by public meetings. This was a glorious age in our history. His heart thrilled with joy when he thought of the universal shaking of man's position every subject. The people had no longer to have respect for all institutions which they used to have. Scotland had declared that she would no longer support the Government. Wales was now speaking; did they think he should not have spoken Ireland had spoken; did they imagine that he should not bear the voice of his country within the walls of the Court? But now he would not keep his tongue silent. The principles of Christianity and common sense were becoming widely spread. Violence was no longer rational; sedition, young men's enemies, was being taught which would engage the hearts and affections of the people. (Here the defendant read in a remarkable manner several verses from Birmingham, highly laudatory of his country.) Much was the result of your proceedings in the expectation of the national principles. He had called the Government a despotic Government, and he believed that the people, according to the ancient Constitution of England, were and ought to be a branch of the Government; but, by the act of Henry VI., the franchise was taken

ed, and the people were excluded from their share in the Government, till at length those who professed to represent the people had no connection with them.—Instead of coming in by the door of the constitution, like thieves and robbers they had come over the wall, by force. The House of Commons, instead of representing the people, only represented itself. The House of Commons represented bricks and mortar, cloth, iron, ships, sugar—not hearts, minds, intelligence—a short, not the people. Such a Government could not be other than usurped. He was charged with bringing the House of Commons into contempt, but that was quite unnecessary—they had brought themselves into contempt."

Now reads the conclusion of his speech, which lasted eight hours, heard various letters and memorials in his favor, from Birmingham and its neighborhood, especially one from Joseph Sturge, which was strongly in his praise. The Court was then adjourned. On Saturday, Mr. O'Neill called the Rev. Mr. Davis, Baptist minister at Cradley, and another person, as witnesses, but both refusing to take the oath, their evidence was not taken. The Rev. W. Stokes, of West Bromwich, then gave evidence in favor of the character of Mr. O'Neill. This being the case for the defense.

Mr. Sergeant Talfourd, addressed the jury in a speech of great length, in which he contended that the principal enormity of the defendant consisted in his having made an enthusiastic religious profession the cloak to his political machinations.

Mr. Justice Williams summed up at considerable length, and the jury having consulted for not more than two minutes, returned a verdict of Guilty.

The defendant, upon being asked what he had to urge against judgment, said that he had many and weighty reasons to urge:

"If," continued he, "you value your own cause, and do not desire that my principles should spread, there is no more certain means of so doing than by my imprisonment, by which I shall obtain greater influence than I now possess. Moreover, I am not desirous of leaving all the institutions with which I am connected in Staffordshire—the schools I have formed and taught, the congregations I have preached to, the sick I have visited. Nor do I wish to leave the excited population of Staffordshire without the control I have hitherto been able to exercise over them. But for myself I have not the slightest objection to imprisonment. I shall in jail have a better opportunity of studying the scriptures diligently, and learning from the sage and learned men the principles and will I have ever struggled against."

He was then committed to imprisonment for twelve calendar months in Stafford Jail.

The "Non-Conformist" newspaper publishes the following comments on the case:

"However, the offense with which Arthur O'Neill was charged, of which, at the Stafford assizes he had been acquitted, he was found guilty by a special jury, and for the commission of which he had been sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment, is the commission of lawfully regulated as being the laws, constitution and government of the country into contempt. There are the people who must through life without ceasing, maintain in the struggle. There is already an army of patriots, which, if you open that, might be as many as the continental armies. Government, however, in attacking subjects for prosecution in this matter, address the at high price. O'Neill keeps a constant war on the whole, he is a man of war, and with his body, some steps to attack, he—O'Neill is left at liberty to say and do what he pleases. The Times all but justify imprisonment in South Wales, and declares that imprisonment has no chance of gaining a hearing, until it has first made the appropriate outcry—and yet the Times is the same. But Arthur O'Neill denounces the war. His denunciations of the government, despite of the House of Commons, that they have no care for the people; signs a resolution which, after stating that in the opinion of the government the ruling power had taken away the just constitutional rights of the people to show for the purpose of punishing for the crime of grammar, declares—'justice is more between not only a right, but a duty.' We therefore need not be any the government by serving them in any capacity. We need not be reminded that we are not government, and we therefore need not be put any taxes.—And Arthur O'Neill is committed to Staffordshire jail for twelve months."

Now we are not about to impugn the verdict of the jury. There is little doubt that O'Neill did intend to bring the House of Commons and the government into

Christian Investigator.

MONDAY, JANUARY, 1844.

MODE OF DISTRIBUTION.

At the Syracuse Convention, it was understood that those who subscribed and paid the sums pledged on that occasion should be entitled to receive papers, to the amount of their subscription, at 50 cents per copy, for the year 1844, or until the twelve numbers of the second volume are published. We have therefore arranged our direction-books accordingly. Those who subscribed \$5 will receive 10 papers, and so in proportion—except in the case of some few who were understood not to desire it. If it is desired that the papers should be directed by us to as many different names as there are papers, we will do it, if the names and post-office address of the persons are furnished to us. The subscriber of \$5 may have the paper sent to 10 different persons in as many different states, if he pleases.

There are other persons, besides those who attended the Convention, who have paid us more than the amount of their own supply; and, if they wish, they too may receive a number of copies proportionate to their payments, or may order copies to be directed by us to such persons as they may think fit.

We have, indeed, been thinking, for some time, of sending extra copies to those who have made us extra payments, and arranging our direction-books accordingly. Perhaps we shall do so, and leave off sending to those who have either paid nothing, or are now in arrears, and of whose interest in the topics we have under discussion we have no means of judging. We do not wish to send the paper where it is not read, or where it is not likely to do good. Our friends who have manifested an interest in our labors by paying more than the price of their own paper, may be able to help us to distribute the papers to better advantage than we are now doing. If we should send them two or more copies, they could perhaps put them where they would be read with attention. And if the postage of extra copies is burdensome to them, they can perhaps find readers who will pay their own postage, and receive them direct from us, as before stated.

"THE MINISTRY"—FURTHER EXPLANATIONS.

What we have said of the right and the duty of "lay preaching," (as it is called,) together with our quotations from the learned Neander, (as cited by Prof. Schumucker,) in proof that the churches of the first century were supplied with pastors from among their own number, who continued to follow the mechanical or agricultural labors in which they had been educated—has led some to suppose that we did not approve of sustaining a *lay* preaching who should devote their entire time to the work of the ministry. Such an inference we have not made, either from the facts stated by Neander, or from our own views of the right of all Christians (having the ability) to preach the gospel, as the first Christians undoubtedly did. Nor do we entertain any such views, adverse to the support of ministers devoting their time to the work, as have been attributed to us.

On the other hand, we believe that more preachers, instead of less, than at present, should be encouraged and enabled, by the cheerful contributions of their brethren, to labor in the Christian ministry, without any other interruption than from the performance of so much manual labor as is requisite to preserve their own health of body and mind—and which no man, in any station, ought ever to neglect. The amount of this manual labor will, of course, vary according to the strength and constitution of different individuals. And no minister who understands his high calling, and remembers the example of his Divine Master, will ever shrink from the humblest of useful avocations, or think himself degraded by

performing the most menial offices of service to his fellow-men.

The minister, like Paul, should be so constituted as to be able, *as a necessity*, to "labor working with his own hands;" and the ministry will never be truly independent until this cardinal feature of primitive Christian education and ministerial accomplishment shall be restored. Never, until then, will an educated ministry be able to assimilate themselves with the mass of the laboring people, or gain a firm hold on their affections and confidence. Manual labor, on this and many other accounts, should enter, vitally, into the education of all ministers, as well as of all other Christians, and all other men.

The page of inspired prophecy does indeed speak of a time when "none shall need way to his brother, Know ye the Lord?" for all shall know him, from the least to the greatest. But that time has not yet come, and will not, until the divine mandate is obeyed—"Go ye, into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." To this work many Christian ministers must devote their whole lives; and those who *thus* "preach the gospel should live of the gospel." And not only foreign missionaries and itinerant evangelists, but many resident pastors, (in the present state of the church and of the world,) may be usefully employed in study, in public preaching, and in teaching from house to house. Those who *thus* labor among their brethren and at their request, and who "give themselves wholly to the work," must, of course, be sustained, for the "laborer is worthy of his hire," and no muzzle is to be placed upon the mouth of "the ox that treadeth out the corn." The inability of the early Christians to sustain pastors devoting their whole time to the work, does not prove that it is undesirable to do so, when the brethren have the means, and when there is more labor to be performed than can otherwise be done.

But from this it will not follow, that the persons thus sustained, and devoting their time to the work, should hold a monopoly of it, and forbid others, according to their time, opportunity, and ability, to preach. The truth is, there is need of *more* preaching than can be performed by ministers deriving their support from their lay brethren. In our own country this fact cannot be denied. It comes attested to us in the reports of our missionary and education societies, that the growth of our own population exceeds all the probable, or even possible, increase of our means of religious instruction, on the system of monopoly now in use. *What shall be done?* We answer—Sustain all the stated preachers we can, and then supply the deficiency by all the other preaching that the Christian brotherhood (in accordance with acknowledged primitive usages) can supply.

The principle we here contend for is, in some measure, involved in the appointment of "class-leaders" and "local preachers" in the Methodist Episcopal church. The "class-leaders" are commonly "laymen," yet the active duties appertaining, in other respects, to the "Pastors" (as distinguished from "Teachers") devolves mainly on them. The "local preachers," too, are commonly farmers or mechanics, (sometimes merchants or physicians,) and nearly or quite all that distinguishes them from "lay preachers" is the ordination, or license to preach, obtained from the ecclesiastical authorities of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In this way, that church provides for a great amount of preaching, as well as of pastoral labor, in addition to that which is performed by men depending on their ministerial labors for a support. In stead of this *Episcopal and artificial* arrangement, we would have the *local church*—the brotherhood—appoint a plurality of elders or pastors, according to primitive usage. Let them appoint as many as are needed, and as are qualified, either as public preachers or visiting pastors. Let one of them, if practicable, be sustained as a constant laborer, by a convenient support, or, in default of this, a support in part. But let neither the one

contempt. The process made in which he sought to accomplish this, is of little consequence, except in so far as it appears in evidence, that he attempted to introduce upon the principles of peace, the practice of temperance, and asserted the inviolability of human life, and that, owing chiefly to his influence, no violence was done during the strike, in that district of the country in which he labored. We are concerned only with the crime laid to his charge; and we confidently ask whether, looking at the proceedings of Parliament, in reference to the existing distress, or at the acts of the executive in China, Afghanistan, and Seludo, it is possible for any man, whose heart throbs with sympathy for his crushed and starving fellows, and whose mind adopts as the basis of morals, the leading principles of Christianity, to do otherwise than denounce the one as reckless and unfeeling, the other as unchristian and sanguinary. Such, then, is the dilemma to which arbitrariness has reduced us; we cannot fulfill our duties, as religious men, without involving ourselves in the meshes of the law, and exposing ourselves to the charge of Sedition.

There is a curious passage in the address of Mr. Justice Williams to the prisoner, which claims a moment's notice. It is this—"How far you can believe that the peaceful millennium which you profess to anticipate as the result of modern enlightenment, and the accomplishment of ancient prophecy, can be brought about without oceans of blood, of which you so strongly express your abhorrence, it is for you to say. No reasonable man can think that the change you deem so much to be desired, can be brought about without a fearful burst of the volcano, to which you referred yesterday, with so much apparent pleasure." Mr. O'Neil looks forward with bounding expectation to the cessation of war, and to the establishment of civil governments in harmony with "the precepts and authority of Christianity." Such an expectation Mr. Justice Williams more than hints, cannot be realized except at an immense sacrifice of human life. No sane man can hope to reach that end, except through the medium of the most violent means. Wars can never be put down—governments can never be made to harmonize with the spirit of Christianity—without a previous libation of blood, the measure of which, every reasonable man must shudder to contemplate. Ah! is it so indeed? Are our rulers, then, so wedded to war, that nothing but appalling violence can compel them to relinquish the pastime? Is oppression so sweet to them that they will not forego the exercise of it, until "oceans of blood" have flowed? Such is the legitimate inference deducible from the dictum of one of our judges. If our readers will contrast this address with the meagre report given in the daily papers, of the prisoner's able and eloquent defence of himself and of his principles, they will be in a position to determine whether the interests of truth, morality and religion, were safer in the hands of the judge, or in those of the prisoner. The first may understand law—but we think "a second possessed a far superior knowledge of the gospel. The one is on the bench, the other is in jail.

The very profound insinuation of Mr. Justice Williams, that it was impossible to look for the success of a political reformation, "without oceans of blood," therefore every man seriously laboring for such a reformation, is to be deemed a traitor and incendiary, no matter how strictly he may confine his efforts to peaceful and constitutional means, is amazingly like the arguments by which it has been customary for colonization divines and politicians to convict abolitionists of incendiariness. Because say they, "no reasonable man can think the change desired can be brought about without a fearful burst of the volcano;" therefore, it is just to convict those who aim at abolition, of a design to kindle the aforesaid volcano.

We will not extend our comments. One design of this article is, to illustrate the identity of the cause of liberty in both hemispheres. The other is, to diffuse information in this country concerning the character, and struggles, and sufferings of those who in England are seeking to enjoy the same liberty which our fathers secured by the revolution. The papers patronized by the Democratic Whigs and the Democratic Republicans of the United States, publish next to nothing of the real developments of the growing spirit of liberty in Great Britain. A third object is, to awaken the sympathies and prayers of Christian freemen in this country, for a Christian brother and exemplary minister now suffering a tedious imprisonment as a martyr to religious liberty. Let our thoughts traverse the ocean, and visit the cell of Stafford jail, where one of the noblest hearts on earth is wearing out a tedious twelve-month at the bidding of the misled advocates of oppression.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 2.
WHOLE NUMBER, 22.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., FEBRUARY, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL. ix., 23.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, \$3 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

PRINTED AT NO. 22, STATE-STREET, ROCHESTER.

The following Lecture was intended for the twelfth number of the preceding volume, and written before the Declaration of the Syracuse Convention was prepared. A portion of that Document was necessarily devoted to a very condensed abstract of the same statements. On that account we hesitated for a time, whether it would be best to go over the subject again, by printing this Lecture. But we have concluded, on a review of the Lecture, to present it, with a few omissions to prevent needless repetitions, that our readers might be better able to understand and appreciate the ground taken in the Declaration, and become more minutely acquainted with the facts involved.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

LECTURE XII. POSITION OF THE AMERICAN CHURCHES, DURING THE PRESENT ANTI-SLAVERY STRUGGLE— COMMENCING IN 1832.

We have seen that there was nothing in the current and prevailing religion of the principal Protestant sects in England and America, to prevent the rise, growth, extension, and establishment of the African slave trade, and the system of Colonial chattel slavery connected with it. Nothing to prevent the abomination from entrenching itself in the bosom of the church. Nothing to prevent church members from prosecuting the slave trade, and ministers from becoming slave holders. This, with few exceptions and slight interruptions, was the general condition of things from 1517 to 1774, a period of more than two and a half centuries.

We have seen, too, that in the subsequent period, extending from 1774 to 1832, the hopeful beginnings of an Anti-Slavery Reformation, commenced in the early part of that period, by a few faithful ministers and christians, were soon stifled and smothered by unholy compromise on the part of the leading influences and controlling authorities of the principal and rival sects, each anxious to out vie the other in the enterprise of enrolling and retaining in their communion the greatest possible aggregate of numbers, irrespective of their moral character, in the all important item of their treatment of the defenceless, the plundered, and the poor. We have witnessed the rapid and downward progress of these sects in the march of corruption, till one dead calm had settled over the whole country, over the church and over the state, and the slave power was in quiet and undisputed possession both of the one and of the other. And all this, after slavery had polluted the church for more than three hundred years.

We come now to consider another, the third

period, in the history of the churches of sectarianism, as connected with the history of slavery.

NECESSITY OF RENEWED EFFORT.—NO MOVEMENT BY THE CHURCHES.

It cannot be pretended that any thing, in any direction, had been really done or was doing, for the abolition of slavery, at the time when the present agitation was commenced. All the virtues of gradualism and procrastination had been tried and had signally failed. The legislatures of the slave states had decided against the gradualism of progressive and spontaneous emancipation, on the part of individual slave holders, declaring the presence of the emancipated incompatible with public safety, during the continued enslavement of their fellows, and prohibiting emancipation, on these grounds, except on condition of transportation, inasmuch that the previous process of manumission, had, for some years, almost entirely ceased. Equally decisive had been the action of the same authorities against the gradualism of preparation, by reviving and re-enforcing their ancient enactments against the education of slaves. Witness the revised code of Virginia in 1819. Witness, likewise, the suppression of Sabbath schools for the oral instruction of colored people, by the city authorities of Savannah, in 1818, and the still more sanguinary enactments of the Louisiana Legislature, about the same time. In this action, the members of churches participated, and the ministry and churches, northern and southern, silently acquiesced!

The Southampton Insurrection in Virginia, in 1831, one year previous to the organization of the first "modern" Anti-Slavery Society in N. England, produced, indeed, a temporary excitement. But a full discussion in the legislature of that state, resulted in the indefinite postponement or decisive defeat of all measures looking towards even a prospective abolition of slavery.—Resulted likewise, in the adoption of measures for the greater security of the slave system, and drawing the cords of oppression still tighter, than before. And still the ministry and the churches slept! Was it not high time for an agitation of the subject to be commenced? How much longer—or for whom—or for what—should the agitators have delayed? Some further ideas of the condition of the churches at this period may be gathered from the testimony of James G. Birney, who, at the commencement of this period was a slave holder, and a member of the Presbyterian Church, in Kentucky.

"Ministers and office-bearers, and members of churches are slave holders—buying and selling slaves (not as the regular slave trader) but as their convenience or interest may from time to time require. As a general rule, the itinerant preachers of the Methodist Church are not permitted to hold slaves, but there are frequent exceptions, especially of late."

"Of the slaves, 80,000 are members of the Methodist Church, 80,000 of the Baptist, and about 40,000 of other churches. These church members have no exemption from being sold by their owners as other slaves are. Instances are not rare of slave-holding members of churches selling slaves who are members of the same church with themselves. And members of churches have followed the business of slave auctioneers."—Birney, pg. 4.

"The slave states make it penal to teach the slaves to read. So also, some of them, to teach the free colored people to read. Thus a free parent may suffer the pen-

"Nothing, by the churches and ministry, most assuredly, and nothing by the civil rulers of the State. The quiet Quaker, Benjamin Lundy, at Baltimore, was sending forth, punctually, his periodical sheet, sufficiently free from the dogmatism of specific measures or the rashness of precipitate immediatism. But did the churches and ministry second his endeavors? Nobody pretends it!"

alty for teaching his own children to read even the Scriptures. None of the slave holding churches, or religious bodies, so far as is known, have, at any time, remonstrated with the legislature against this iniquitous legislation, or petitioned for its repeal or modification. Nor have they reprov'd or questioned such of their members as, being also members of the legislature, sanctioned such legislation by their votes."—Ib. pg. 6.

"There is no systematic instruction of the slave members of churches, either orally, or in any other way. Uniting with a church makes no change in the condition of the slaves at home. They are thrown back, just as before, among their old associates, and subjected to their corrupting influences. But little pains is taken to secure their attendance at public worship, on Sundays. The house servants are rarely present at family worship, the field hands, never."—Ib. pg. 6.

"The negro pew is almost as rigidly kept up in the free states as in the slave."—Ib. pg. 7.

"In some of the other slave states, as Virginia and South Carolina, churches in their corporate character, hire slaves, who are generally hired out, for the support of the minister. The following is taken from the *Charles-on Courier* of Feb. 12, 1835.

FIELD RECORDS BY THOMAS GARDEN.

On Tuesday, the 17th inst., will be sold, at the North of the Exchange, at ten o'clock, a prime gang of ten NEGROES, accustomed to the culture of cotton and provisions, belonging to the INDEPENDENT CHURCH, in *Christ Church Parish*. * * * Feb. 6.

Nor are instances wanting, in which negroes are bequeathed for the benefit of the Indians," [i. e. for the support of Missions among them!—Ed.] Birney, pg. 7.

To the same general points we might cite the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, and the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, attesting the essential heathenism of the slave population, the necessary perpetuity of this, so long as the slave system continues, the active participation of church members in the domestic slave trade, and the utter impracticability of checking the practice by church discipline! And with these churches the Northern churches and ministry were on terms of intimate fellowship and communion without uttering a word of admonition or reproof—without appearing to suspect the impropriety of sustaining, by the votes of their own members, at the ballot box, the trainers of this iniquity by a law, and conferring the highest offices in the nation upon the owners and breeders of slaves, for the domestic slave traffic! Half a century had elapsed since a skeptical statesman, himself a slave holder, had "trembled for his country, when he reflected that God was just—that his justice could not sleep forever." But the churches and ministry still slept! A fatal compromise had stupefied them. Was it not high time that the voice of alarm should be uttered from some quarter? And whom should God employ, when his own plighted watchmen were sleeping, in the hour of peril, at their posts? Would not the warning voice, from whence soever it came, have been gratefully welcomed by the Northern churches and ministry, had they been in a healthy state? However rough, uncouth, or chiding might have been the tones of alarm, at such a crisis, were they not to be gratefully welcomed? If church and ministry are to preach repentance, shall they be angered and swollen when called upon, under circumstances like these, to repent?

WHY THE ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT WAS NOT WELCOMED BY THE CHURCHES, / ND MINISTRY, AT THE NORTH. A FALSE REASON.

Let it not be said that the hostile attitude of the pioneers of this effort, in relation to the churches or the ministry, prevented their testimony from being respectfully heard and received. Let it not be said that their heresies in regard to Chris-

* See Lecture X. for November
1 See Lecture XI. for December.

tion doctrines, or christian institutions, church ministry, bible, or Sabbath, stood in the way of their influence upon christian ministers and churches, at the commencement of this agitation, and prevented the co-operation of the orthodox and the devout. Such representations are utterly untrue, and without the slightest shadow of foundation.

The first FOUR YEARS of the present struggle, viz: 1832, 3, 4, and 5, to say nothing of the preliminary movements of 1831—passed away without a single occurrence that could be tortured into a resemblance of any thing of the kind. During that whole time no complaint or allegation of any error in that direction, was made in respect to any of the prominent abolitionists. They were charged, to be sure, with being "incendiaries, and cut throats," because they preached the duty of immediate emancipation! They were charged with promulgating the "Jacobinism of the first French Revolution" for teaching the "natural equality and inalienable rights of man." They were stigmatized as "infidels" for teaching "the inherent sinfulness of slave holding" and denying that the Bible sanctioned the practice. Of other heresies, or disorganizing sentiments than these and the like of them, they were not charged, until 1836, and the literature of opposition to abolitionists, (periodical, or otherwise) previous to that year, may be confidently challenged for a specimen of any such charge. What then, prevented the churches and ministry, during that time, from espousing the cause of abolition? Even the same that prevents them, now—an unwillingness to REPENT of the sin of upholding slavery—a consequent unwillingness to admit that slave holding, is, in itself, sinful—an unwillingness to hazard the loss of members who apologize for, or sustain slave holding, by assuming such a position, and conforming the discipline of the church to that principle—an unwillingness to renounce religious fellowship even with slave holders,† whom the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1794 declared to be "man-stealers" and guilty of "the highest kind of theft!" Why then attempt to cover up or shift the true issue, by raising a clamor because a few of the early abolitionists, after a four years struggle with a ministry and church of such a stamp, have, in an evil hour been provoked to renounce the church and ministry altogether?

The stern and settled opposition of the leading clergy of the prominent sects, not only to the doctrines of immediate and unconditional emancipation, and the sinfulness of chattel slavery, but to all public agitation of the subject, for four full years before any prominent abolitionists renounced the institutions of church and ministry, is a FIXED HISTORICAL FACT, as susceptible of proof and as indisputable as any fact on the records of the present age. Equally indisputable is the fact that during that same time, abolitionists were subjected to a relentless persecution of which the first and the principal instigators were the clerical

leaders and favorite journalists of the same prominent religious sects.

The publication of the Liberator was commenced in Boston in 1831. Its Editor, Mr. Garrison had been educated among the orthodox Baptists and earnestly adopted their general views, excepting, perhaps, their exclusiveness. His attachment to evangelical doctrines was well known.—His veneration for the Puritan fathers of New England was perhaps excessive—certainly uncommon, for a young man, as he was, at that time—his confidence in the leading orthodox ministers of New England was almost unbounded. From them his ardent and confiding mind anticipated with unwavering assurance all the assistance and co-operation he needed, in the arduous work he had undertaken. He looked up to them for counsel as well as for aid. Not a few of them did he call upon, and consult, before he put his hand systematically, to the warfare. All this we happened to be in a position to know, at the time, and to know too, that if fair promises and professions were any thing worth, both Garrison and Lundy were warranted to expect the hearty co-operation of at least some of them. How those promises and professions have been regarded, events have revealed! The moment the flag of "immediate and unconditional emancipation" was distinctly unfurled, and the doctrines and language of Wesley, Hopkins, and Edwards, earnestly revived that moment the leading clergy of New England took the alarm, well knowing, as it would seem, that such doctrines would "drive the plow share of division" through their favorite sects.

Mr. Garrison's admiration of Dr. Beecher, the champion of Congregational and Presbyterian orthodoxy, in its contest with Dr. Channing and the Unitarians, drew forth one of the most popular productions of his youthful pen, and led him to leave, for a time, his Baptist meeting, to attend the Doctor's preaching at Hanover street Church. This was as early as 1829, before he left Boston to join Lundy at Baltimore. The Liberator was not commenced till after his return. And up to the beginning of 1836 no adversary of Garrison detected any flaw in his theological or ecclesiastical views, except on the subject of slavery, and of human rights.

Among the early pioneers of abolition, Arthur Tappan was scarcely less prominent before the public than William Lloyd Garrison. And who was Arthur Tappan? An elder in the Presbyterian Church. The munificent patron of the American Board of Foreign Missions, at a time when the missionary cause had to encounter prophane ridicule as the cause of the oppressed afterwards did. Up to the hour that Arthur Tappan espoused the cause of the enslaved, no layman in the American churches was more universally honored by the ministry than he—none more cherished. From that hour forward, none more abused! But to the present day, no man has ever heard his strict orthodoxy impeached. His regard for the Bible, the Sabbath, the Ministry, the Church, have never yet been called in question. The name of his brother Lewis Tappan, deserves similar mention, and the clerical persecution he has suffered is well known.

And who ever doubted the orthodoxy of Dr. Emmons, the very patriarch of Puritan orthodoxy in its strictest form, and one of the earliest clerical pioneers of "modern abolition?" And what was there in the theological or ecclesiastical position of William Jay, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, that could excite clerical fears? Who ever suspected him of disorganizing views? To which of the platforms of evangelical Association, the Bible, the Tract, or the Missionary Society, was he not a welcomed, a solicited, a coveted visitant, co-adjutor and patron? It would be easy to swell the list of such names. The Anti-Slave-

ry Editors, be it Lundy and Garrison, who they, that they should excite clerical alarm? Next after the Liberator, appeared the New York Emancipator, in the spring of 1835, under the auspices of the Tappans. Its five Editors were Rev. Charles W. Denio, orthodox Baptist, Wm. Goodell, Elizar Wright, Rev. Amos A. Phelps and Rev. Joshua L. orthodox Congregationalists, all of them, New England School, believers in church estry and Sabbath. Of the early lecturers great majority were of similar views. J. Buffum, a Quaker, and Rev. Samuel J. May (a Unitarian) furnish the only instances that come to us of lecturers that were not of the "orthodox" sects. And even these would have been welcomed into all orthodox pulpits, had they placed their feet on the Colonization cause. Church, Sabbath, ministry, so far as we know, have never been assailed by either of them.* James G. Birney, I should have sooner mentioned, the Kentucky hyetian, orthodox and orderly enough, in good fellowship with northern churches, remained a Colonizationist and a slave holder charged with no heresy, now, nor disorganizing movement, except the emancipation of his and the sacrifice of nearly all his property cause of the perishing. Of Gerrit Smith, we might speak, before he was guilty of the of Christian Union, as taught by Prof. Selzer, (to the edification of the Doctors at Andover)—before he profanely emulated the Puritan primitive New England habit of preaching politics on the Sabbath. Our clergy could prize with the "Plans of Gerrit Smith of Persepolis" so long as they could keep him in their Colonization Society—and had he like Rev. Dr. St. Rev. R. R. Curley, Mr. Finley (a Unitarian) and other Colonization Agents, and orators sent to preach Colonization politics, for the benefit of the immaculate HENRY CLAY, on the Sabbath,† as has been done perhaps in half the pulpits in N. England, who knows but the Unionism might have been tolerated as well as in the Gethseburg Professor? At this time would fail to enumerate the Sunderlands, Scotts and Lees and Hortons of the Methodist Episcopal Church—the Grosvenors, Galswold Colvers of the Baptist Church, and the towns, Roots and Jocelyns of the Congregational Church, and to demand what heresy or error on their part, prevented their ministerial fellowship from co-operating with them, in the cause of the enslaved Methodists and Baptists, eighty thousand each class, and of other sects, forty thousand. How happens it, that no infamy of character even the combined atrocities of the duel, the gambler, the debauchee and the man-stealer disqualify a man from attaining the high honors in the Colonization Society—without forfeiting clerical co-operation, by their dissent; while the heresies of disorganizing the ministry and Sabbath, on the part of a very abolitionist, since 1836, (and who are now nested from the main body of active abolitionists) should be made a reason why the Church ministry cannot speak out against oppression, man-stealing—a reason why they did not, long years before any of these heresies were ad in the Anti-Slavery ranks, at all?

A LAME FLEA, AT BEST.

Disincumbering ourselves, then, at the end of the webs of sophistry that have been woven by impudent men, polluting the sacredness of the ministry, to hide with thin disguises and shame of their guilty pos-

* Whether Mr. Buffum was "orthodox" or "hyetian" I do not remember. Mr. May, as a clergyman, could not but have the divine institution of Church, Ministry and Sabbath in view. Henry Clay, President of the Colonization Society, and for the Presidency of the United States, a prominent anticipation of National patronage to the Society, under the auspices of a Clay administration, was known. Similar views and aims must have been the basis of each political agent of the Society as Judge Wil-

† The debates in the late Convention at Middletown, Conn. as reported in the Christian Freeman of Nov. 3, 1843, bear witness that these are the points of difference that still keep "the great body of ministers" in that state, out of the ranks of active abolitionists. So testified one of their number: "The second position we cannot agree in, is this—slave holding is, in all circumstances, sin!" Is this was the second point of dissent from the abolitionists, what does the reader suppose to have been the first? This, verily, that faithful Christians are called upon to withdraw fellowship from slave holders! Starting, first, with the position that slave holders must be retained in Christian fellowship, it was inevitable that "the second" position should follow, viz: that slave holding, in itself, is not sinful! A distinguished Doctor of Divinity, not present in the Convention, (and one reputed to be more of an abolitionist than most of his compeers) was alluded to by the same speaker, and the Convention virtually admonished that unless that Reverend gentleman could be permitted to have "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," his important assistance and co-operation could not be expected in the work of "reproving them!" Valuable help, that! For what number of co-adjutors, are the Connecticut abolitionists prepared to compromise their fundamental principle that slave holding is sinful? How many Doctors of Divinity do they calculate would outweigh, in point of influence and availability, the fundamental truths of religion, and the favor of HIM who has revealed them, and required fidelity to them?

† Lundy had visited Boston, and other parts of New England, and sought the co-operation of the leading clergy, as early as 1829. Garrison joined him in the autumn of 1829.

to chronicle some of the out standing cases, showing definitely the position leading influences of the principal religions during the period under review.

Never might have been the lies and acts of prominent abolitionists, they did not see the nature of slavery. They could not see the leading men and controlling influences and authorities in the churches from the abilities originally resting upon them. If persons of their wisdom and sanctity co-operate with such abolitionists have been, on account of their follies and impurities, what then? They could act by themselves. In the high places they occupied, they could speak words of wisdom, if wisdom were in them, they could make their words heard and read, while the words of "fanatics," shut out from their pulpits, were unheard or despised. — They spoke — they have acted. But what have they said? What have they done?

THE TESTS OF SINCERITY.

These men, they have inquired — they have inquired — they have inquired themselves — they have made themselves familiar with the whole — they understand the errors of the fanaticism, and are prepared to refute them. In their case?

These men, they have courted investigation — have fostered inquiry in others. They have rebuked the flocks of their charge to see to it that they do not remain ignorant in matters of momentous importance. The knowledge of themselves acquired, they have solicited. What are the facts?

These men, as they claim to be, they have counsel of God. They have prayed "Lord, let them have me to do?" The abolitionists and disorganizers as they are called, assemble monthly, for this very purpose. — It is with the eminently pious leaders of the anti-slavery host, who cannot consent to meet with them? Do they meet, for this purpose, themselves?

BORN FACTS—"WANT OF LIGHT."

Questions of this character is to ask. — The public understand, well enough, the case. The first prayer meeting, on the subject, except among the proscribed abolitionists, probably not to be held. At an early hour, the New-York Observer charged it upon the abolitionists, as an unpardonable offense, that they had dared to pray, at the morning prayer, during Anniversary week, in New-York. And in a vast number of churches, such as in a social meeting, is accounted an offence. So far from courting investigation, our leading clergy who are not abolitionists, constantly and almost uniformly been in efforts to stifle it. So far from seeking it, it has been with the greatest difficulty they have been prevailed upon to hear it.

Unit here, (to avoid needless repetition,) the clause stated in the Declaration of the Convention, of the indignant rejection, of the clergy, of the Anti-Slavery Convention out from New-York in 1833. One tract is now before us. It is entitled "from Clarkson's Thoughts on the Utility and Safety, and the Advantages to be derived, of the emancipation of the Slaves." The document ever issued from the Anti-Slavery Convention, has been more contemptuously and scoffed back into the teeth of the disorganizers. It was our lot to receive back from the New-York Post-Office, large lots of "Tracts," on many of which were requests of clerical gentlemen, that no "secondary publications" might be sent to them.

Marvel that, to the present hour, the assembly of anti-abolitionists, whenever

it undertakes a discussion or puts forth a manifesto, on the subject, seldom fails to exhibit, on all the vital facts and principles involved, a depth and a density of stolid ignorance; no where else to be met with, not even in the National Senate! And so well is this matter understood by their apologists, who would dissuade abolitionists from giving them up as incorrigible, and abandoning their ministry, that the standing argument in their behalf is, that "they want light!" Yes! The most elevated among our religious luminaries, after a long years' agitation of this subject, want light! They are unacquainted with the plainest facts and considerations, essential to a right understanding of their duty. They will not inform themselves, and therefore they must not be harshly judged! Abolitionists must not cease to cluster round their candlesticks, for illumination. If the light that is in them be darkness — poor souls! how can they help it? — It is only because — "they want light!"

REAL POSITION.

The position of the American churches, and their prominent ministers, in regard to Abolitionists, was a comparatively light matter, except as illustrating their position in regard to the American Slave, and American Slavery. And last exceptions should be taken to that kind of evidence, standing alone, we will be careful to notice, we proceed, their position in respect to Slavery in itself. One of the principal topics of complaint against the abolitionists was that they insisted on the duty of "immediate emancipation." A distinguished clergyman of Connecticut,* in his articles in the Christian Spectator, conjured philanthropists to stand aloof from those who would not "cease the bewildering cry of immediate emancipation." Such a position, of religious teachers, would either involve the absurdity and impiety of decreeing immediate repentance of sin, and preferring a gradual or future repentance in its stead, or else it must be founded on the assumption that Slaveholding itself was not sinful, but only the incidental abuses of that practice. Sometimes one horn of the dilemma would be taken, sometimes the other, and sometimes a half hesitating or vacillating position between them. But for the most part, the more discriminating and prudent of our theological opponents were early driven to deny the sinfulness of Slaveholding. And this somewhat bold and startling position was sometimes very cautiously taken, and the shock upon the public mind relieved by the statement that slaveholding was not necessarily sinful, in all circumstances, or that there might be cases of innocent slaveholding. Whenever an assent could be obtained to these propositions, the inference was forth-coming that abolitionists were wrong in denouncing slavery, and insisting on the duty of its immediate abolition. The columns of the Vermont Chronicle, Boston Recorder, New-York Observer, and other religious journals, bore abundant evidence that this was the object in view, in broaching the doctrine of innocent slaveholding — so opposite to the teachings of Edwards, Hopkins, and Wesley — so opposite to the testimony of the Methodists in 1780, and of the Presbyterian churches in 1794, which (as seen in our last Lecture) was identical with that of the modern abolitionists.

AN INSTANCE, AS A SPECIMEN.

I shall not easily forget an interview I once had with a distinguished Doctor of Divinity in the city of New-York, to whose instructions for a number of years, I had listened. The Doctor had been distinguished as a Hopkinsian, a teacher of the theology of Hopkins. I had therefore put into his hands a copy of Hopkins against Slavery, not doubting that the personal would secure to the cause of the enslaved, the earnest advocacy of one of the most influential and accomplished ministers in the Presbyterian church; one whose high reputation for exalted piety and sound learning

had placed him among the chiefs of his sect. In this confident expectation, after a suitable time had elapsed for the personal, I called on the Doctor again to converse with him. With his accustomed urbanity, (contrasting, most strikingly, with what I often encountered,) he handed me the pamphlet, with many thanks for the loan of it. It was a work of his favorite author that he had not before met with. Its denunciations of slavery he found no fault with, at all. Human language, he said, might be ransacked in vain, for epithets so severe to be employed in the description of such a system. The fault of your abolitionists, added he, with a smile, does not lie in the severity of your denunciations against slavery. On that point we are happily agreed. There can be no controversy raised on that topic. You only err in the means you would employ for the removal of the evil. Indeed! Is that all the difference between us? I inquired. And what means, sir, would you have us employ? The Doctor recommended the Colonization Society as the best, the only suitable means in our power. But how long a time, Doctor, do you suppose it would take the Colonization Society to remove slavery? Some statistics, and calculations of the annual increase of the slave population, were here hinted at, and discussed. The Doctor confessed it would require a generation or two, before any very distinct impression could be made. A generation or two, Doctor? And in the mean time, would you not have us exhibit the enormity of this great national sin, and call the oppressors to repentance? A little staggered with this query, the Doctor nevertheless gave it a sufficiently explicit answer. No direct agitation of the subject could do any possible good. In many ways it would be promotive of evil. It would irritate and only make matters worse. Without a compensation, at least, the masters could not be expected to emancipate. Do I understand you to say, Doctor, that we should not call on the slaveholders to repent? He repeated that he did not think any direct appeals to the slaveholder, or to the community, would do any good. He was not satisfied that immediate emancipation would be safe. He was persuaded that a gradual and indirect removal of the evil would be more prudent. A gradual work was all we ought to advocate or expect. Such a sentiment, from such a source, struck me with no little surprise. After a short pause, I said, Doctor — I have heard you preach for several years, not without profit, I would trust. Your published writings, too, I have read with much interest and pleasure. But I am led to ask myself, whether I have ever understood you? If I have, I cannot understand you now. Have I lived to hear Doctor — discard the doctrine of immediate and unconditional repentance? Do I hear him recommend a gradual, a future repentance for sin? The Doctor was evidently taken aback. For sometime he was silent. He changed color. He fixed his eye on the floor. He made no reply to my questions. He gave a different turn to the conversation, and in less than ten minutes, framed a Bible argument in defense of slavery! Yes — at the same interview in which he had fully endorsed all the strong language of Hopkins and modern abolitionists against it! This was sufficient! The interview closed. This was early in 1834. Was I in fault, that I could never afterwards enjoy the Doctor's eloquent apostrophes of immediate and unconditional repentance? Some time afterwards, I learned that a wealthy member and Elder in the Doctor's church was an extensive slaveholder. And some years after, the Doctor's Bible defense of slavery was preached in his own pulpit, and put in print. Who has not heard of the pro-slavery sermon of Dr. Spring?

THE OPEN SECRET.

This story of the Doctor of Divinity in New-York city, is, in substance, the story of scores and hundreds of ministers, elsewhere, as their pa-

* Rev. Leonard Bacon.

richmoners can testify. In most cases, they will begin with the strongest professions of hostility to slavery, affirming that it cannot be too severely condemned. In their principles they agree with the abolitionists, but they cannot agree with their measures. Show them that the measures proposed are nothing distinct from the immediate abandonment of the sin—and let the innocence of slaveholding, at least in certain cases, come in, to relieve them from the duty of preaching immediate repentance, and to keep them in countenance in retaining ecclesiastical fellowship with slaveholders, so that the *sect* may suffer no numerical damage! The New-York Doctor had his rich slaveholding Elder and his "General Assembly" to secure. Other ministers have their pro-slavery members and their slaveholding brethren at the south, and so the truth of God must be cut and pared down, nay, abandoned, to suit their ecclesiastical convenience! Here lies the grand secret of the difficulty we meet, in persuading ministers to enlist in the cause of the enslaved. The members of northern churches are, in manifold ways, involved in the guilt of upholding slavery, and nothing must be said of the sin, "lest the peace of the church should be disturbed!" This oft repeated precaution tells its own story, and reveals to all who have hearing ears and seeing eyes, that the true reason why the churches and ministry, as a body, do not listen to the admonitions addressed to them is because they do not wish to repent of their sins. They hate the light, and will not come to it, lest their deeds should be re-proved. And hence the never ending and vain expedients resorted to, recommended and attempted, to "get rid of the evil" of slavery, without repenting of the sin of sustaining it—of sustaining it ecclesiastically, and at the polls.

DEMONSTRATIVE PROOF.

That the churches and ministry in general, in the non-slaveholding states, do not enlist in the contest against slavery is a fact that all must admit, and hence the various and conflicting excuses offered as a reason why they do not thus enlist. The true reason of their standing aloof, is the question at issue. That solution which, being founded on established facts, will account for the phenomenon, is alone entitled to be regarded as the true one. The solution we have here offered rests on the indisputable facts that the churches and ministry of the north, are deeply involved in the guilt of sustaining slavery, and that they indignantly refuse to confess and forsake the sin. By their apologies—by their ballots—by their church fellowship—by their prejudice against the colored man—by their negro pew—by their suppression of free discussion in the churches—by their bolted pulpits and closed doors, they notoriously uphold the slave system. And so long as they do this, they cannot be expected to enlist in the contest against slavery—it is indeed impossible for them, while maintaining such a position, to do so. Thus the known facts of the case, account fully for the phenomenon that is witnessed—nay, they constitute that phenomenon.

But on the other hand, the self-confuting excuses that are offered on their behalf, are founded on assumptions at variance with known facts; and were it otherwise, such facts, if they existed, could not account for the phenomenon intended to be explained. Were it true, (as it is not,) that the pioneers of the present anti-slavery enterprise, began with abusing the churches and clergy, or with renouncing church, ministry, and Sabbath, such a fact would not and could not prevent the churches and ministry from enlisting in active efforts against slavery, if they were so disposed. It would not prevent them from writing, speaking, and voting against slavery. It would not prevent them from taking down their negro pews. It would not prevent their withdrawing fellowship from the oppressors, according to God's explicit commands.*

So far from this, the fact that church and ministry were coming into disrepute on such alleged grounds, would tend powerfully to make them earnest in such efforts as should show that their accusers were in the wrong. As a matter of fact, not a little of the "church action against slavery," such as it is, that we now witness, is plainly incited, to some extent, by this very means. Not unfrequently the preamble to the resolution, or the proviso or disclaimer appended to it, sufficiently certifies the origin of the whole movement to be such as is here hinted at. In those very sections of the country where church and ministry have been most derided, since 1836, have church and ministry, as such, and in bodies, been most solicitous, within a short time, to publish their resolutions against slavery; while in regions where active abolitionists have never been charged with decrying church and ministry,† the testimonies of ecclesiastical and clerical bodies against slavery have been comparatively unfrequent and even rare.

Thus demonstrably and historically certain is it that the churches and ministry, of the prominent sects, as a body, stand aloof from the anti-slavery enterprise, not because the church and ministry have been assailed, or Christian institutions discarded, but because they are deeply involved in the guilt of sustaining slavery, and will not repent.

IMPORTANCE OF THIS TRUTH.

All attempts to cover up or conceal this truth must be futile, and all expedients to 'heal the hurt of the daughter of Zion, slightly, crying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace,' must prove as vain now as they were in the days of the prophets. It is no slander nor abuse, to point out the sins of the church and ministry, and call upon them to repent. Without "showing the house of Jacob their sins," there can be no means used for their repentance, and without such repentance and confession, there can be no solid reformation or amendment.

If God, in his providence, should overthrow slavery to-morrow, without the aid of the churches and ministry, so that henceforth there should be no slavery for them to uphold, that circumstance, without confession and repentance, on their part, would not purge them from the sin of having supported slavery while it existed, nor could it give them the present disposition and temper of heart which God requires of them, and which they are bound to exhibit. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whose confesseth and forsaketh his sins shall find mercy." Yet seldom do we witness any attempts at combined clerical action on the subject of American oppression, without perceiving an obvious solicitude on the part of many, to contrive some way in which slavery can be terminated without requiring confession and repentance on the part of the ministry and churches.† This policy, could it perfectly succeed, would leave the churches still in their sins, though abolition should triumph!

"OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH WILL I JUDGE THEE."

As the leading ministers and ecclesiastical bodies controlling the principal sects, have sufficient

but rather reprove them." Eph. v. 11. Very plainly implying that continued fellowship with incorrigible transgressors is inconsistent with the duty of reproofing them. "Not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or an extortioner (an oppressor) with such a one, no, not to eat." 1 Cor. v. 11. "Know ye not that a little leaven (one allowed transgressor) leaveneth the whole lump—(corrupts the whole church.)" 1b. ver. 6.

† These charges are commonly very vague. It is one thing to decry the incumbent and another thing to decry the office; one thing to say that certain churches are corrupt, and another thing to say that there should be no churches at all.

‡ "Let us pull down the fort that sustains slavery, and let the men within take care of themselves. Let us abolish the slave laws, and the work will be done." [Debates at the Middle-town Convention. Christian Freeman, Nov. 2.] Not! The work will not be done—the work of Church reform, unless the church confesses and repents of her sins. Nor does Christianity thus coldly leave men to "take care of themselves!" The same speaker could not go with "Liberty party men, and Come-out-ers." By whom, or how will he "abolish the slave laws!" By men who continue supporting them?

ly defined their position, let us hear them speak for themselves. They ought to know the reasons why they do not enlist in the anti-slavery enterprise. Let their testimony be credited, and let not their apologists appeal from it, or attempt to shift or evade the true issue.

A volume might be filled with these testimonies. Our selections shall be from sources sufficiently authoritative; and from a period or date which shall leave no room to doubt that the position was deliberately taken. The contest commenced in 1832. Our citations shall be from the literature of 1836 and '37. If, by that time, the anti-church, anti-ministry, and anti-sabbath heresies among certain abolitionists, had begun to manifest themselves, a fair opportunity was afforded for the clerical opponents of abolitionists to place their plea of non-co-operation with them, on the grounds of those heresies. We shall see whether they do so, or whether the point of dissent was the character of slavery itself.

In the Biblical Repertory, for April, 1836, appeared an article, understood to be from the pen of the Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton,* in which a bold effort was made to show that slavery, whatever may be said of any abuses of it, is a violation of any of the precepts of the gospel. "It is remarkable," says the writer, "that there is not even an exhortation," (in the writings of the apostles,) "to masters to emancipate their slave much less is it urged as an imperious and immediate duty."

This article was published in a separate pamphlet at Pittsburg, in the May following, just the eve of the sittings of the Presbyterian General Assembly in that place. The following appeared on the title page—"Pittsburg, 1836. Free gratuitous distribution." And accordingly it was very industriously circulated among the members of the General Assembly. It was scattered on the south, and its reception and effect among slaveholders, may be learned from the following facts:

Rev. Mr. Savage, a Presbyterian minister residing in Utica, had an interview with a Presbyterian minister of high literary and religious standing, in a slave state, who "assured him that the Princeton Professor, through the Pittsburg pamphlet, had contributed most powerfully and effectually to bring the whole south under the persuasion that slaveholding is in itself right—a system to which the Bible itself gives countenance and support."†

Rev. C. W. Howard, in an article in the Southern Christian Sentinel, a Presbyterian paper, Charleston, S. C., says—

"The south owes a debt of gratitude to the Biblical Repertory, for the fearless article 'behalf of the position that slavery is not forbidden in the Bible. The writer of that article said, without contradiction, to be Prof. Hodge of Princeton. His name ought to be known and revered among you, my brethren, for in the land of anti-slavery men, he is the only one who has dared to vindicate your character, from a serious charge of living in the habitual transgression of God's holy law."

Here, then, we have a Professor in a northern Theological Seminary, instructing southern slaveholders in the divine institution of chattel slavery! And how did the northern ministry churches regard the position and course of writer? By whom, except by abolitionists has been censured for his course? What minister (not an abolitionist)—what ecclesiastical body has thought it worth while to bear testimony against this heresy at Princeton? Had Prof. Hodge written an article, containing the statements of Hopkins and Edwards, who suppose that he could have retained his professorship?

* Prof. Hodge.

† Vide Green's "Chattel Principle."

* "If we have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness,"

might? No one! A decided stand against slavery, has, a hundred times been declared, on the highest authority, to be incompatible with the annual standing of a clergyman, or theological professor, at the north. And on the ground of this known fact, the gentlemen holding those stations have as often excused themselves from taking such a position. What can be more certain than the pro-slavery attitude of the northern clergy and churches that have not enlisted in the anti-slavery enterprise?

The Rev. C. W. Howard seems to have erred in supposing that Prof. Hodge was "the only one among the clergy of the north who could defend the 'peculiar institutions' of the south." The liberal gentlemen connected with the Methodist University at Middletown, and the Theological Seminary (Congregational) at Andover, seemed eager to correct this error. They evidently did not intend that the Princeton Theological Seminary should monopolize all the honors and advantages of loyalty to the "peculiar institution," and the Princeton experiment had plainly showed that no forfeiture of favor and patronage, on the part of northern churches and ministers, (excepting a few "fanatics") was to be apprehended by a Biblical defense of slaveholding.

About "a year after" the Princeton and Pittsburg pamphlet was issued, an effort in the same direction, was jointly made by Dr. Fisk (President of the Wesleyan University at Middletown) and Prof. Stuart of Andover. In a letter to a Methodist clergyman, Mr. Merritt,† published in Zion's Herald, Dr. Fisk gives utterance to such things as the following:

"But that you and the public may see and feel that you have the ablest and those who are among the honestest men of this age against you, be pleased to notice the following letter from Prof. Stuart. I wrote to him, knowing as I did, his integrity of purpose, his unflinching regard for truth, as well as his deserved reputation as a scholar and biblical critic, proposing the following questions:

"1. Does the New Testament, directly or indirectly, teach that slavery existed in the primitive church?

"2. In 1st Tim. vi. 2. 'And they that have believing masters,' &c.—what is the relation expressed or implied between 'thy' (servant) and 'believing masters'? And what are your reasons for the construction of the passage?

"3. What was the character of ancient and eastern slavery? Especially what (legal) power did this relation give the master over the slave?"

PROF. STUART'S REPLY.

Andover, April 10, 1837.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Yours is before me. A sickness of three months' standing, (typhus fever), in which I have just escaped death, and which still confines me to my house, renders it impossible for me to answer your letter at large.

"1. The precepts of the New Testament respecting the treatment of slaves and their masters, beyond all question, recognize the existence of slavery. The masters are, in part, 'believing masters'; so that a precept to them, how they are to behave, as masters, recognizes that the relation may exist, *salvo, fide et salva ecclesia, [without violating the Christian faith or the church;]* otherwise Paul had nothing to do but to cut the band asunder at once. He could not lawfully and properly temporize with *malum in se*, [that which is in itself sin.]

"If any one doubts, let him take the case of Paul's sending Onesimus back to Philemon, with an apology for his running away, and sending him back to be a servant for life. The relation did exist—may exist. The abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong. Not that the theory of slavery is right, in itself. No. 'Love thy neighbor as thyself'—'Do unto others that which you would that others should do unto you,' decides against this. But the relation, once constituted and continued, is not such a *malum in se*, as calls for

† Let it be borne in mind that Dr. Merritt, who, during his connection with the (Methodist) Christian Advocate and Journal, as assistant editor, had felt bound to maintain silence in the subject, had now been publishing his thoughts against slavery; though not even yet fully identified with active abolitionists.—Dr. Fisk takes up his pen—to confute his argument against slavery—not to defend the church and ministry from the assaults of abolitionists.

† How could Prof. Stuart say this! "Not now as a servant," were the words of Paul!—Ed.

immediate and violent disruption, at all hazards. So Paul did not counsel.

"2. 1st Tim. vi. 2, expresses the sentiment that slaves, who are Christians and have Christian masters, are not, on that account, and because as Christians, they are brethren, to forego the reverence due to them as masters. That is, the relation of master and slave, is not, as a matter of course, abrogated between all Christians. Nay, servants should, in such a case, as *forbear*, do their duty cheerfully. This sentiment lies on the very face of the case. What the master's duty in such a case, in respect to liberation, is another question, and one which the apostle does not here treat of.

"3. Every one knows, who is acquainted with Greek or Latin antiquities, that slavery among heathen nations has ever been more unqualified and at least ends than among Christian nations. Slaves were property in Greece and Rome. That decides all questions about their relation. Their treatment depended, as it does now, on the temper of their masters. The power of the master over the slave was, for a long time, that of life and death. Horrible cruelties at length mitigated it. In the apostle's day, it was at least as great as among us.

"After all the spirit, and vehemence on this subject, the good old book remains the same. Paul's conduct and advice are still our guides. Paul knew well that Christianity would ultimately destroy slavery, as it certainly will. He knew too that it would destroy monarchy and aristocracy from the earth, for it is fundamentally a doctrine of true liberty and equality. Yet Paul did not expect slavery or aristocracy to be ousted in a day, and gave precepts to Christians respecting their demeanor, *ad interim*.

"With sincere and fraternal regard,

"Your friend and brother,

"M. STUART."

"This, Sir, is doctrine that will stand, because it is *Biblical doctrine*. The abolitionists, then, are on the wrong course. They have travelled out of the record; and if they would succeed, they must take a different position, and approach the subject in a different manner.

"Respectfully yours,

"W. FISK."

"What are we taught here? That in the ecclesiastical organizations that grew up under the hands of the apostles, slavery was admitted as a relation that did not violate the Christian faith, that the relation may now in like manner exist; that 'the abuse of it is the essential and fundamental wrong,' and of course, that American Christians may hold their own brethren in slavery without increasing guilt or inflicting injury. Thus, according to Prof. Stuart, Jesus Christ has not a word to say against the 'peculiar institutions' of the south. If our brethren there do not 'abuse' the privilege of exacting unpaid labor, they may multiply their slaves, to their heart's content, without exposing themselves to the frown of the Savior, or laying their Christian character open to the least suspicion. Could any trafficker in human flesh ask for greater latitude? And to such doctrines Dr. Fisk eagerly and earnestly subscribes."—Green's Chattel Principle, &c., page 9.

Aye, truly! And from those doctrines, who but abolitionists have expressed, to the present hour any earnest dissent? These letters of Pres. Fisk and Prof. Stuart were eagerly and triumphantly copied into the leading periodicals of the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Congregational sects. And who besides abolitionists have felt it to be a shame and a scandal that such sentiments have polluted the high places of the church?

Can it be doubted that President Green, in the above extract from his Review, has done justice to the sentiments of Messrs. Stuart and Fisk? Will it be said that he imputes sentiments to them which they did not hold? or infers from them what he had no right to infer? The reader will judge for himself. Pres. Green's "Chattel Principle" has been before the public since 1839, and it has not come to our knowledge that from any quarter, there has been any intimation that the views of Messrs. Stuart and Fisk have been misconstrued by him, or misunderstood. It

would avail nothing to say that portions of Prof. Stuart's letter are inconsistent with his own conclusions. That does not alter the fact that that conclusion is his own. "Error is indeed fated to run crooked," and those who would see the inconsistencies of Prof. Stuart exposed, and his web of sophistry unravelled, would do well to peruse, at their leisure, the work from which we have just quoted.

Our business in this lecture, is not to confute the pro-slavery arguments of Prof. Hodge, Prof. Stuart, and President Fisk, (those recognized luminaries of the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist sects,) but simply to record the fact, that such pro-slavery arguments have been written and published, and eagerly disseminated through the leading organs of the principal sects, and that to the present hour, they have been neither disavowed nor repented by the writers, (those of them who are living,) or by their respective denominations, through their ecclesiastical bodies, or by their associates and friends. Neither the Faculties at Princeton, Middletown, or Andover, or prominent members of them, have made any disavowal of them, as they doubtless would have done, had the sentiments published been in accordance with the writings of Edwards, of Wesley, and of Hopkins. Prof. Hodge and Prof. Stuart are still regarded by their respective sects (with exception of a few "ultra abolitionists") as proper persons to qualify young men to expound the scriptures of truth! This fact, of itself, settles the question but their sentiments are not regarded essentially heretical or erroneous.

And how many repetitions have we had of the arguments of Prof. Hodge and Prof. Stuart! One brief year produced not less than half a dozen pamphlet sermons of New-England ministers, teaching the same sentiments. And who, except abolitionists felt themselves aggrieved?

The Editor of the Baptist Register, at the Baptist Anti-Slavery Convention in Hamilton, expressed similar views, and no one, to our recollection, dissented, except abolitionists. Dr. Wisner, at the last General Assembly, went over the same ground, and arrived at the same conclusion.

And since it is growing more and more unpopular to come out boldly on that ground, it is becoming more common to state the sentiment cautiously, or arrive at the same practical conclusion, without distinctly affirming the doctrinal premises. As an example of the former, notice the assumption that slaveholding is not in all cases sin. This is, in reality, saying, with Prof. Stuart, that it is not *malum in se*—and all the rest that either he, or Prof. Hodge, maintained, follows, of course. A case of the latter is witnessed, whenever we hear it urged that continued ecclesiastical relations may be maintained with incorrigible and impenitent slaveholders—for if this may be done, it must of course, be on the ground that slavery itself, aside from its abuses, is not sinful. So Prof. Stuart evidently understood the matter. He tells us that Paul "could not lawfully and properly temporize with a *malum in se*—that which is in itself sin." So the New-York Doctor of Divinity understood it, when he so suddenly shifted his ground from the most unqualified condemnation of slavery, to a Bible sanction of it. He saw, as clearly as the great body of intelligent ministers and editors have seen, all along, that if slaveholding be admitted to be sinful, the immediate abolitionists have the whole argument, and there is not the least possibility of meeting them successfully on any other controverted topic connected with the entire subject. This it is—as we said before—the unwillingness to repent and to preach repentance of the sin, that drives them into a position equivalent, in reality, to a defense of

† President Fisk is deceased.

† The argument of Prof. Stuart, though more cautiously advanced, (as a New-Englandian might require it to be,) was but a re-statement of the argument of Prof. Hodge.

slavery itself. If slaveholding be necessarily and unalterably sinful, then voting for slaveholding and pro-slavery rulers, and retaining church fellowship with unrepentant and incorrigible slaveholders, and apologists of slavery, must be sinful likewise. How clearly was this seen, and how painfully was it felt, at the recent religious Anti-Slavery Convention in Middletown! What prevented unanimity there? Had they all admitted heartily, and fully, the sinfulness of slaveholding, there had been no room for debate. But if slaveholding be not sinful, it ceases to be a religious question, at all, and a Convention of ministers and church members to discuss the subject, as an ecclesiastical matter, was as much out of place as though it were a chemical or a mathematical question!

The whole dispute, from beginning to end, has been upon the moral character of the act of slaveholding. Settle this, and the whole question is settled. When the church and ministry can agree with abolitionists, on that one point, and carry out the principle into consistent action, the work will be done.

We had intended to cite some further testimony, but have room only for a few items.

Rev. Elijah Hedding, D. D., one of the six Methodist Bishops, said—"The right to hold a slave is founded on this rule—Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."—*Christian Advocate and Journal*, Oct. 20, 1837.

Let it should be thought that injustice has been done to the late President Fisk, of the Wesleyan University—one of the most amiable, and otherwise estimable men that ever opposed the abolitionists—we give a place to the following, further extracts from his writings:

"The relation of master and slave, may and does, in many cases, exist under such circumstances, as free the master from the just charge of guilt and immorality."

"1 Cor. vii 20-23. This text seems mainly to enjoin and sanction the fitting continuance of their present social relations; the freeman was to remain free, and the slave, unless emancipation was to offer, was to remain a slave."

"The general rule of Christianity, not only permits, but in supposable cases, enjoins a continuance of two master's authority."

"The New Testament enjoins obedience upon the slave, as an obligation due to a present rightful authority."

Rev. N. Bangs, D. D., of New-York, for many years Editor of the (Methodist) *Christian Advocate and Journal*, said—

"It appears evident, that however much the apostle might have deprecated slavery as it then existed throughout the Roman Empire, he did not feel it his duty, as an ambassador of Christ, to disturb those relations which subsisted between masters and servants, by denouncing slavery as such a moral sin, that they could not be servants of Christ in such a relation."

Something like the Romish distinction between mortal and venial sins seems here to be implied, and slavery placed among the latter!

The *Christian Advocate and Journal* accordingly took the ground that if abolitionists were sincere in regarding slaveholding a heinous sin, they ought, in consistency, to come out of the churches where it was tolerated. This was approvingly copied into most of the leading papers of the different sects, and for a long time it was the common method of attempting to silence abolitionists, to bid them quit the church, if they could not leave off denouncing the practice of slaveholding. Abolitionists answered that they chose to stay in the churches, and attempt their reformation, but the time, we think, has now fully come, when the leaders of the sects should be taken at their word.

* Rev. Alexander McCaule, of the Methodist Protestant church, now at the south, and a slaveholder, but formerly illustrating at the north, has very recently to echo this stereotyped and knock-down argument of the northern religious press, (in former years) against the abolitionists, and it is quite instructive to notice the silence of the northern religious press, now, con-

We have but just entered upon the documentary proof, of our assertion that the grand question at issue between the little handful of abolitionists in the American churches and their numerous and powerful opponents in the same communions is, and has been, mainly, from the beginning, a question of the moral character of slaveholding, and not a mere question of circumstances and modes of operation. Volumes might be filled with similar proofs from the periodical and pamphlet literature of the last ten years. Only a few months have elapsed since another edition of the old argument of Prof. Hodge has been given to the public by a venerable and titled Divine, whose writings are in no mean repute, and who is now laboring in the collecting agency of the American Board of Foreign Missions; a man whose missionary labors in the new settlements of this state is deeply engraven on the recollections of our earliest years, and of whom we can not bear to speak or think with disrespect. For him our partiality would incline us to frame the apology of doing so, but who shall point us to a paragraph of earnest dissent from his pamphlet or of grief at the publication of it, from any of the religious press not identified with the efforts of abolitionists?

Here then, for the present, at least, we must pause, having quoted only from the writings of ministers in the non-slave holding states.

If any one still thinks we wrong the leading ministry and churches of the country, in representing them as the apologists or defenders of slaveholding, let them consider whether we could mend the matter by assuming a contrary position. Slaveholding is either sinful or it is not—and the churches and ministry now standing aloof from the advocacy of the enslaved, either believe in the sinfulness of slaveholding, or they do not.

If they do—if, with Wesley they believe it to be the "sum of all villainies"—and with Edwards, to be man-stealing, and a greater crime than fornication—and with the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1791 to be "man-stealing" and "the highest kind of theft"—and with the Methodist Conference of 1780 to be "contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, hurtful to society, contrary to the dictates of conscience and true religion, and doing what we would not others should do unto us"—if these are the principles of our prominent sects and their leading ministers, how do they honor their convictions by their practice? Or, if they simply admit slaveholding to be a "moral evil," a sin (without fixing upon its degree of turpitude, or the proper epithets descriptive of it) what shall we say or think of them? With these views, do they raise the cry of "slander" and complain of "denunciation" because the churches and ministry are called upon to repent of their undeniable connexion with, and support of, this national sin? Do they cry out "schism" because it is proposed to withdraw fellowship from the impenitent transgressors? Do they refuse, in their ecclesiastical bodies, to bear testimony against this sin, as they do against dancing? Do they "tamper with sin"? Do they talk of gradual and future repentance? And that too, after it is admitted by all intelligent men, that an immediate abandonment of the practice would be safe? Do they welcome the transgressors to their pulpits; while they exclude those of the same ecclesiastical standing, who testify against the transgression? If they believe that slaveholding is sinful, why do they talk of the curse of Canaan and of Ham?—Why cite the supposed slaveholding of Abraham any more than his polygamy? Why talk of Onan's sin and Philemon? Why prate of "good treatment" and "oral instruction" and "better off as they are!"—What pertinacity or honesty is there in all this, if they believe slaveholding to be sinful? Why hesitate to make the subject of this sin a church test, as they do other sins? The refusal of the late General Assem-

bling it. To censure the proposition would be to censure themselves, the originators of it. And so, with their columns filled with exclamations of horror at the impoty of those "schismatic" abolitionists who have proposed to secede, they are as quiet and dumb as brethren oracles, when the same thing is recommended by a prominent clerical slaveholder, with whom they sustain brotherly relations, and manifestly sympathize. We hear no reproofs of the "thematic" Mr. McCaule! Whenever the alternative of secession, or the dread of exclusion can be held as a rod over abolitionists, to terrify them into silence, all is well, and for this purpose, examples may be made, if possible, of active abolitionists, such as E. W. Goodwin, Lewis Tappan, and others, if need be. But Oh! the fraternal horror of "schism," when slaveholders and their abettors are in danger of being cut off!

* Rev. Seth Williston, D. D.

At the last General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church, the slaveholding members said distinctly they must secede, if the Assembly declared slaveholding to be sinful. And now delegates from the South declined taking their seats till the matter was settled. The Assembly therefore did not declare slaveholding sinful, and thus secured a new accession of slave

holders! And Dr. Beecher who fell in with this course, declared the opposite course due to the cause of righteousness and the character of the Presbyterian Church.

by to do this, shows that the character of slaveholding in the grand question at issue. Turn which way we will, one conclusion forces itself upon us. The sin of slaveholding, that for more than three centuries has been a galling cancer in the churches of Protestant rectorism unrepented of, festers there still. The disease is desperate—has reached its last fatal stages, and the victims, spurning the true remedy, must abide the sure issue. The church of the living God, phoenix-like, will survive them, as it did the recent churches of Asia, and the apostasy of Rome.

ANOTHER WITNESS.

Postscript. Since the manuscript of the preceding Lecture has been revised for the press, there has been placed on our table a pamphlet, recently published, replete with fresh evidence that the leading clergy of the prominent religious sects in this country are still rotten to the core, on the subject of slavery—that at this late day, after all that has been written and spoken on the subject, the Slave Power of the South, when it seeks the fittest instruments to subvert northern freedom, and roll back the rising tide of indignation against slavery, takes care to select non-resistance, of high literary repute, and in good and regular standing with their clerical brethren, for the service!

We speak of the "JUNIA TRACT, No. 5, on 'POLITICAL ABOLITION,' from the well known pen of Rev. Mr. Colton, formerly of the Presbyterian, but now (in his onward course, 'Tendimus in Latium') of the Episcopal (once 'Protestant Episcopal') sect.

A more bitter, malignant, and wicked assault upon civil liberty, religious freedom, and christian philanthropy, has never come under our eye. A more artful and deceptive plan in behalf of slavery (along with the proffered disapproving it) we have seldom seen. In its low appeals to vulgar prejudice, sordid self-interest, and enmity against the unoffending colored people, it cannot easily be out done. Yet it comes from the high places of "THE CHURCH!"

We know it may be denominated a political rather than an ecclesiastical document. We admit that its object is political, and that it comes out in the name of a political party, pre-eminent in the arts of Jesuitism, and seeking to elevate to the Presidency of the United States, the Prince of political Jesuits, one of the most profigate of modern statesmen, the notorious gambler, duellist, slave breeder and debauchee, the fit President of the Jinnu-faced Colonization Society. All this we understand. But this does not alter the fact that such a party, and for such purposes, cannot dispense with the aid of learned theological sophists who can quote scripture and weave religious creeds, for the benefit of their party, though in the act of denouncing religious appeals in behalf of honest political action! It does not alter the fact that the prominent ministers furnish, (and without rebuke) from among the most gifted of their number, the chosen champion for the direct of all conceivable political service! It does not alter the fact that with all his and their holy horror at "forcing religion into a political warfare" they have no rebukes for such a desecration of Biblical learning as this! Examining the religious journals not conducted by abolitionists, and find, if you can a solitary reproof of the Rev. Mr. Colton for such an unprincipled political religious essay as this.

Look at the unblushing profligacy, the brazen faced effrontery of this clerical politician. Our republican institutions are apparently approaching their death throes under the crushing, strangling grasp of the Slave Power. Already the right of petition is cloven down, and the people are gagged. This, Mr. Colton understands, and dares not deny. He says too, "It cannot be denied that the ballot box is a primary and fundamental political power. All other political powers above it, are only its instruments and agents. Whatever may result from this primary function of the body politic, these PRIMARY ACTORS are RESPONSIBLE FOR." And yet, the great effort of Mr. Colton's pamphlet is to PREVENT the exercise of this "primary function of the body politic," for the abolition of slavery and the preservation of a nation's freedom! He "judges slavery to be wrong"—insists that it is a political institution, politically guaranteed, and yet, it must not be politically abolished; in other words, it must not be abolished at all! Under pretence of opposing political abolition, and preferring "moral suasion," he uses all his powers of "suasion" not only against the political abolition of slavery, but against

holders! And Dr. Beecher who fell in with this course, declared the opposite course due to the cause of righteousness and the character of the Presbyterian Church.

"We are moving towards Rome." Vide N. Y. Evangelist, as quoted in *Christian Investigator* for October.

emancipation itself! To this subject (and notwithstanding his pretended sorrow that abolitionists have put it back, and his repetition of the stale falsehood that "previous to the start of political abolition in the free States, the spirit of emancipation prevailed extensively in the slave States") he revives the exploded bugbear that "immediate abolition" (or emancipation) would turn adrift "two and a half millions, to work on wagons or be a public burden and a public nuisance." And thereupon, the selfishness and the prejudices of "white laborers, Americans, Germans, and Irish" are artfully invoked against emancipation! The long forgotten horrors of "amalgamation" and black wives are conjured up by the writer, who nevertheless professes to believe that God has made of one blood all nations! "The natural and unshakable aversion of the white to the black race," he says is "doublets physical, and then, in the same paragraph he contradicts it by saying that the claim to equality, creates the aversion, and hence no such aversion is known at the South! Assuming that the two races, if both were free, could not live peacefully together in this country, he leads his readers to the old conclusion of the Colonizationists that the slaves are not to be emancipated until, by "the grand results of Providence" a home in Africa, some centuries hence, perhaps, can be provided for them! Yet he "judges slavery to be wrong!"

Yes! He judges slavery to be wrong! but labors incessantly to have it appear that nobody is guilty of this wrong—that the wrong cannot be righted without a greater wrong—that, after all, it is, by no means so great a wrong as, by "misrepresentation," and "exaggeration" it has been pictured to be! It "originated" in the benevolent projects of "Las Casas, a Roman Catholic priest." It originated (as he likewise tells us) "in the barbarous passions and habits of the [African] race." [S] barbarous that they tolerated slavery! Again, it originated, he says, in the policy of the British Government, forcing the slaves upon us without our consent!

And then, as to this "barbarous" practice itself—the writer denies that it involves the principle of "property in the persons of men." In the contradiction of the express words of the slave code, as well as of the declarations of his political leader, Henry Clay (who declared that "what the law makes property is property," and that centuries of legislation have "sanctified property in slaves"—also that, being chattels, the conditions of chattelship must, of course, appertain to them) Mr. Colton speaks of the chattel principle as "an acknowledged attribute of slavery" and labors to prove that abolitionists have falsely charged this iniquity upon the slave system! That the claim of property is only in the services and not in the persons of the slaves—that, in this respect, the law of slavery does not differ from the law that gives the master a right to the services of the indentured apprentice—the father a right to the services of his minor child—the husband a right to the services of his wife—the wife a right to "the service and protection" of the husband! That slaves are not property, in any other sense, than apprentices, minors, wives, and husbands, are property! To this point the writer demands—"What is the difference between these cases, and that of the slave, except that in two of the former, the period of service is not for life?" And he affirms,

"The objection to property in persons applies equally to all the relations of life, in which service is contracted or enacted, because, in each case, the claim is the same. It is based on the SAME PRINCIPLE, ratified by the same authority, and rendered available by the same means, that is, the law, and is THE SAME THING." Again he says—

"It is observable that the relations of husband and wife, and of master and slave, have existed from the beginning of society, and that God has prescribed rules for both, in the Old Testament and the New."

"[And on the same page of this "religious political creed" the old version of Onesimus and Philemon, "and New Testament slave holding, is revived! And so there neither is nor can be any such crime as 'man-stealing,' which Moses, and Paul, and Grotius, and the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1793, considered 'the highest kind of theft'—to be classed with the murder of fathers and of mothers, and deserving the punishment of death! It follows, likewise, that the laws of the civilized world, punishing the slave trade as piracy, ought instantly to be repealed, since the law of slavery, the law of marriage, and the law of service to parents, is 'based on the same principle' and is the same thing! Said we not truly that it needed a theological politician, of the modern and current stamp, to weave sophistries like these?

That the writer knew better than to make such representations,

is abundantly evident from the self contradictory concessions which a well grounded recognition of indignant rebuke, from the wives and children of insulted freemen, (whom, for unholy purposes, he had degraded to the condition of slaves,) could not but force from his pen. For he adds—

"There is this difference, however, that God did not 'institute slavery.' On the contrary, we believe the 'perfection of society, under the influence of Christianity, will remove it from the face of the earth, while 'the sacred institution of marriage will abide. That of 'slavery is profane.'"

How is this? He had said they were both "based on the same principle," and were "the same thing!" What meaning then is there in the jargon of calling the one sacred and the other profane? Of saying that God instituted the one and not the other of these original institutions, "existing from the beginning of Society?" And what if God did not institute slavery? The writer had labored to prove that there was nothing in the principle of slavery that could have prevented its divine institution?

On the whole, considering its late date, the blaze of light now shining on the subject, the results of W. India emancipation (so carefully kept out of sight, by this writer) and the general progress of sentiment now visible in the public mind, the appearance of such a pamphlet, for such a purpose, at such a crisis, from such a source, and unreviewed by the pulpit and the religious press of the country at large, constitutes altogether the most striking and conclusive documentary proof that has yet appeared, of the deep and inveterate corruption of the existing religious sects of this country. But when we add to all this, the well known fact that a large portion of the active and leading members of these religious sects, occupying official stations in the churches, are eagerly engaged, and at great expense, in the circulation of such a pamphlet—that it finds favor even from some of them who have professed to be abolitionists—and especially when we remember that its abominably wicked doctrines—its apologies for slavery, its atheistic exaltation of human enactments and arrangements above the divine law, its insidious cry of "Church and State" against those who would wield civil government, for its only legitimate purpose, "to execute justice between a man and his neighbor," and its moribund prediction that the American people WILL NOT TOLERATE the attempt to do so, are all passed by, unheeded, and unreviewed, by that other large portion of the members and ministry of the existing churches whose political position could not betray them into a sympathy with the writer and his pamphlet, (thus proving that, on these points they agree with their political rivals, and religious associates) we are impelled to conclude that the measure of the iniquity of these warring yet congenial sects is well nigh filled up, and that it is high time for those to "come out of" them who would not "partake of their sins, and receive of their plagues."

[See page 10, near the top. When it is observed that this is the conclusion, the summing up of the argument in the course of which all the old charges of amalgamation, of treason, of anti American feeling, of insurrectionary and bloody designs, of hostility to the Federal constitution, of "perjury," of "crime"—(once so effective, in the hands of the same class of politicians—the partisans of Henry Clay in rousing against abolitionists, the lawless riots of 1833, 4, and 5) are once more resuscitated and revived, in the same style of violent invective and abuse, it cannot be doubted that the end and object of these false charges is the same now that it was then, though their power to do mischief may be less, owing to the diffusion of anti slavery truth, among the mass of the people. And this fact is not altered by the circumstance that the same writer resorts to alternate coaxing and threats—that he claims the traitors and perjurers as having more congeniality and sympathy with his political party than with the opposing one. With the arts of exciting mobs against the abolitionists to secure southern votes, and then claiming anti slavery support, the principal circulators of this tract have been familiar, for a number of years past, and no part of the game seems to be relinquished.

"I MUST PRESERVE MY INFLUENCE."

In order to perform effective labor in the Lord's vineyard, the Christian must have spiritual strength. In order to have spiritual strength, he must have integrity.—In order to maintain his integrity he must exercise self denial. And whoever exercises self denial in the presence of self complacent and self indulgent religionists, will be accounted a disturber and a fanatic. The Christian's influence, therefore, can be preserved only by a course which will be likely to bring upon him the dislike and hatred of a worldly ministry and a degenerate church. "Woe unto you who all men speak well of you!" Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose it for the sake of Christ, shall find it.

Christian Investigator.

HONEYOYE, FEBRUARY, 1849.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

We have now completed the series of lectures contemplated at the commencement of the preceding volume—twelve Lectures in all. Designing to make them embody the outline of our views on that subject in a correct form, we published more than a supply for our list of subscribers and patrons, in order that we might have sets to dispose of after the publication of them should have been completed. That calculation we have realized, except in relation to the first Lecture, the unexpected demand for which has exhausted our supply. Its place, however, is well supplied by the number containing the SYNOPSIS DECLARATION; so that by using that number, (of which we have a supply,) we can furnish sets of the Lectures essentially complete, as to the facts and arguments we meant to present.

As there is now an increasing call for information on the subject, and as many are becoming interested in the new movement who have not read any connected discussion of the principles upon which it is founded, we suggest, to those who agree mainly in our views, the utility of circulating the Lectures among those who are inclined to read. Our new subscribers, now coming in, by having those Lectures, would be better able to understand the scope and bearing of what will be presented to them this current year; as they would be able to review the facts and the arguments which have brought us to our present position.

To facilitate this circulation of the Lectures, we will put them up in regular sets, and sell the twelve numbers at the reduced price of 25 cents; which, we think, is much cheaper than the same amount of reading could be furnished in book, pamphlet, or tract form.

Agents sending the names of new subscribers, will please be careful to enter against each name the amount paid; also, the date or number at which the subscription commenced; also, what back numbers have been furnished by them; with the post-office address of each subscriber—not forgetting that the name of the post-office is not always that of the local settlement, town, or village.

Our Address.—We must again request who write us, or send us papers, to direct to Honeyoye, Ontario Co., N. Y.—not Honeyoye Falls, nor Rochester, nor Whitesboro. Will our London friends please notice this, in directing to us their papers?

THE SECRET OF IGNORANCE.

In order to learn, the first and grand pre-requisite is a teachable spirit—a desire to know the truth for the purpose of performing duty. Where this spirit exists, the discovery of the truth is as certain as the promise of Jehovah. "If any man will do my will," said the Savior, "he shall know of my doctrine." To this agrees likewise the divine maxim "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Not a single step can be taken in the road to true knowledge without it. For this fear of the Lord is the same as the love of God. "And this is the love of God that we keep his commandments"—all his commandments are not grievous." To know the commandments of God is to do the will of the Savior, and knowledge or wisdom is the certain, the promised result. When men complain, therefore, of the want of light, it is an acknowledgment (however unintentional) of their want of love, their lack of the spirit of obedience; for in Scripture philosophy, light, love, and obedience are inseparable—are one and the same thing. An undisciplined child is backward to learn the sentiments and the will of the parent. Such a child will perhaps complain that the father fails to afford the necessary instruction; when

the truth is, parental affection and solicitude have been expended in vain, on account of the unteachable temper of the child. Captious evils, contradictions, affectation of more wisdom than the father, have been fostered with the pretence and under the abused names of *independent thought and free inquiry*! *Fit, to be worthy of the name, must be exercised in accordance with the voice of conscience, not against it—must be cherished as the means of discerning and performing duty, not for the purpose of forming errors, and getting rid of it!*

LETTERS TO THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION.

FROM WILLIAM PUTNAM,

Minister of the gospel in Herkimer, N. Y.

HERKIMER, Dec. 18th, 1843.

GRANT SMITH, Esq.—DEAR BROTHER,—I have been looking forward, with high anticipations, to the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention to be held at Syracuse, the 20th instant, expecting to attend it, and share in the heaven-born privileges of such an assemblage of men. Since my withdrawal from the Oneida Presbytery, last February, on account of its determined continuance of Christian fellowship with slaveholders and their apologists, I have been prepared to look through other than sectarian eyes: and, alas! alas! how sad the spectacle of all the leading denominations of professing Christians in our land!—perverting utterly the objects for which the Savior established his church in the world—the reformation and holiness of men—and making purity and humanity, indeed every distinctive feature of Christianity, bow down to the promotion of their sectarian schemes, the increase of their numerical or pecuniary strength; using their energies to build themselves up on the ruins of some rival sect—Judah vexing Ephraim, and Ephraim envying Judah; or, like the ancient Scribes and Pharisees, suspending their own hostilities when a common enemy was to be despatched, who had dared to teach them, that “tithing mint, and rue, and all manner of herbs,” would not pass as an acceptable substitute for the true religion, “judgment” and the love of God,” (or the love of man—for “he that sayeth he loveth God, and hateth his brother, is a liar;”) or, like Pilate and Herod, who had before been at enmity between themselves, were made friends in one day, when Jesus was to be condemned and crucified.

Looking upon the Convention as an attempt to restore organized primitive Christianity to our land, it is a matter of great disappointment to me that I cannot see my way clear to attend it. But Providence sees fit to afflict my family with sickness, that seems to forbid my leaving them under present circumstances; and I must say, “the will of the Lord be done.”

I trust your Convention will begin, continue, and end in prayer; and while it may utter severe and searching truth, still will utter the truth in love.

Your brother in Christ,

WM. PUTNAM.

FROM LOUIS D. POMEROY,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL IN VERMONT.

MONTEPELIER, Vt., Dec. 13, 1843.

Dear Brother Goodell:

I had hoped to meet you and others at Syracuse on the 30th, but have concluded that I cannot do so. I regret it; none but God knows how deeply! My prayers will ascend, without ceasing for you, and during the expected session, I shall be with you in spirit.

I am united to this association, (Montpelier,) in little else than name, I have every reason to believe. If silence upon the sin of slavery, or hostility to the prominent means used for its destruction, be *pro-slavery* then this association is *pro-slavery*, and own sister to every other association in this state, so far as I am informed. The slaveholding clergyman who reported on his return from Vermont, “The clergy of Vermont are with us,” reported truth. There are those who consider themselves abolitionists, and as far as they can

act as abolitionists and still remain in “*regular standing*” with sects; they want it said by me. But even this compels them to “*define their positions*” so often, as to be rather discouraging, and the consequence is, they content themselves with *doing less and less* for the slave, and are becoming known as those who were “*once abolitionists*.” But hearty, efficient action, for the slave, (I may say for God or man,) I have ceased to look for, from an adherent to party, either ecclesiastical or political. Of course I do not expect the conversion of the world by the present popular instrumentalities. There is but one voice in condemnation of the Jesuits who sought to promulgate their faith, without interfering with the abominations of heathenism. But that which manifests the man of sin in Papacy, becomes the very spirit of wisdom and virtue in Protestant Jesuitism! Papal Jesuits interfered not with the “*heathenism of idolatry*.” Protestant Jesuitism interferes not with the “*heathenism of oppression*.” The first deludes the mind, the second destroys it. “*And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon, and he exercised all the power of the first beast before him.*” Rev. 13. 11, &c.

An effort is now making by the several religious societies of the land, I know not whether meant to sustain themselves, or counteract the influence of abolitionists. Perhaps both are equal. Their publications fall like autumn leaves around us, “*Revival at the South*,” “*Colporteur Reports at the South*,” “*Self-denying labors of slaveholders and their wives in circulating Tracts*,” &c. “*Donations, legacies, &c. from the South*.” And while much is said of the influence of tracts written especially upon Gaming, Intemperance, Sabbath-breaking, Dancing, Profanity, &c. &c. we hear nothing of tracts exposing the *infulness of slavery*; but hear of slaveholders ardently engaged in the Colporteur’s work, and of the *indulgences and politeness of overseers*, in permitting meetings with slaves, but never any thing said of “*Tracts or Bibles distributed among slaves*,” or slavery rebuked.

We hear an auxiliary of the American Bible Society, declaring that “*it never entered into the intentions of the Bible society to give Bibles to the slaves*.”

We hear of the refusal of said American Bible Society to give Bibles to refugee slaves in Canada, and we are here in Vermont, told “*if any wish their donations thus applied they can have the worth of their money in Bibles for that object*,” but it will not be entered upon the society, report with “*appropriations of the society*,” but as “*Bibles sold*.” To expect the conversion of the world by the present popular instrumentalities is short-sighted. Even should the world be converted to the present standard of piety, we should be as far from the millennium as now. The jubilee that commences under the agency of those who oppress the poor, will be first proclaimed in hell.

I have much that I wish to say upon subjects that will be discussed in your convention, but have neither space nor time. My prayer is that God will abate the pride and human glory of a man made ministry, by sending forth again the “*Fishermen of Galilee*” in the power of the Holy Ghost. Raise the standard of holiness in the church, to the Bible standard, “*Dominion over the world, flesh and devil through simple faith in Jesus*,” destroy “*castles*”—convincing all “*that we have all one Lord, and all we are brethren*.” Restore the administering of ordinances to the church, that the poor may enjoy them without money and without price. Make the safe guard of the church, faith in God, and her bands love, instead of creeds, traditions, &c. &c. Open the table of the Lord to all “*Christ’s disciples*” instead of “*all in regular standing*” whether hypocrites, deceived, knaves, or slave holders.

And now my dear brother, God speed thee, and those that are with thee. I am so somewhat relieved. This paper is at your disposal, for *truth only*. May the very God of peace lead thee forth,

Prays your brother in the bonds of the gospel,

LOUIS D. POMEROY.

FROM A BROTHER IN ILLINOIS TO GERRIT SMITH.

FARMINGTON, (Illinois,) Nov. 28, 1843.

BROTHER SMITH—Having just received the Emancipator, I soon cast my eye on the notice for a Christian Convention at Syracuse, the third Wednesday of December. There is nothing that would more rejoice the hearts of many of the followers of our Lord in this region than to be with you. There are more than thirty in the neighborhood around me that have been for three or four years praying over the anti-gospel organizations called the church. More than two years ago we undertook to get back on to primitive principles and practice,

and we organized in a church capacity. The number of the names now stand perhaps nearly as they stood when the brethren met in an upper chamber at Jerusalem, though we number not quite as many as they did, (120.) The Lord has abundantly blessed our efforts, and we have evidence, every week, that he is a prayer hearing and answering God. We have had to combat not only with the powers of darkness, but worst of all, with the anti-Christian organizations around us, as they have made every possible effort to draw us into their pens or destroy us. Hitherto the Lord has helped us. Within ten miles from where I now write there are more than 20 men commissioned ministers or preachers, and in all kindness we have been inviting and urging them to the discussion of church organization up to the present time, but they will not meet it. And I conclude they are most of them of the opinion of Brother H. H. K. of Gatesburg who remarked to me not long since, that he would not think any body would attempt to support the present church organization from the bible. I do not know of scarcely one denomination around us but what has been decreed by not only grace but in numbers, and I venture to say there is no redeeming influence in the 7 or 8 denominations around us, and if any of them do any thing for God or God’s suffering poor they have got to step out of their organization, and feel and act as they are recognized in the Gospel, in their own individual, and on their own responsibility, and standing identified with Christ in every Bible truth.

“*DETRACTED*.” Among *deferred editorials*, is one, (which ought to have appeared last month,) in reply to “*L. N. H.*” in the N. Y. Baptist Register. Perhaps we shall find room for it, next month.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS.

For the Christian Investigator, up to February 12, 1844.

Of M. J. Morseman, Henderson, \$0 50; S. Finney Ditto, 0 50; L. Butts, South Butler, 0 50; G. Candy Ditto, 0 50; C. Campbell, Ditto, 0 50; C. D. Haddon Ditto, 0 50; D. Thurston, Windthrop, Me., 1 00; J. Mayell, Albany, 1 00; E. Alden, Taberg, 1 00; Mir E. Verplanck, Houdout, 1 00; E. Strong, Hudson, O., 0 50; A. Kilbourn, Ditto, 0 50; J. C. Norton, Cazenovia, 1 00; T. Davis, Fabius, 0 50; W. Frazer, Ditto, 0 50; J. Mosher, Canadaigua, 3 00; Mary Cox, Cleveland, Ohio, 2 00; C. Levin, Perch River, 0 50; D. H. Acherman, Ditto, 0 50; J. Hawley, N. Milford, Penn., 1 00; H. McKinney, Terrytown, Penn., 1 00; G. F. Horton, Ditto, 1 00; C. Arnold, Honeoye, 0 41; L. Blackmer, W. Richmond, 1 00; H. Wright, Yates, 1 00; J. H. Payne, Half-Day, Ill., 0 50; J. Selkirk Ditto, 0 50; J. Hartzell, Warren, Ohio, C. McNeal, Union Vale, Ditto, E. H. Nevin, Athens, Ditto, A. F. Hannah, Cadiz, Ditto, J. Kern, Ditto, Ditto, 2 00; H. Hopkins, W. Bloomfield, 1 00; H. Brewster, Le Roy 1 00; A. F. Holt, Elmira, 0 50; Ditto, for G. W. Hathaway, Bloomfield, Ma., 0 50; S. Hale, Union Corners, 0 50; J. Cowman, Honeoye, 0 50; Ditto, for J. Wilson, Mason Center, Mich., 0 50; H. Blackmer, Livonia, 1 00; N. H. Fowler, Ditto, 1 00; J. Hancock, Dexter, 0 50; T. O’Connor, Three-rails Bay, 0 50; J. Truair, Apulia, 1 00; A. Foster, Dryden, 1 00; B. Church, Tullmadge, Mich., 0 50; Ditto, for J. Builard, Kent, Mich., 0 50; H. B. Davis, Weedsport, 0 50; B. Barnoy, Ditto, 0 50; S. Salyer, Romulus, 0 50; O. B. Tomlinson, Ditto, 0 50; J. T. Lisk, Ditto, 1 00; H. Haldridge, Ditto, 0 50; J. Wickoff, Ditto, 0 50; L. Gurnee, Ovid, 0 50; E. Mandoville, Ditto, 0 50; S. Crosby, So. Onondaga, 0 50; A. Chapman, Do., 0 50; T. Lawrence, Do., 0 50; G. A. Parsons, 0 50; H. Lawrence, Ditto, 0 50; E. L. Goodwin, Oisco, 0 50; S. Lyon, Ditto, 0 50; N. Eastwick, Ditto, 0 50; L. Colton, Marcellus, 0 50; P. Baldwin, Sennett, 0 50; R. Sanders, So. Onondaga, 1 00; C. H. Gregory, Sand Lake, 1 00; D. Clarke, Ovid, 0 50; A. Gray, Ditto, 0 50; S. A. Dewey, W. Branch, 0 50; J. Dewey, W. Leyden, 0 50; Amount, \$48 94. Com. and in hands of Agents, 3 00; Nett receipts, \$45 94.

E. SHEPARD, BOOK & JOB PRINTER, Rochester.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. II—No. 3,
Whole Number, 23.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., MARCH, 1844.

Published by
AND PUBLISHED.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall repaired in troublous times."—DANIEL ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 25 cents, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Single copies, 5 cts. per copy.
Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Per Post Master, 12 cts. per copy, and 10 cts. for postage.

Printed at No. 23, STATE STREET, ROCHESTER.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

The subject of Church Organization is attracting the public attention in an unwonted degree. Many causes concur to give interest to the discussion. In the course of our lectures on Church Reform we have exhibited freely our own views. The Declaration of the Syracuse Convention, (a rather of the majority of its members,) in conformity with the same views, is also before our readers, and it is known to them that on some points of that Declaration, a few members of that Convention whose opinions are entitled to a respectful and candid hearing, felt themselves obliged to dissent from the majority. The circumstance that they were in the minority ought not to prevent an examination of their views, and, if found correct they ought to prevail, and the opposite sentiments should be renounced. The whole truth and nothing but the truth is what the church needs. We feel desirous, therefore, of presenting to our readers the views of these beloved brethren, and in their own language, as far as we are able. President Green dissented from that part of the Declaration in which Associations, (along with Conventions, Presbyteries, and Diocesan Episcopacies) were repudiated, in the language of Dr. Estlin, as leading to Romanism; but we have no statement or argument from his own pen, which we could present to our readers. If he will favor us with such a statement of his views, with his reasons for holding them, we shall be happy to publish them.

VIEWS OF GERRIT SMITH.

Brother Smith dissented from the Declaration, not on account of its repudiating "Associations," (in accordance with the views of Dr. Estlin,) but because it contained the sentiment that Christians can organize Churches of Christ.

As we have, to some extent, his own statements of his views, we will now give them a condensed piece in our columns, along with such remarks as they suggest to our own mind.

In his letter published in connection with the Declaration, Br. Smith says:

"My heart is pained because I am compelled, by what it says of church organization, to withhold my name from it. I am confident, that what you mean to have it say—that what you think it does say, on that point, does not conflict with my own views. Nevertheless, to call the duties which result from the Divine organization of Christians—from their gracious relation to each other, and to their common Lord—to call these duties organization itself, is a misnomer so great, and glaring, and pernicious, in my sight, that I must not, in anywise, seem to countenance it."

Brother Smith's views were also stated in the following resolutions presented by him to the Convention, and adopted:

Resolved, That it is not for a company of Christians to organize their Church; but to do their duties, which spring from its Divine organization.

Resolved, That notwithstanding Christians have not the power, either to vote persons into or out of the Church of Christ; they have, nevertheless, the power and the right to commend, admonish and rebuke each other, and the power and the right, so far as exercised under the directions of an unbiased and charitable judg-

ment, to extend or withdraw the hand of Christian fellowship."

But a more full expression of his views may be found in the Circular of the "Church of Peterboro," understood to be from his pen, and we will here copy the document entire. It contains indeed many things foreign to the present discussion, but the whole movement at Peterboro is a matter of too much importance in the current history of church organization, not to have a place in our columns. Our readers need not be told that it contains much, (and on the subject of church organization too) that harmonizes with our own views, notwithstanding our dissent in the particulars we shall designate.

The Circular is introduced with a quotation from a justly celebrated author, the sentiment of which, as we understand it, we have no objection to disclaim.

In the beginning of the Gospel, whenever he received the spirit of Christ, was esteemed a member of the Church. But now in the 19th century, the order was inverted; and no one, unless a member of the Church, was counted to have received the spirit of Jesus Christ. (De laubigne's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. 1, p. 21.)

CHURCH OF PETERBORO.

The 20th day of November, 1843, was observed as a day of fasting and prayer by persons in Peterboro (N. Y.) and its vicinity, who believe that the Christians therein do, simply because they are Christians—do, of more Divine organization, all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding—constitute "The Church of Peterboro." In the afternoon of that day, they held a public meeting in the School room in Peterboro, and spent the time of it in prayer, reading the Bible, singing and conversation. A series of resolutions were submitted to the meeting, with the request that they should be read the subject of much and earnest thought, conversation, prayer, until the time for definitive action on them.

The meeting was adjourned to the 27th day of the following month.

All the interested parties, a part of the time of which was spent in prayer, singing, and conversation, the creed and resolutions, submitted to the meeting, were read, (submitted by, and unanimously adopted.) That the order of the meeting, the request was made that all who, in view of the doctrine and language of the Church, believe in the members of "The Church of Peterboro," should give their names to the Secretary of the Meeting. In accordance with this request, a number of persons gave their names.

The creed and resolutions are as follows:

"We learn from the Holy Scriptures, which are the only infallible guide in all questions of morality and religion, that Christian and Church relations spring, not from external fellowship and human arrangements, but from the union of those who are the subjects of such relations with Jesus Christ, who is the Head of the body, the Church."—[Col. i. 18; Eph. iv. 15, 16; 1 Cor. xii. 27; John xv. 5; 1st Peter ii. 4, 5, 6; Eph. ii. 20; Rom. xii. 4, 5; vii. 4.] Hence we believe, that the Church of Christ on earth is composed of all the Christians on earth; that the Church of Christ in any nation is composed of all the Christians in such nation; and that the Church of Christ in any smaller community, even as the Church of Christ in this country, is composed of all the Christians in such community.

Thus believing, we declare that the Christians of Peterboro and its vicinity compose a church; and that, following Apostolic usage, we may properly call it, "The Church of Peterboro."—[The propriety of this name, and also the propriety of declaring that all the Christians of a given locality constitute the Church of Christ, are justified by the following and other texts: Rom. i. 7; 1st Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 1, connected with Phil. iv. 15; Col. i. 2; in 2d and 3d Rev., "Church of Ephesus," &c. &c.] As a consequence of the beliefs which we have expressed, we acknowledge ourselves bound—not to vote into our local Church, (for we can neither vote into it, nor out of it)—but bound to recognize as a member of it every person within our territorial limits, who affords satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple and friend of Christ; and bound too to do this, even in the case of those who do not consent to our thus recognizing them, and

even in the case of those also who, in their doctrine or practice, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, or to whatever extent objectionable. Another consequence of the beliefs which we have expressed is, that, while we are to maintain a strict Church discipline, and to admonish and rebuke each other as occasion shall call for such fidelity, we are to deem no person worthy of being disfellowshipped by us but those whom we have ceased to regard as Christians.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. Resolved, That Samuel Wells of Vernon is affectionately invited to remove from this community, and thereby become a member of the Church; and that, in the event of such removal, he be expected to officiate as its Elder or Bishop, and to assume that share in instructing and feeding it which is appropriate, to one whom the Holy Ghost has made an overseer [Acts xx. 28].

2. Resolved, That, in view of the abundant means of living in this neighborhood, we hope our Elder may always be in circumstances to give himself continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. [Acts vi. 4] But, whether he shall be his circumstances, or whether he shall be compelled to labor, working with his own hands, [1st Cor. iv. 12], we cannot, without guiltily obtruding our eyes to the glaring evils of the practice of describing salaries to preachers of the gospel, propose him a salary. We trust that contributions in money will be made in our midst, and that the Elder will be able to support himself and his family.

3. Resolved, That, in view of the abundant means of living in this neighborhood, we hope our Elder may always be in circumstances to give himself continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word. [Acts vi. 4] But, whether he shall be his circumstances, or whether he shall be compelled to labor, working with his own hands, [1st Cor. iv. 12], we cannot, without guiltily obtruding our eyes to the glaring evils of the practice of describing salaries to preachers of the gospel, propose him a salary. We trust that contributions in money will be made in our midst, and that the Elder will be able to support himself and his family.

4. Resolved, That the Elder be expected to keep an account of all the contributions, whether in money or otherwise, which shall be made to him by the Church and the community; and that he be expected to make a report of all such contributions, at the expiration of every three months.

5. Resolved, That the contribution both of the truth—the Church will, as there shall be occasion for it, express its convictions in relation to doctrines and practices.

6. Resolved, That a Church of Christ is a company of moral reformers; and, therefore, that a Church which refuses to engage in the prosecution of moral reforms, especially those that are nearest at hand and most urgent, is, however excellent may be the character of individuals in it, not a Church of Christ.

7. Resolved, That asceticism, guilty as it so clearly is of rendering the seamless garment [John xix. 23] of the Savior—of dividing the Church of Christ into mutually warring parties—of tearing asunder those who should esteem themselves to "be one," even as the Father and the Son "are one" [John xvii. 22]; guilty also as it so clearly is, of making the strongest and most successful appeals to the pride, bigotry, and intolerance of the heart; is, therefore, the mightiest foe on earth to truth and reform, to God and man; and is, in its features and spirit, one of the most marked children of its "father, the devil."

8. Whereas there is a prevailing delusion, that a Union Church requires a surrender of private judgment and a compromise of truth; and that but for this surrender and compromise, its contentions in such Church would be too great to be endured; Resolved, therefore, That the members of a Union or Gospel Church are not only free to entertain their respective views, both of doctrine and practice, but are bound to inculcate them on their brethren, and to rebuke the rejection of them; and resolved, further, that whilst, on the one hand, such freedom and faithfulness do not only not engender fatal strife, but do actually produce assimilation of character and that true peace which follows unity [James iii. 17], the barriers which such freedom erects do, on the other hand, by hindering the mutual access, and fomenting the mutual jealousies, of Christians, obstruct the progress of truth, and maintain an increasing disagreement of sentiments and opposition of spirit between those who are commanded to be "per-

footly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" [1st Cor. i. 10] and to merge their diversities of character even in oneness itself [John xvii. 21, 22, 23].

"9th. Resolved, That although, as is evident from the 10th chapter of Acts, there are occasions which justify the assembling of Christians together from different parts of a country, or from different parts of the world, to discuss and decide on questions of religious interest; nevertheless, for a local Church to refuse to come into an Association of Churches, is a wise precaution for preserving its independence and unity.

"10th. Whereas the mob which, in the year 1842, disgraced this community, and which is justly supposed to be the most fruitful cause of the disorders and lawlessness that have subsequently prevailed amongst us, was approved, rather than condemned, by the great majority of our professing Christians: Resolved, therefore, That this Church solemnly and loudly called on to declare that mob to have been, what every other mob is, a most flagrant outrage on human and divine laws—the rights of man and the rights of God.

"11th. Whereas there are in this community professing Christians, as well as other persons, who defend the use of intoxicating liquors as a drink; and who also defend the selling of grain to the brewer and distiller: Resolved, therefore, That this Church condemn such doings as unscriptural and wicked; and pronounce the selling of such liquors for a drink—the licensing of the sale of them for that purpose—the election of officers who license the sale of them for that purpose—the manufacture of such liquors for that purpose—and the furnishing of materials for the manufacture of them for that purpose—to be all parts, one of them as certainly as another, in that great and horrid work of death which has already destroyed the bodies and souls of millions of our countrymen.

"12th. Whereas there are professing Christians amongst us who patronize missionary and other societies, which solicit contributions from slaveholders: Resolved, therefore, that such professing Christians cannot be sincere, unless God has repealed his declaration—"I hate robbery for burnt-offering." [Isaiah lxi. 8.]

"13th. Whereas there are in this community professing Christians, as well as others, who vote to fill civil offices with slaveholders, and with persons who wield their official power in behalf of the most murderous and diabolical oppression of millions of God's poor: Resolved, therefore, That it is the duty of this Church to declare such voting to be very guilty treason toward the cause of humanity and the cause of God. And whereas the criminality of such voting is partially or entirely hidden, to many eyes, by plausible excuses—rich as, that there cannot be great sin in voting with a large party, in voting as thousands and millions vote—such as, that the person voted for, although on the side of the oppressor, will nevertheless, if elected, accomplish in his office more good than evil, and will wisely conform himself to the maxim which requires the doing of "the greatest good to the greatest number": Resolved, therefore, That God has left His admonitions—"Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." [Ex. xxiii. 2;] "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." [Prov. xi. 21]—for the very purpose of teaching men that they cannot hide themselves and escape from responsibility in a crowd; and that, in the light of these admonitions and of other Divine instructions, the whole sin of electing a tyrant, or an upholder of tyranny, rests on each of the votes, as well as on the sum of the votes, which elect him: And Resolved, further, That so long as the maxim should be, not "the greatest good of the greatest number," but "the greatest good of the whole number;" and so long as Christianity forbids our seeking the good even of a universe, at the expense of the least right of the least being in it—I cannot be proper to clothe a person with official power, when we foresee that it will be employed to wrong, though it may be but a single individual, and that, too, the barest individual among the millions subject to such power: And resolved, further, that if the consideration that he will exercise his official power justly toward others of his fellow-men, can authorize us to set up a tyrant over some of them,—then, by the like reasoning, can that tyrant derive from the justice of his dealings with some persons a license to be unjust toward others; then can the adulterer, the slaveholder, the murderer, be able to vindicate their adultery, slaveholding, and murder, if they can but prove that the harm which they have done to some of their fellow-beings, by these crimes, is overbalanced by the benefit which, in whatever ways, they have done to others of them. To illustrate and justify the positions of this resolution, we say, that whoever would estimate

the measure of his own sin against the tens of thousands of slaves in the district of Columbia and in the territory of Florida, for having voted to fill the office of President of the United States with a tyrant, who wields the power of that office to retain in slavery those tens of thousands, should hold out of view every other vote cast for that tyrant except his own, and make his own wholly responsible for the election; and should, also, hold out of view all, however good or bad, of the official acts and influences of that tyrant, save only such as bear upon those tens of thousands of slaves.

"14th. Whereas there is, even amongst professors of religion, a prevailing opinion that it is wrong to preach politics on the Sabbath: Resolved, That the correctness of this opinion turns wholly on the character of the politics which are preached; for whilst it is clearly wrong to preach anti-Bible or unrighteous politics on the Sabbath, or on any other day, nothing can be clearer than that no day is too holy to be used in preaching the politics which are inculcated in the Bible."

EDITORIAL REVIEW OF THE PRECEDING.

The creed and proceedings of the "Church of Peterboro" furnish us with another specimen of that spontaneous, independent, local action of the Christian brotherhood, so indispensable to any trust-worthy reformation in the church. Hitherto, a few clergymen, or some ecclesiastical body, either with or without the request of the brotherhood, or sometimes the founders of new sects, have been accustomed to draw up church creeds, and then, a whole sisterhood of churches have been expected to adopt, without scruple, letter by letter, and word for word, the same formulae and articles of faith! Here was often a seeming agreement rather than a real one. Had the brethren all spoken for themselves, the confusion of Babel might have been the result. Instead of the monotonous tunes that, to the reflecting mind, reveal any thing but evidence of united free thought.

But another era has dawned. Religious people come to discuss again, and so on, until there becomes among them some real agreement, in fact. Then, they put their sentiments on paper and the public have something from them, deserving the name of their creed; "that which is believed"—not something merely heard and submitted to. Thus was it at Peterboro—thus at Honooyo, and at other places, it may be presumed. Whether the creed be good or bad, right or wrong, it is worth something to have a veritable reality. Something that is, and not merely a something that seems to be. One problem for the disposal of the present age appears to be the exorcism of the ghosts of things—the dislodgment of mere shadows and shams, standing where things ought to be. If this step in the onward progress of the race can even begin to be taken in our day, the generation will not have occupied earth's surface its allotted period in vain. The history of succeeding and glorious centuries would have been prophetically compressed in the records of such an age. All honor then to every truthful publication of an actual religious creed.

A comparison of the Honooyo and Peterboro creeds, at first sight, would seem to present a striking contrast. The one prolix and minute, touching a great variety of topics; the other sententious and brief, confined wholly to the subject of church organization. The reader of the Peterboro creed might be tempted, in the first place, to think the framers had but one item of religious faith, and that that was the Divine Constitution of the Church. Strange position for those who had been suspected of leaving that article entirely out of their creed; and whose language, even now, very closely resembles that of those who abjure local church organization. An examination of the resolutions, particularly the 5th, reminds us that a church "Creed" (technically so called) cannot contain all the belief of the framers of the document. Presbyterians, we may charitably hope, believe many things not found in their printed "Confession of Faith." And Bishop Onderdonk himself is reported to have attended earnestly a number of sentiments not expressly contained in the immaculate Thirty-nine Articles of "the Church."

Of the brevity of the Peterboro Creed we make no complaint. It is somewhat longer, we believe, than the so-called and far famed Apostles' Creed, though it touches fewer topics. We said, in publishing the Honooyo Creed, that, on some accounts a comprehensive brevity was preferable to that more extended statement which might sometimes be useful. It is to be hoped that the Church is not done speaking its sense for the first time.

Our first criticism of the Peterboro document is, that its language in some places seems difficult to reconcile

with its language in other places, and with the facts it records.

All those were invited to "give their names to the Secretary of the meeting" who, in view of the doctrines and language of the Creed, believe themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro. This would seem to imply that all would be recognized as members of the church of Peterboro who believed themselves to be Christians, whatever the other members might think of them. But this would not agree with the right claimed by those members to recognize or not to recognize particular persons as Christians.

The Church of Peterboro disclaims the power of voting into or out of the church, but then, it claims the right to recognize those within its territorial bounds who afford satisfactory evidence that they are disciples and friends of Christ, and it claims likewise the right to dis-fellowship those whom it does not regard as Christians. In both these matters the church claims a right to do the same things that are done by others, whom it describes as voting persons into or out of the church. It only calls the acts by different names.

The members of the Church of Peterboro are understood to deny, as brother Smith does, that Christians can organize a church of Christ. Yet they assembled together, discussed the subject of church order, enrolled their names, adopted a creed, and elected their officers. In doing this, they did the same things that others do, when they undertake to organize a Christian church—the same things that, in all organized bodies are usually denominated the act of organization.

The Church of Peterboro holds itself bound to recognize those who give evidence of being disciples and friends of Christ, even in the case of those whose "doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may." Hence, at first sight, one might be led to suppose that none could be excluded from recognition who professed to be disciples and friends of Christ, let them believe or reject whatever doctrines they might, or maintain whatever practices they desired. But the meaning cannot be this! On a closer reading it appears that those who must be thus recognized, must give evidence that they are disciples or friends of Christ. But how is that evidence to be exhibited, while the persons in question, both in doctrine and practice, may be unscriptural and blameworthy, "to whatever extent it may?" Perhaps the meaning is, that those who are to be recognized, whose doctrines and practices, however unscriptural and blameworthy, are not, on the whole, so unscriptural and blameworthy as to destroy the evidence of their being disciples and friends of Christ. But the language would seem to imply that no amount or degree of unscriptural doctrine or blameworthy practice should be considered decisive evidence that a person is not a Christian. And the puzzle is increased when we find the writer (in reference to the anticipated action of a convention) using language like the following:

"I am afraid, not that you will say what is a Christian—for a Christian is one who loves God and man—and it is always safe to say so. But I am afraid, you will at least intimate that a man's doctrines or actions must be—and so, in order to his being a Christian."

On these points the Creed of the Church of Peterboro, we think, is couched in such terms, that the real meaning is not easily understood. And we cannot wonder at the fact that different persons, of good intelligence, on reading the document arrive at opposite conclusions in respect to its meaning, a circumstance quite unusual with those who read the writings of Gerrit Smith, so remarkable for their lucid and transparent style. We cannot avoid the impression that for once, the writer's views were not exactly clear and distinct in his own mind. Perhaps the fault may be in some of the words, or in the wrong views of the subject, but we know of no remedy without a discussion and free interchange of thought. POSITIONS DIFFICULT TO MAINTAIN.—"TERRITORIAL LIMITS."

There are some other points in respect to which the creed of the Church of Peterboro, if not directly inconsistent with itself, assumes positions which we do not see how they can with propriety maintain and reduce to

All the Christians "within their territorial limits" they claim as members of the "Church of Peterboro," whether they consent to membership or no; they are "bound to recognize" them "as members of it," "even in the case of those who do not consent to" their "thus recognizing them." Over these, it would seem, they are to "maintain strict church discipline," without their consent. By what forms shall such discipline proceed? Or how, without usurpation, shall it be done at all? No person suspected, or accused, should be condemned without a fair hearing. But

shall the accused be eld to give attendance before a body to which he does not hold himself amenable, and to which he does not acknowledge himself to belong? a church that he does not recognize? The Romish Church, we know, is accustomed to do this, in the case of Protestants who deny its authority; but the "Church of Peterboro," certainly, cannot intend to follow such an example.

And by what rule are the "territorial limits" of the church to be determined? "Peterboro and its vicinity" is a somewhat indefinite term. Does it include the neighboring settlement at Siliam? Does it include the whole town of Smithfield? If not, who shall run the parish bounds? By what authority? and by what rule? May the Christians at Siliam, or those living one or two miles west, or north, or south of Peterboro, assemble together, under their names, and choose officers [for we must not use the English word *organize*] without being guilty of a schism? If Peterboro should grow to the size of Albany, must all the Christians in Peterboro still constitute the Church of Peterboro? Must all the Christians in New York, Philadelphia, and London, do the same? If so, then some system of diocesan Episcopacy, or some Episcopal Presbyterianism, must be the inevitable result. Such, in fact, was the origin of Episcopacy at Rome; and the whole superstructure of the Romish hierarchy was the natural growth of that "little horn."

THE PRINCIPLE CARRIED OUT.

Again: If all the Christians in Peterboro must constitute the Church of Peterboro, then all the Christians in Smithfield must constitute the Church of Smithfield; and all the Christians in Madison County must constitute the Church of Madison County; and all the Christians in the State of New York must constitute the Church of the State of New York; and all the Christians in the United States must constitute the Church of the United States. [The territorial bounds of a church must correspond with the geographical or political divisions of a country. If the legislature of the State of New York should have made the town of Smithfield twice as large as it now is, then the "territorial limits" of the Church of Smithfield would have been twice as large as it is at present, and there could be no subdivision without schism.] The end of the ladder is reached by saying, as the "Christian Fathers" did say, that all the Christians in the world must constitute the "Holy Church Catholic or Universal."

Now for the operation of all this. If the Church of Peterboro may "maintain a strict church discipline" over all the Christians in Peterboro, without their consent, then the Church of Madison County may do the same; so may the Church of the State of New York, the Church of the United States, and the Church Universal. And from neither of them could there be any recession without schism. The conflicting jurisdictions of the village, town, county, state, national, and universal churches would need to be harmonized; and how could this be done without an ultimate court of appeal, or an universal authority—a concave of cardinals, a stated general council, or an universal bishop—a pope?

DANGERS TO BE AVOIDED.

No one will understand us as charging all these evils upon the good brethren at Peterboro, any more than we charge the Papacy upon those excellent "Fathers" who unwittingly laid the foundation of it. We have said, that we cannot be certain of understanding correctly the meaning of the Peterboro creed; but our best apprehension of its language involves principles the fruits of which have filled the pages of church history for sixteen centuries. In this nineteenth century we are exceedingly prone and exposed to commences, with fresh ardor, the downward race of the second and third—and to do so under the delusive idea of Christian reform. A perversion of the idea of universal Christian union, undoubtedly, laid the foundations of the Papal throne. After three centuries of Protestant sectarianism and interminable subdivisions, it is certainly not to be deplored that the idea of union and universal fraternity is beginning to gain favor; but it is not quite so encouraging that nearly all the present popular writers in favor of Christian union apparently imbibed the same opinions, and favor the same usages, by means of which the union of all Christians was formerly made the watchword and the stepping-stone of ecclesiastical power. Prof. Schmucker, for example, would cement a union of the existing evangelical sects, by erecting still another ecclesiastical body over them, a head of union between them. This idea, carried out, could end in nothing but a "catholic church." The late Luther Mack, at one time, was in favor of organizing [or administering, if we may not say organizing] county churches, to the manifest destruction of local church independency, in the single worshiping

congregation. And the claim of the Church of Peterboro, to "maintain a strict church discipline" over all the Christians within their "territorial limits" appears to involve the same principle. It is not we alone who understand that the principle assumed by the Church of Peterboro might be assumed likewise by the county, state, national, and universal churches. They themselves distinctly affirm, that "the church of Christ on earth is composed of all the Christians on earth; that the church of Christ in any nation is composed of all the Christians in such a nation; that the church of Christ in any smaller community, even down to a single family, is composed of all the Christians in such a community." And "thus believing," the Church of Peterboro claims a jurisdiction over all Christians within its "territorial limits"—apparently implying that national churches, and that the church universal, may do the same; just as we have supposed, in the preceding remarks.

A SOLUTION.

If asked to give our own exposition of the texts referred to in the Peterboro creed, as evidence that national churches as well as local churches, and one church universal, are recognized in the New Testament—we would say, in the first place, that on reference to them all, we find not one that makes the least allusion to the church of any nation, province, or district of country. The first series of texts referred to in the creed, and beginning with vol. 1: 18; Eph. 4: 15, 16, &c., relate exclusively to the Christian brotherhood in general, the only church universal of the New Testament. We find no allusion, anywhere, to any "bishops and deacons" of this church universal. We find nothing said of its maintaining a "strict Christian discipline" over the members within its "territorial limits;" and we conclude that this Christian church or brotherhood universal is, and should be, without any form of visible outward organization, either divine or human. This cannot be said of the local congregations or assemblies, also called churches, [plural,] which always had their bishops [elders] and deacons, and acted as organized bodies in the maintenance of a "strict Christian discipline."—See 1 Cor. 5.

The second and third series of texts referred to, in the Peterboro creed, relate exclusively to the Christians or churches of one local place, city, or family, who could personally assemble together. These were organized bodies, with officers, deliberating together and acting in concert. All questions of church order, church discipline, and church action, must relate exclusively to these.

Unless we will admit that the word *church*, when applied to the universal brotherhood of Christians, has somewhat different meaning from that of the word *church* when applied to a local assembly of Christians, we must arrive at one or the other of the following conclusions:—either that the church universal must have its bishop, and exercise an universal church discipline; or that the local church must have no bishop, and maintain no church discipline. The former idea is that of the Papacy—the latter is that of no visible church organization. The independency of the local churches, rejecting all other ecclesiastical arrangements, is the only tenable ground between the two.

Of this local church independency, the Church of Peterboro seems to entertain somewhat vague and inadequate views. Witness its 9th resolution. It seems here to be conceded, that a general council may "decide on questions of religious interest," as did the council of Jerusalem, whose inspired members could speak authoritatively, in the name of the Holy Ghost, though it was by no means a representative body delegated by the churches, and affords no precedent or warrant for such assemblages. "Nevertheless," says the resolution, "for a local church to refuse to join into an association of churches is a wise precaution, for the preservation of its independence and purity." We should as soon have thought of saying, that for a chaste bride to refuse to go up to the bed of a seducer was a wise precaution for the preservation of her virtue. The language is quite too faint to convey the just and proper impression. The moment a local church consents to such an arrangement, that moment her independency is sacrificed, not hazarded—that moment she renounces the authority of Jesus Christ, and espouses herself to the mystery of iniquity, standing where it ought not.

The texts cited in the Peterboro creed, and which bear upon the subject of local churches, seem to imply, indeed, that those churches consisted of all the friends of Christ in the specified locations. This, we doubt not, was the fact, though in some cases (as in Rom. 1: 7, and Eph. 1: 1) nothing is said distinctly of a church or

churches. The letter to Rome was addressed "to all that be at Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints," &c. The letter to Ephesus addresses "the saints which are at Ephesus, and the faithful in Christ Jesus." Whether these brethren at Rome and at Ephesus worshipped in one place or in two or three, (that is, whether they constituted one or more churches,) the language of the address would be equally proper. And when Paul wrote to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are a Philippi, with the bishops and deacons," he used long ago which would not have been improper had there been two or more churches, with their bishops and deacons, in that city. It is not probable, however, that at the time Paul wrote there were more Christians either at Rome, Ephesus, or Philippi, than could assemble together, and transact church business together, as the Christians at Corinth were exhorted to do. (1 Cor. 5.) And the reference to Phil. 4: 15, seems to determine the matter, that all the Christians in that city constituted one church or assembly. This was the only proper course, so long as they could conveniently assemble and act together, as an assembly or church. Whenever they became too numerous for this, they ought to have assembled in different places, and to have become sister churches, each independently transacting its own business. That the churches at Rome and elsewhere did not thus subdivide, in outward form of organization, and maintain congregational church independency, is only one among other proofs that the "mystery of iniquity" Paul speaks of, was already at work, and that Episcopacy, or the subjection of two or more worshiping congregations to the same bishop, was early preparing the way for the Prelacy and Papacy that followed, and almost as a matter of course.

We admit freely that all Christians who can conveniently worship together, ought to constitute one church, as was the case with the first Christians at Ephesus and at Rome. We admit too, that subdivisions of churches on other grounds than secession on account of apostasy, or amicable subdivisions, on the ground of local convenience, and the friendly establishment of sister churches, are forbidden by the spirit of unity among Christians. If all the Christians in Peterboro can assemble together, they ought to constitute but one church. But if this should not be the fact, there ought to be two or more churches in Peterboro instead of one church of Peterboro. The matter of "territorial limits" or other mode of demarcation would require mutual adjustment. Christian co-operation and action will be with mutual consent. And no one will be subjected to "strict church discipline" by a church with whom he has not consented to assemble. Individual rights are not to be overshadowed by the power of a "territorial" church. The "territorial" claims of the parish churches in Connecticut, to go no farther, afford instructive lessons in this direction.

DO CHRISTIANS ORGANIZE CHURCHES?

But it is time to examine the position of Bro. Smith, that Christians cannot organize Christian churches, because they are organized by Christ.

There are some who think that men cannot "make themselves a new heart," because the Holy Spirit renews the hearts of all who are renewed. They seem to think that the agency of God excludes the agency of the creature, and they infer that men are merely passive and not active in their own regeneration.

Just so Brother Smith and others seem to suppose that the agency of Christ in organizing Christian churches precludes the agency of Christians, and renders it absurd to say that Christians organize churches of Christ. But if it be true that Christians act freely under the divine influence, if the agency of God accedes, instead of superseding, the activity of the creature, if Christians are active and not passive in regeneration, if they are active and not passive in being created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works, if they are active and not passive in becoming members of the body of Christ, and members one of another, then they may be as properly exhorted to organize churches of Christ, as to "make themselves a new heart," or to perform any other duties or exercises any other affections which are the "fruit of the Spirit."

In support of his views, Bro. Smith is accustomed to cite those portions of Scripture in which Christ is represented as being the Head of the body, the church, and Christians are represented as being members of the body of Christ, and members of one another; also the declaration of Christ, that he is the vine, and his disciples the branches; and likewise the declaration that Christians, as lively stones, are built up, a spiritual house.—Such are the references in the "creed," (commencing Col. i. 18, &c.) and in repeating them, at the Syracuse Convention, Bro. Smith dwelt much on these figures, insisting that they furnished illustrations of his distinction between Christians organizing a church, and perform-

* "Catholic—Universal or general."—Arch. Webster.

* "The churches [plural] of Asia [not the church of Asia] are you?"—1 Cor. 16: 5.

ing the duties growing out of their divine organization. What an absurdity, said he, would it be for me to talk of organizing my body, when I only use my limbs in walking!

Bro. Smith's mistake, here, seems to be in his making these figures or similitudes apply to particulars which they were never designed to illustrate. "Parables," said one of the old divines, "do not run on all fours."—We must not expect the figure to furnish analogies at all the points entering into the description. The similitudes of the vine and the branches, the body, (or head,) and its members, the building and its stones, may well represent the intimate union of believers with Christ, their dependence upon him, and subjection to him, but certainly they could not have been intended to teach us that Christians have no more spontaneous choice or activity in becoming united to Christ and to one another, than the branches have in becoming connected with the vine, or the stone with the building, or the human limbs with the body and the head! Such an application of the figure would reduce Christians to mere stocks and stones. And it would ill accord with the language of exhortation not unfrequently connected with the use of these figures.—When Christ called himself the vine and his disciples the branches, it was for the purpose of admonishing them to abide in him, nor can we think it improper to urge all men to become branches of the true Vine. So when Paul, (in Eph. 4: 15, 16,) uses the figure of the head, the body, and the members, it was to show how, by "speaking the truth in love," men might "grow up into" (become members of) that living Head, and "make increase" "according to the effectual working, in the measure, of every part." And then, again, when the figure of the building is used; Christians are exhorted to "build themselves up in their most holy faith." In all this, activity and not passivity is connected with the figures. But if Christians are active and not passive, in becoming branches of the Vine, members of the Head, members of the body, stones of the building, then the parallel supposed by Brother Smith does not hold good, and his argument from those figures, falls to the ground.

The whole question may be determined by a consideration of the things wherein the organization of a church (by whomsoever organized) must consist. Christ instituted the Church—determined and directed that Churches should be organized. What is it to organize a church? Settle that question and we shall soon see whether Christians can, properly be said to organize a Christian Church.

Two answers may be given to this question—two only, that we can imagine. And Brother Smith, so far as the decision of the point in hand is concerned, may select either of the two, and we will show, in either case, that Christians do organize Christian churches.

FIRST. The act of church organization may be considered as an outward act—may be contemplated in respect to the form. A church of Christ may be said, in this sense, to be organized, whenever a number of faithful, spiritual Christians assemble together, agree to discharge the social duties they owe to one another, and to Christ their common Head,—the duties growing out of the relations they sustain to one another and to him. They compare views. They unite in some expression of their sentiments and purposes. They enrol their names—they elect their officers. They do what the brethren at Peterboro did, when they had the proceedings recorded in their circular. It is in accordance with the common and authorized use of language to call such proceedings the act of organizing—organization.

"Organization"—"The act of distributing into suitable divisions, and appointing the proper officers, as an army, or a government."—Nonah Webster.

"Organize"—"To distribute into suitable parts, and appoint proper officers, that the whole may act as one body."—Id.

In this sense of the terms "organize—organization," it cannot be denied that Christians may organize churches of Christ.

SECOND. But it may be said, (Brother Smith would say) that church organization does not consist in these outward, visible acts. The vital essence—the spiritual reality (we admit it) lies back of all this, and should precede such transactions as have been described. All such transactions, when not veritable expressions of a living, real union of Christians with each other, and with Christ, a union existing before such transactions took place, are but truthless affirmations of things which do not exist.

The spiritual essence, the vital principle of Church organization, lies, doubtless, in the spiritual union of Christians to Christ, and to one another. In sentiment, in affection, in purpose, in aim and endeavor, Christians are united together, because, in these particulars, they are united to Christ. They become thus united to him

by a living faith, a loving, confiding reliance upon him and trust in him. Here lies the essence of their union with him, and in virtue of this union they cannot but be united with each other, so far as they know each other, and understandingly recognize each other as Christians. That they should associate and labor together, as opportunity offers, is almost a matter of course. And thus the outward act of association becomes the natural expression of the spiritual union existing between them, though the "territorial" or other limits of their visible, outward association must, from the nature of the case, be a matter of mutual understanding and adjustment.

Be it so, then, if Brother Smith pleases, that the terms "organize" and "organization" belong properly and exclusively to the spiritual union of Christians, and not at all the outward acts by which this spiritual union is expressed. For the argument's sake, we will grant him all this. And yet it will remain strictly true that Christians organize churches of Christ. They voluntarily exercise faith in Christ, and thus voluntarily become united to him, and to all Christians. They voluntarily come into the presence of their fellow Christians; voluntarily contemplate the Christian graces they exhibit, and spontaneously recognize and love them as Christians. In these free, voluntary exercises, and acts of Christians, the living, spiritual essence of Christian church organization consists. To say that Christians cannot organize churches of Christ, is to say, in effect, that they cannot believe in Christ, cannot confide in him, cannot unite with him—cannot unite with each other.—But who will understandingly say this? Bro. Smith will not, we are quite sure. True, he may say, "We are not sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of our selves, but all our sufficiency is of God." But then, he will say too, "I can do all things through Christ, that strengtheneth me." The truth is, Christ organizes Christian churches by working in the hearts of Christians these graces of the Spirit, in which, and in their manifestations, church organization (both spiritual and visible) consists. In other words, Christ organizes churches by teaching and causing his disciples to organize them.

If Bro. Smith only means to say, that by their mere outward arrangements, without the spirit of Christian love and unity, men cannot organize churches of Christ, we agree with him. This is only saying that there cannot be Christian churches without Christians, a doctrine we are more and more solicitous, every day to maintain.

If he means to say that Christian church organization is not a mere conventional, artificial affair, a thing which men may mould and shape as they please—If, in opposition to this common fallacy he means to affirm that church organization, both in spirit and in form, is heaven originated, and that like its divine author, it exists necessarily, in the nature of things, and is immutably the same, in despite of all the devices and substitutes of men, here too, we are fully prepared to enter into his

But we cannot consent to use the language he has used. We could not do so without seeming to sanction what we deem to be manifestly wrong. To say that Christians cannot organize Christian churches is to use the language of those who mean, by the use of it, to justify their practice of "forsaking the assembling [organizing] themselves together, as the manner of some is." By the statement that men cannot organize churches of Christ, it is commonly intended to affirm that it is anti-Christian and arrogant for the Christians of a given locality to enrol their names, elect officers, call themselves a church of Christ, and "maintain strict church discipline." That the practice of the church of Peterboro indicates a different construction of their language, furnishes no good reason why such language should be used.

As the common use of such language apparently implies that in the matter of church organization, the local churches have no more right to choose officers and maintain church discipline than have national churches, and the church universal, the natural effect of a sure reaction would be, that the claims of organized national churches and of a church catholic, would come up anew, and be urged with fresh vigor.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

But our main objection to this language, in its connexion with other expressions already noticed in the Peterboro creed, and in the writings of Brother Smith, is its tendency to favor the notion, which so many are known, (from such various considerations) to indulge, that Christians, as members of churches, (and whole churches of course) are under slight obligations, if under any at all, to know or to inquire into, the spiritual condition, the religious principles, or the moral characters, of those with whom they are connected in church relations. That the

responsibility rests on others, not on themselves, if those who reject the fundamental truths of the gospel, or trample the most sacred obligations of morality under foot, are found in the same church organizations with themselves—That ecclesiastical connexion with the enemies of God and man, may not only be innocent, but laudable and praiseworthy.

If Christians cannot organize Christian churches, cannot vote members into the church or out of it, if all those are invited to enrol their names who "believe themselves to be members of the church,"—if those are to be held as church members who do not even consent to be considered as such, (after the manner of the church of England) and whose "doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blame-worthy, be it to what ever extent it may,"—if a Christian assembly is not to "intimate that a man's doctrines and practices must be thus and so, in order to his being a Christian"—if this language, as it would be commonly understood, should obtain general currency and favor, what limits would their be to church membership? What denials of Christian doctrine—what derelictions of duty—what abominations in practice, would be understood to be forfeitures of church membership? Or, under what circumstances, or for what reasons, might Christians, without schism, secede from churches, as Anti-Christian, and

And what shall we understand by "maintaining a strict church discipline?" and what by being "disfellowshipped" by the Peterboro church? Are the "disfellowshipped" persons still members of the church—entitled to its privileges, and to a participancy in its measures? What, or who shall exclude them? The Peterboro brethren can neither organize their church, nor vote into or out of it. And by what rule shall any persons be excluded? Or for what cause? Are all the pro-slavery professors of religion within the "territorial limits" of the church of Peterboro claimed by it members? If not, for what reason? Is it because they are not regarded as Christians? But if not, why not? Is it because of their position in regard to Slavery? The creed says they are bound to recognize those who are "blame-worthy, be it to whatever extent it may." And the following Resolution presented to the Syracuse Convention by Brother Smith, may bear a similar construction.

"Resolved, That to refuse to worship with a church, because it is sectarian, or pro-slavery, or otherwise sinful, rather than because it does not wear the features, nor exhibit the character, nor perform the office, nor deserve the name of church of Christ, is to be guilty of schism, and of doing violence to that mystical body of which the Savior is the Head and his friends the members."

This may be understood as saying that we should not separate from churches stained with these sins, unless we had come to the conclusion that their attachment to them was so settled as to destroy the evidence of their being Christians. This sentiment we should not oppose. But what is meant by saying that a church does not wear the features, nor exhibit the character, nor perform the office, nor deserve the name of a church of Christ? Are there no specifications in detail, that go to make up the aggregate? If to be sectarian and pro-slavery, and to adhere unmoveably to these and similar sins, be not to fail in wearing the features, exhibiting the character, performing the office, and deserving the name of churches of Christ, by what particulars shall such derelictions be described?

TESTS OF CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.

Or must we understand Bro. Smith to say, as he seems to say, that specifications and rules for forming our judgment of Christian character are the things that should be set aside? He would not have a Christian assembly "intimate that a man's doctrines or practices must be so and so, in order to his being a Christian."—What intelligible meaning, then, shall be attached to the idea that some are to be recognized, while others are not to be recognized as Christians? If the judgment is not to be made in view of some definite standard of Christian Character, if no specifications either of belief or of conduct, of principles or of practices, are to enter into our conceptions and definition, and if no evidences of the conformity or nonconformity of persons with that standard are to be enquired after, what is meant by saying that some, in distinction from others, "wear the features, exhibit the character, and perform the office of Christians, or churches of Christ?" Take away from men their principles and their practices, and what moral character, (good or evil) have they left?

* In the minutes handed us for publication, this Resolution was put down as adopted, and we published it accordingly. We are not quite certain whether it was adopted or not. It was read on near the close of the meeting, and if the convention understood its meaning, we cannot be certain that we do.

is by a mere glance into the countenances of men, bearing the tones of their voices, by marking the composition of their deportment, the solemnity or benignity of their carriage,—is it by their and or fearful countenances, their tears, their groans or their smiles, that we can tell whether they bear the image of Jesus Christ? Can we hope for the gift of such an intuitive insight into men's hearts as shall relieve us from the trouble of knowing the tree by its fruits? Or suppose we could look directly into men's hearts, as Christ looks into them, of what use would it be for us to look, would not regard the belief, the principles, the truths, the "doctrines" that are loved and cherished there?—Dissimulation itself, if we possessed it, could not relieve us from the necessity of judging the tree by its fruits.—This is God's own rule of decision. He will "bring every work into judgment." "He will judge men according to the deeds done in the body." "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned." A man's "doctrines and practices must be so and so, in order to his being a Christian," in his sight. Why not, then, in ours, especially, since no other intelligible definition of human character can be conceived, and since God himself, in his word, has unfolded to us the treasures of his wisdom, for the very object of telling us what "doctrines" a man must receive, and what "practices" a man must exhibit, in order to give evidence that he is a Christian,—has done this for the express purpose of helping us to "know the tree by its fruit" to try those who say they are apostles, and are not, and find them false—to "take heed and beware of men,"—to receive none who "bring another doctrine, lest we be partakers of their evil deeds?"

The distinction between the practice of voting members into or out of the churches, and the practice of "recognizing" or "disfellowshipping" those who may claim to be Christians, is a distinction that can avail Brother Smith nothing, in the matter now in hand. For, in order to recognize or to fellowship, we must either have some standard or rule of judging, or we must proceed without any standard or rule at all! We must either use or else disregard the standard and the rules laid down for our direction in the Bible. Will Brother Smith and the Church of Peterboro, as a matter of fact, "recognize" men as Christians *without* considering whether their "doctrines and practices are so and so?" without regard to their derelictions in these matters, "be it to whatever extent it may?" Difficult as we find it to understand them, we feel quite confident that they will do no such thing. Why, then, use language so calculated to confuse and mislead the reader?

[To test, by-the-by, the distinction just alluded to, and to gain, if it be possible, a clearer view of its import and bearing, we would ask, whether the Church of Peterboro intend to "recognize" as Christians, any whom they do not consider members of the church? Whether they mean to "disfellowship" any except those whom they consider as *not* being members of the church? To both these questions we will suppose they answer "No." For since all Christians, in their view, are members of the church, all members of the church, we suppose, must be Christians. To "recognize," then, is to "vote into the church," or at least to declare a belief that they are members. To "disfellowship" is to "vote out of the church," that is, to declare a belief that they are not church members. And this is all that we mean by voting into or out of the church. So that the distinction is merely in appearance, and not real. Nothing is gained by it, but a confusion of language.

This must be true, unless the Church of Peterboro claims among its members some whom it does not "recognize" as Christians; and may "disfellowship" some whom they consider still in the church. If this is their view, (and of this we are not quite certain,) then Christian character and fellowship, after all, with the Peterboro Church, is not the essence of church membership, and the forfeiture of Christian character does not exclude from the church. Their own delusions would forbid us to suppose that this is their view; and if it be not, their distinction between "voting into the church" and "recognizing"—between "voting out of the church" and "disfellowshipping," is a distinction without a difference.]

But whether we "vote into the church" or "recognize"—whether we "vote out of the church" or "disfellowship," we cannot act intelligently nor justly—we cannot give moral significance to our acts—we cannot follow reason or Scripture—we cannot "discern between the righteous and the wicked," unless we have some standard of principle and practice, by which to test the characters of men.

THE BIBLE STANDARD.

Such a standard is found in the Bible. According to that standard, "a Christian is one who loves God and

man, and it is always safe to say so." This Brother Smith understands. But then he does not think it safe to say "that a man's doctrines and practices must be so and so, in order to his being a Christian." [And this, perhaps, may explain his unwillingness that the Convention at Syracuse should so distinctly charge upon the theological opponents of Abolition, an affinity with the teachers of Universalism.]

But must not a man's "doctrines and practices be so and so, in order to his" "loving God and man?" Can he love God without "believing that he is, and that he is the rewarder of such, (and such only,) as diligently seek him?" [Two important doctrines of theology to begin with!] Can a man love his brother, in the Scriptural sense of that term, without believing in the immortal nature and high dignity of man, as formed in the image of his Maker? Can he regard human rights, without believing the doctrine that affirms them? If not, then a man's "doctrines must be thus and so, in order to his" loving his fellow-man or his Maker. To suppose otherwise would be to suppose that his love was without intelligence and without motive—that is to say, without moral character. To act without regard to correct doctrine, would be to act without regard to correct principle—to be unprincipled; for principle and doctrine are only two words to express the same thing. A true doctrine in theology is always a binding rule of ethics—a moving-spring of spiritual affection. If we could have the affection or the action without a perception of the doctrine, (which is impossible,) it would be unintentional action, unmeaning affection—nothing worth! All the spiritual life even of love itself is suspended upon the perception the soul has of the worthiness of the object loved. But this is the perception of a doctrine—a truth. "Sanctify them through thy truth—thy word is truth."

And must not a man's "practices be so and so, in order to his" loving God and man? "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor." A man's love to his neighbor is shown only by his "practices." "Show me thy (love to God and man) without thy (practices)—if thou canst; and I will show thee my (love to God and man) by my 'practices'!" How also can any man show them? Or how can any man "recognize" my "love to God and man" unless he finds that my "practices are thus and so?"

The Bible abounds much in statements of what the "doctrines and practices" of men must be "in order to their being Christians."—And "it is always safe" to repeat those statements, and to use them, in judging of our own characters and the characters of others—in deciding whom we shall "fellowship" and "disfellowship" as Christians.

"The righteous considereth the cause of the poor, but the wicked regardeth not to know it." "Be not deceived (with appearances and professions.) He that doeth righteousness is righteous." "Inasmuch as ye do it unto one of the least of these, ye do it unto me."

"He that is of Christ, heareth Christ's words." "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh."—"even denying the Lord that bought them, and so bringing upon themselves swift destruction." "Whoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son."

We should have to transcribe a large portion, and a most valuable portion of the Scriptures, in order to present a synopsis of the "doctrines" and "practices" which are there enumerated as necessary to be believed and to be exhibited, in order to a man's being a Christian.

The admonitions to "beware of false prophets," to "take heed and beware of men," to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them," to "put away from among ourselves wicked persons," to "come out from" the Babylon of a corrupt church, lest we "partake of her sins and receive of her plagues"—these, and similar warnings of Scripture, give weight and emphasis to the divine distinctions between the righteous and the wicked, which are given for our guidance.

UNION CHURCHES—WANTS OF THE TIMES.

And the doctrine of Christian union, and church unity, so far from modifying or pointing down these pointed admonitions of Scripture, only give them increasing solemnity and weight. Are we bound to "recognize" all Christians—to "disfellowship" false professors of religion? Then it is high time to study the Bible definition of a Christian—the Bible directory for detecting counterfeit—the Bible specifications of the "doctrines and the practices" men must hold and exhibit, in order to be Christians.

Alas for us, in times like the present, if we cannot learn to give prominence to divine directions like these! How else shall we "put a difference between the clean and the unclean?" How else can we restrain and "maintain church discipline?" How else can we honor the divine institution of the church, or exhibit and make manifest the distinction between the church and the world?

God has so constituted men, that they cannot help forming some judgment of the character of their fellows. How important that that judgment should be in accordance with the truth, and regulated by the divine standard! How vastly important that the churches should hold up that standard—extend or withhold their "recognition" and "fellowship" in conformity with that standard, and thus become "lights of the world!"

The common sense implanted in the breasts of men impel them commonly, to look to the "practices" of men in order to decide whether they are or are not Christians, or else they cannot forbear to infer that the distinctions between Christians and men of the world, is imaginary, or of little worth. This latter impression has been extensively made by the fact that the eminent churches of reformation, with their eyes almost exclusively on the petty distinctions they have set up as barriers to divide them from each other, have almost wholly lost sight of the distinctions of character most insisted on, in the scriptures. Hence the standard in the churches has become lower than in the community at large! Thousands are received as Christians whom the community, (in view of their "practices") cannot regard, and ought not to regard even as honest men! Thus religion has sunk into contempt.

How lamentable, if, at such a time the new churches discarding sectarianism, should, through another road run into the same practical error, and "recognize" men as Christians by their practices "blame worthy to whatever extent they may!" So far as the moral purification of the church is concerned, little would be gained. What we regret is, that the language and the theories of Brother Smith, and of the "Church of Peterboro" should seem to countenance a vague and indiscriminate Catholicism, that (equally with a narrow sectarianism) overlooks or does not turn to practical account the divine discriminations between good and bad men.

Br. Smith has had his eye much on the evils of "party" in the church. He has seen the spirit of sect despoiling the church of her power, and opening upon her the flood gates of impurity and sin. To have churches without party lines and sectarian interests and rivalries, this surely the object will not be reached, by a Catholicism that would embrace the same impure elements that the old churches of sectarianism contain. Br. Smith cannot suppose (can he) that by scooping into his "Church of Peterboro" even without their consent all the professors of religion within its "territorial limits" be their "practices blame worthy to whatever extent they may" (even to the cherished sin of voting for the Pharos of the times) he can by the mere process of superceding the churches of the sects, with their rivalries and the corruptions growing out of them, transmute all the base metal they contain into gold—and make good Christians out of men bent on their political idols.—That the sanity of calling them church members, instead of coming out from among them, will allure them over to the correct ground. Such a philosopher's stone we do not expect to discover even in an anti-sectarian church. Such churches are needed, to be sure, and chiefly because no other churches can be expected to elevate and to honor the Bible standard of church membership—the standard of Christian character—a Christian character defined by a loving and obedient reception of the CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES, as the nutriment and the law of spiritual life, the directory and the incentive to the CHRISTIAN PRACTICES wherein true godliness consists.

But if these high spiritual and moral ends are to be wrecked in the beginning by theories of church organization which exclude nobody from the church who think themselves suitable members, the means employed are divested of their value. The union churches that could not eject the workers of iniquity, through fear of being sectarian would do little more for the revival of a pure Christianity than the churches who could not exclude the same class of members, through fear that it might injure their sect.

Of the "Church of Peterboro" we hope better things though we thus speak. The happy inconsistencies between their language and their doings, leads us to hope much of them. Perhaps they may be wholly free from all those latitudinarian tendencies that we have described, and that, we think, some of their expressions favor.—But that is no good reason why their language should pass without comment. Our columns, we are persua-

ded, could not be better filled by any thing we could write, than with cautions against those mistaken views of church organization and order which we have described. Whether we rightly understand the Peterboro document or not, we think we do not misunderstand the direction in which the rising *anti-sectarian feeling* of the country is, in many instances, inclined to float—the direction in which not a few prominent writers against sectarianism, have guided it. That direction we think is fraught with much danger. And of course we felt it a duty to express freely our views.

Christian Investigator.

HONEYOYE, MARCH, 1844.

INFORMATION TRACTS.—To meet the growing wants of the brethren engaged in the new enterprise of church reformation, we propose to publish from time to time, and as there may be a demand for them, a series of *cheap tracts* for distribution by the friends of the cause. The Anti-Slavery enterprise itself, to look no further, requires tracts upon the religious and ecclesiastical bearings of that subject, which the *political* Anti-Slavery associations can hardly be expected to furnish. The whole subject of church discipline, church order, and ecclesiastical authority requires, for Anti-Slavery purposes as well as for the intrinsic importance of those subjects, to be fully spread out before the religious community, in a manner which none of the present religious denominations can be expected to do.

Beyond and above all this, the claims of a truly *spiritual and living Christianity*, alike Scriptural and rational, practical and evangelical, require to be set forth in earnest and direct appeals to individuals, professors of religion and others, and a *personal religion* urged upon each and upon all, that, when lovingly embraced, shall be adequate to the social wants of man on the earth, the regeneration of human society, as well as the felicity of the individual in a future state—so that the *divine will may be done on earth, as it is done in heaven*. The lamentable defects of religious teaching and of religious literature, in this direction, are beginning to be extensively felt as well as detected. Some little beginning we may hope to make in this comparatively unoccupied field. And no department of ethical, philanthropic, or reformatory inquiry should be deemed foreign to the plan of such a series of tracts, if the enterprise of publishing them be adequately sustained.

We begin the series of tracts, by a re-publication of President Green's discourse, "INQUIRY AND A MEETING." Our second tract will bear the title, "ARE YOU A CHRISTIAN?"

CONSISTENCY OF SECTARIANISM.

A writer under the signature of L. N. H. (in the Baptist Register of Dec. 29) is horrified at the sentiment of the Christian Investigator, that incorrigibly *pro-slavery*, or pretendedly neutral churches, are to be abandoned, as anti-Christian.

Very evidently, all *professedly* Christian churches are either *Christian* or *anti-Christian*. There is no "half-way covenant," middle ground; or if there were such a spot, the Baptist Register, of the same date, could tell us that the foot-prints of the Savior are not to be found there.

Well, then, let the obnoxious sentiment of the Christian Investigator be so modified as to affirm, that *Pedo-Baptist*, or apparently neutral churches, are anti-Christian, and should be forthwith abandoned; and "L. N. H." would undoubtedly be ready to subscribe to the sentiment, then! That is the ground his sect occupies. That is the "Jerusalem" whose "peace" he would seek, at all hazards and at all sacrifices. Is it not so? What churches except Baptist churches will L. N. H. recognize, and fellowship and commune with, as *Christian*? It troubles him much that "Mr. Goodell can make no exception in favor of that noble band" of Puritan pil-

grims, who for so "many years embodied in themselves the Congregational denomination of our country—aye, and the religion of New England!" And all this "un-charitableness" for no other cause than their *pro-slavery* character. But does L. N. H. fellowship those same Congregational churches of New England? Will he admit them to be Christian churches? Not he. But then, it is not on the ground of their *pro-slavery* character. Oh, no! (For then must he needs withdraw fellowship from the Baptist churches at the South, and perhaps at the North.) But he cannot call them Christian churches, because they do not baptize by immersion, and (worse than all the rest) they sprinkle their children! For this cause he would entreat their members to abandon them! And this is the difference between his "come-out-ism" and ours! What says L. N. H. to the come-out-ism of the Baptists who separated from the other English Independents in 1608? And what says he of the "come-out-ism" of "Roger Williams," whose sepulchre he garnishes for becoming "an exile and a wanderer" for the privilege of "come-out-ism"—sometimes setting up a church of which himself and wife were the sole members?

Not a single argument or consideration is urged by L. N. H. against our positions, that could not be wielded by a Roman Catholic or by a *Pedo-Baptist* against L. N. H., with equal effect. The light of the gospel and the blessings of salvation have come down to L. N. H. through the instrumentality of the churches he will not recognize as Christian! "Bibles, tracts, self-sacrificing missionaries," "revivals of religion"—have not all these been witnessed in the *Pedo-Baptist* churches?—nay, in the Roman church herself! Why then will not L. N. H. extend to them the right hand of his Christian fellowship? Why secede from them? Many pious members of the Baptist churches trace their conversion to the influences exerted upon them by members of the *Pedo-Baptist* churches in which they themselves first made a profession of religion. But this furnishes no good reason, in the mind of L. N. H., why the process of *Baptist* "come-out-ism," so perseveringly pried among the "Congregationalist denomination" should not go on—for, mark! it is the *sprinkling*, not the *stealing*, of infants, that has polluted those churches in his sight!

And then, what a "hypocrite" Martin Luther must have been, (if converted in the Roman Catholic church,) to "come out" so bitterly against his "corrupt mother!" Martin Luther ought to have known, that Christians are born of holy "mother Church," not of the HOLY SPIRIT!

And "Who is this that judgeth another's servants?" What right had Luther and Calvin—what right had the English Dissenters, to judge the clergy of their times by "their fruits?" And how manifestly was "satan divided against himself," if God (in spite of him) converted and saved any persons connected with anti-Christian organizations! How evident, too, (by the logic of L. N. H.) that the Roman church must be a true church! because, if it were not so, then good Thomas a Kempis, Fenelon, and Bourdaloue must have been but the tools of anti-Christ, if laboring, as they doubtless did, to build up their church. And how manifest, that all the piety in the Roman church is to be traced to her, just as L. N. H. traces the connexion of "cause" and "effect" in other churches.

And since the Editor of the Christian Investigator is to be convicted of "monomania," for the simple fact that he does not discover Christian character in the *pro-slavery* organizations of England and America (founded on "come-out-ism") from 1517 to 1774, (convicted without stopping to inquire after the facts of the case,) how plain is it, that all Protestants are likewise, by the same summary process, to be convicted of the "monomania of come-out-ism," because they discover no organized Christian churches, in the arrangements of the Romanists, for a thousand years previous to 1517!

"If any of the readers of the Baptist Register are infected with the *monomania of come-out-ism*," (i. e., of Protestantism,) the logic of L. N. H., if they follow it, will carry them back to the "mother church," with a directness and rapidity that Dr. Pusey himself never dreamed of.

After deprecating "fire-brands, arrows, and death," L. N. H. closes his article thus:

"Would to God we could see the entire Christian church bearing its decided testimony against American slavery—against oppression everywhere, and in all its forms. But let us exercise a spirit of forbearance and love. Our brethren will yet see their error; and if in *meekness* they are instructed and labored with, will put away this sin. May God save us from treating them with bitterness, and hurling at them harsh denunciations; and until we come to see eye to eye, and to employ the same means to accomplish this desirable end, let us forbear one another in love."

Very charitable and forbearing, to be sure. But suppose the writer should write it over again, substituting the words "infant sprinkling" instead of "American slavery and oppression;" would the Baptist Register publish his article then? Nay, would he himself wish it to be published over the inverted initials of his own name, then? To do so, would be to give up that "*monomania of come-out-ism*" in which, as a Baptist minister, he has so long labored. He might then be prepared to labor *solely* in the cause of that common Christianity which insists so much on showing mercy to the poor.

In order to get disentangled from the labyrinth of self-contradictions in which L. N. H. has involved himself, he should address himself to the work of finding the right answers to these few questions:

1. Are there any causes for which a Christian may raise the standard of secession from the church in which he has been educated, and of which he has been a member?
2. If so, what are those causes?
3. In what does true religion consist?
4. In what does a true church consist?

If, in the examination of these questions, we shall arrive at the discovery, that pure religion and undefiled, before God and the Father, is *this*: to visit the widows and fatherless in their affliction, and to keep unspotted from the world;—that a true church is an assembly of persons controlled by such a religion;—that a *false* church is one of an opposite character; and that Christians should "come out and be separate" from false churches—why then L. N. H. will be able to exchange the "come-out-ism" of a schismatic, and hence *pro-slavery* sect, for the Protestantism of an evangelical Christianity. Till then he will probably continue to occupy a position of religious fraternity with men guilty of "the highest kind of theft," and practically sympathizing with that beautiful specimen of sectarianism who recently inquired, in sober earnest, through the columns of this same Baptist Register, whether it could possibly be supposed that slave-holding, (i. e., infant *stealing*), were as great a sin as infant *sprinkling*!

THE NEW YORK EVANGELIST, in its incessant warfare against *Episcopacy*, is impelled to circulate facts and arguments equally subversive of *Presbyterianism*, and indeed of the whole existing machinery of an organized, self-perpetuated *clerical caste*. Look at the position of Dr. Potts, in his controversy with Dr. Wainwright. Ponder the extracts made by the latter, from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Dr. Mason, &c. Then listen to the doctrines advanced by Albert Barnes, and say, if you can, how Romanism and Episcopacy are to be repelled, without coming on to the ground occupied by the "Christian Investigator," on the subject of church order and clerical claims.

A Review of the controversy between Drs. Potts and Wainwright, with copious extracts, is in preparation for our columns.

CHURCH IN UTICA.

After our remarks on the circular of the Church of Peterboro were put into the hands of the printer, we received the following from "the Church of Christ of Utica." It contains features apparently the same as those of the Church of Peterboro, on which we have already given our views. What we then said concerning the tendency of *Episcopacy*—of the claim that all the Christians "in one place" (however extensive or populous) must constitute one church, seems confirmed by the 3d article of the Utica Church. The brethren there appear to have understood, that the principle laid down in their first article required them to provide for the future subdivision (if necessary) of the church—the one church, as having "different places of meeting." And to "each one of these assemblies" is accorded the name of a church, in an accommodated sense. Very evidently, too, in a subordinate sense; for still the original mother church, the "Church of Christ of Utica," is to remain the same one church, in the full and proper sense, with its bishop (pastor) and deacons, or other officers, over the "different places of meeting"—is it not? If this is not the meaning, what is it? But if it is, does it not involve a departure from the strict independence of the local church, which the brethren, in their 5th article, have properly denominated "an approximation to Popery?" So it seems to us, if by the "local church" is meant the Christians meeting in one place. And if this is not the "local church," what is it? Shall we call "the Church of Christ of Utica" the "local church" when it shall have become subdivided, at some future day, into a dozen or an hundred "places of meeting," if the reformed religion prevails there, and if the city becomes populous enough? And why may not all the Christians in the county of Oneida, or in the State of New York, or in the United States, or in the whole world, claim to be "the Church of Christ," and then, "subdividing" under the third article, and recognizing the "different places of meeting" as "churches in an accommodated (a subordinate) sense," take "disciplinary steps" over the entire membership, under one [universal or provincial] bishop? Very much have we mistaken the nature and the history of *Episcopacy*, if this be not the very thing, and the precise process of its incubation. It alters not the fact, that the character and habits of the brood are not suspected till a long time after they are hatched. The Roman Christians of the first century had no more intention or fear of establishing *Episcopacy*, or of "departing from the strict independency of the local church," than the Utica brethren have now. Their lost liberties were not missed for centuries. And the language of the Utica brethren is remarkably identical with that which *Episcopalian* have always held. Press a high churchman (English or American) with the fact that local assemblies, in primitive times, were called churches, and what is the reply? It is this: "We, too, have our parochial churches—our St. Thomas' and St. Paul's. But the word church is to be understood 'in a subordinate, an accommodated sense.'" Happily, the parochial "subdivisions" of "the Church of Christ of Utica" are yet in the future tense; and so we will not call it a *diocese*, at present.

Sentiments of the Church of Christ of Utica with respect to Church Order.

1. The Church of Christ in any place consists of all the Christians of the place. Thus we read in Scripture—"The Church at Jerusalem," "the Church at Antioch," "the Church at Corinth," &c. Consequently there cannot, from the nature of the case, be but one Church in one place.
2. Every person regenerated by the Spirit of God is, by virtue of such regeneration, constituted a member of the Church, and no act of the Church can make him more so.
3. The church of any place may be subdivided and have different places of meeting, when the numbers are more than can meet in one place.

In such cases each one of these assemblies may, in an accommodated sense, be called a Church.

4. Consequently, we recognize all the Christians regularly worshipping in our place of meeting as members of this Church.

5. Every departure from the strict independency of the local church is an approximation to popery.

6. The members of a Church, including all its officers from its pastor downward, are all equal brethren, with equal rights and privileges.

7. The pastor of a church is constituted so by his God-given qualifications and the voluntary consent of his brethren, and his only power consists of the influence growing out of his abilities and as "an example to the flock."

8. An independent clerical order is a breach of Christian unity and equality, without warrant from the Scriptures, and involves the essential elements of Popery.

9. The Bible is an inspired record of the will of God, and is wholly sufficient for faith and practice, and is therefore the only authoritative standard of doctrine, duty, church order and discipline.

10. This Church holds, that connection with pro-slavery organizations, either political or ecclesiastical, as *prima facie* evidence of corrupt Christian character, and therefore we will not fellowship as Christians any persons holding connection with such organizations, except in case where persons are in unavoidable ignorance of the character of such bodies, or may be taking such disciplinary steps for their reformation, as the Scriptures direct.

We found, the other day, among some old papers of little consequence, a handbill that seemed worth while to preserve. On examination we recognize in it the production of one of the most talented as well as rigidly orthodox Congregational ministers in New England. It must have been a dozen or fifteen years ago that he put it into our hands. The occasion, if we remember correctly, that led to the draft of such a document, was the efforts then making, in one of the principal towns on the seaboard, to unite in one religious church and congregation the people of color, who had been educated in the different sects. Such an enterprise required the draft of a church creed at once orthodox and liberal. The following was accordingly proposed:

ORTHODOXY AND LIBERALITY.

THE PROBLEM.

"The greatest obstacle in the way of a place of public worship on this plan lies in the distinctions of sects. You cannot have a prosperous and permanent establishment of this sort, unless your clergyman and his congregation be of some one denomination in particular. In order that you may have a consolidated religious society, it is necessary that the sacraments should be regularly administered. Here is a difficulty, that should be well considered, before any attempts to establish a society of this sort are made. It is most devoutly to be wished, that some method may be devised for obviating it."—*Hackelder.*

SOLUTION.

The wisdom and the power of God in the Gospel are, doubtless, sufficient to obviate any difficulty, which the imperfection of man may have brought into existence.

The Profession and Covenant of a Pacific Christian Church.

The members of the Religious Society which is formed in _____ and called _____, moved and guided, as they hope and believe, by the Spirit and word of God, approve and adopt, as the foundation of their union and fellowship, and as the expression of their sentiments and obligations, the following profession and covenant.

I.

We believe and acknowledge the existence of the one only living and true God, who possesses in his nature, every divine property, and in his character every natural and moral perfection; who is the Creator, Preserver, Governor and Proprietor of all creatures and all things; and the only

proper object of supreme reverence, affection, confidence and enjoyment to his rational creatures.

II.

We believe and acknowledge the perfection, glory and beauty of the law, which requires and binds rational beings to be constantly and perfectly holy; and also the rectitude and benevolence of the Supreme Being, in his sanction of this law, by his infinite authority and the righteous penalty of his most holy displeasure.

III.

We believe and acknowledge ourselves to be free, moral agents; proper subjects of the divine government, and justly bound, by our rational existence and mental powers, as well as by our relations and obligations to our Creator and our fellow-creatures, to feel and express true and supreme love to God and holy and impartial affection to man.

IV.

We believe and acknowledge our voluntary and unreasonable and criminal departure from God and the law of love, in our thoughts and feelings, in our words and actions; and the consequent necessity of divine instruction, influence and mercy for the true knowledge and performance of our duty, and the bestowment of repentance, forgiveness and salvation.

V.

We believe and acknowledge the Holy Scriptures, which are contained in the Bible, to be the word of God; which came no, by the will of man, but by holy men of God, who spake and wrote, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and that they are, as means, under the influence and instruction of the Holy Spirit, a perfect and complete rule of doctrine and practice.

VI.

We do, therefore, receive the Holy Scriptures for our instruction, guidance and comfort in this present life; and we promise and covenant, in the presence of God, angels and men, to walk according to the light of divine truth, as God, by his Word, Spirit and Providence, shall teach and show us his will and our duty.

VII.

And now, professing repentance towards God and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ, we choose and receive the Almighty, the ever Blessed and ever Gracious *Jehovah*, as he reveals himself in the Gospel, *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, to be our God and Father, our Redeemer and Saviour, our Sanctifier and Comforter: and we mutually promise and covenant to love and serve God and the Lord Jesus Christ, through the power and grace of the Holy Spirit, by a humble and faithful obedience to the divine requirements in our conduct towards God and man; and we also promise and covenant to maintain the true knowledge and pure worship of God in the ordinances and discipline of the Gospel, and by holy affection, brotherly forbearance and Christian kindness towards all the members of this church and all the churches and children of our God and Father through our Lord Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit.

Now unto Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all, that we ask, or think, according to the power, that worketh in us; unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages world without end. For of him and through him and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen. ALLELUIA! FOR THE LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT REIGNETH.

If such a confession of faith and church covenant would do for a church of colored Christians, why not for a church of white Christians? or, at least, for Abolitionists, who rank with people of color? We do not remember whether those for whom this paper was intended made any use of it, though we think the ground was ultimately occupied by the Free Will Baptist sect.

But it is interesting to see how, on this subject of Christian union, not a few pious and judicious Christians and ministers, long ago, recommended distinctly the usage now in process of being introduced. It is quite remarkable that such a document, at that early day, and coming from such a quarter, should have been entirely silent on the subject of outward ordinances and observances.

A PUZZLE.—A SOLILOQUY.

How shall I be a popular Preacher? A difficult problem, that, in these days! To be popular, a preacher must be eloquent, for without eloquence, the pith of John, and the zeal and knowledge and integrity of Paul would make no preacher popular, now.

But how shall I be eloquent? To bark eloquently, at scare crows, for any length of time, is a task that very few men have a talent for, especially if they be men of common sense. To aim a shaft at any thing except scare crows, would be to grapple with some of the actual sins of the people, as they really exist. To do this would be becoming a fanatic—a disorganizer—a disturber of the peace of the Churches! A worse heresy than the lack of eloquence itself.

And then, the task of contriving and dressing up these same scare-crows—to be shot at, from the pulpit, as an eloquent preacher, must needs shoot. How shall the effigy of straw be made to resemble a reality, so much as to keep the preacher and his audience in countenance while he is shooting at it; without creating the suspicion that it is in very deed, some one of the monstrous unrightly realities that the fanatics are forever tilting at.—But the breath of such a suspicion would brand a preacher as a fanatic, at once.

To be eloquent, a preacher must moreover, contrive to be in earnest, about something: at any rate he must appear to be, or his attempted eloquence will flag. But the moment he begins to be in earnest, that moment he falls under suspicion of fanaticism, the sin of all sins, in a preacher.

There was my class-mate, the Rev. Mr. P.— who was settled in the city of U—, a few years since.— Surely Mr. P.— was the very model of a popular preacher, if any man could be. He had the reputation of being exceedingly eloquent. He was a prudent man, withal, and prudence, equally with eloquence, (rarely united) is indispensable to the preacher that would be popular. Yet with both of them, Mr. P.— failed to succeed! The moment he began to be pointed enough to be interesting, and earnest enough to be eloquent, that moment his remarks were thought personal, and he was suspected of an inclination to abolitionism! 'Twas even hinted there might be danger of his exchanging with R. v. Mr. G.— of the neighboring village of W—, (a sufficiently eloquent preacher by the bye—but so imprudent as to have identified himself with "the niggers!") To quell these alarms in his congregation, Mr. P.— very prudently lowered the tone of his preaching, till all were satisfied that the good man had meant nothing, in particular, in his preaching, only to be eloquent, and so the congregation became quiet. But, who would have thought it? In two or three years it was whispered by lawyer—and judge—, that Mr. P. was not sufficiently interesting—lacked variety—exhibited no originality—was not eloquent! And rumor has it, that the pulpit of Mr. P.— is about to become vacant again.

Alas! who shall succeed, if Mr. P.— could not? *How shall I be a popular preacher?*

FURTHER EVIDENCE.—If any further evidence is needed to prove that the present position of the leading ecclesiastical and literary influences in the now slaveholding States, is decidedly a pro-slavery position, the columns of the periodical press furnish abundant and continuous items of confirmatory intelligence. Scarcely a month passes without bringing, along with its other

records of passing events, an item like the following, which we clip from the Vermont Voice of Freedom:

C. M. CLAY AND DR. JUNKIN.—While Cassius M. Clay, a slaveholder of Kentucky, was hurling his burning anathemas against the institution of slavery, and denouncing it in the name of God and man, a person in one of the free States, (Dr. Junkin, President of Miami University, the only State Literary Institution in Ohio) was writing his Bible argument to prove, that slavery was sanctioned by the God of love! The pamphlet is before us. Eighty pages, by a Northern college president, to prove that to be right which all the world acknowledges to be wrong! Eight hours were spent in the delivery of this discourse "in proof," according to its title, "of the position, that believing nations ought to be honored and obeyed by their own servants, and tolerated in, not excommunicated from, the church of God!" Dr. J. is a Colonizationist.

D'AUBIGNE'S PROTESTANT REFORMATION.—We are delighted to find this truly invaluable work so extensively and eagerly read. It is now to be had, complete in 482 pages, at the low price of fifty cents, of SAOZ & BROTHER, ROCHESTER.* Every friend of church reform should have a copy. It abounds in facts and principles of the highest importance at the present time. The good providence of God is manifest in the wide diffusion of such a work at such a crisis.

* Sold also by Haxon & Miles, New York; James M. Campbell, (publisher), Philadelphia; Robinson & Jones, Cincinnati, &c.

"THE APOSTLES' CREED."

There is little reason to think that the creed commonly known by this name was ever written or seen by any one of the twelve Apostles. It bears marks, however, of a venerable antiquity, and from its comprehensive brevity and simplicity, deserves the attention of Christians at the present time.

Having often alluded to it, and presuming it is not familiar to all our readers, nor in all cases, readily at hand, we have given it a place.

For above two hundred years, after the death of the Apostles, it is said, his creed was almost the only one in common use. And yet it says nothing of the Lord's Supper, of Baptism, of the Sabbath, of the Christian Ministry, or Church Government, important as those topics doubtless are, in their place. What if our newly gathered churches in this region should content themselves with the Apostle's Creed? Would it be considered as "modern innovation?" Or would its remarkable omissions be noticed as auspicious indications of heresy, or in proof that the churches were left "at loose ends?"

THE CREED.

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, the Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried. The third day he rose from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic (or universal) church; the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen."

TITLES.

The Editor respectfully requests that those who have occasion to write or print his name, would not append to it any title, particularly those of Esquire or Reverend—the former of which, does not belong to him, and the latter never belonged to any man. Ministers to whom our paper is addressed will please be assured that we intend no disrespect to them or to their high calling, when we omit, (as we intend to do) the use of a title which reflecting men in general are beginning to consider improper.

E. SHEPARD, BOOK & JOB PRINTER, Rochester.

PARAPHRASE OF THE FIRST PSALM.

Blest is the man that counsels not,
Nor walks with godless men;
Nor bends his steps, nor shapes his course,
To plans of selfish gain.

With earth-born maxims, aims and ends,
He holds no compromise,
Upward his steady foot ascends,
Nor turns aside to lies.

The sinner's way he hastes to quit,
He stands not where they stand;
He sits not down where scorners sit,
Nor takes them by the hand.

But his delight is in the law—
The law of God, most high,
In this all day, he meditates,
For this at night doth sigh.

He shall be planted like a tree
Where living waters flow,
His leaf forever green shall be,
Nor drought nor winter know.

His molten'd foot shall pierce the soil,
And fix'd, like God, abide,
And timely fruit reward his toil,
Whatever else befall.

Whatsoever he doth shall prosper still,
He doth what God commands,
He wills but what his Maker wills,
Like God's—his counsel stands.

Oh! how unlike the worldly wise!
Th' ungodly are not so!—
Driv'n like the chaff of summer skies,
By all the winds that blow.

Expediency their only guide,
Expedients all their trust,
When these are wreck'd, they've nought beside,
And perish sure they must.

In judgment, therefore, with the just,
The wicked shall not stand,
Their names are written in the dust,
They build upon the sand.

For God doth know the righteous men,
That walk the narrow way;
But those that count his guidance vain,
From their own mercies stray.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS.

For the Christian Investigator, up to March, 1844.

Of S. M. Pond, Buckport,	1 00	ditto, for C. C. Cary, Phila.	
Me, for himself and four others	3 00	E. Allen, Canaanville, for E. Edgerton, Delphi	
W. B. Stone, Gardner,	1 00	and for H. B. Allen, Rock-ester	
Mrs. S. W. Stewart, Clinton	0 50	Papers sold	
W. W. Alexander, ditto	0 50	C. Kendall, Bathany Centre	
Mrs. Dwight, ditto	1 00	W. Bailey, Buffalo	
Mrs. Avery, ditto	1 00	D. Bailey, Darlet Centre	
J. Powell, ditto	0 50	E. V. Bradley, Careyville	
Mrs. J. Powell, ditto	0 50	L. H. Parsons, Flushing	
B. Bishop, Honeyoye	0 50	(postage deducted)	
J. Robinson, ditto	0 50	R. Anderson, Gaines	
J. Pettit, Fredonia	0 50	A. Hutchinson, ditto	
A. F. Taylor, ditto	0 50	G. Goodyear, ditto	
R. A. Putnam, Cornish, N.H.	1 00	E. H. Allen, Oswego	
S. K. Williams, Albion	0 50	T. Hough, Martinsburg	
C. Wilder, ditto	0 50	J. A. Hubbard, Champlain	
W. F. Sheldon, W. Bloom- field	10 00	W. Johnston, Macedon Co-ty, Wayne Co., N. Y.	
J. Pixley, E. Bloomfield	1 00	Zelotes Sheldon, same	
J. Hartzell, Warren, O., for C. Herring, ditto	0 50	Orleans Co.	
And for A. J. Morley, Palmyra, O.	0 50	Geo. Spalding, D. Spalding	
N. E. Seward, Honeyoye	0 50	T. Haight, H. Thors.	
H. Gilbert, Richmond	0 50	Hammond, Bondino	
B. Darrow, Orlino	0 50	J. W. Sherman, Phelps	
C. Gleason, ditto	1 00	C. Heath, ditto	
E. Cowles, ditto	0 50	J. Curtis, ditto	
C. Choate, ditto	0 50	A. Stewart, Canandaigua	
L. Rice, ditto	0 50	Papers sold	
A. Van Syppe, Vernon	1 00	Amount	
J. W. Eaton, Dedham, Mass.	0 50	Ded. uncurrent, may. 1 00	
F. T. Russell, Ira	0 50	Commission, &c. 300-	
H. R. Ward, Ganey	1 00		
B. Dickson, 24, Livonia,	0 50		

REFORMATION TRACTS.

TRACT No. 1. *Iniquity and a meeting*, by Philip Green—2 pages, for sale at \$1.00 per hundred, for cash only. Orders to be addressed to Wm. G. Honeyoye, Ontario co., N. Y., or to E. Shepard, Rochester; or J. Mosher, Canandaigua.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES. VOL. II—No. 4.
WHOLE NUMBER, 24.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., APRIL, 1844.

WILLIAM GUODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix. 25.

INIQUITY AND A MEETING:

Discourse, delivered at the Congregational Church, Whiteboro, Lord's Day, January, 31, 1844. "He lifted the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well with him; was not this to know me, saith the Lord?" By BENJAMIN GREEN, President of the Anti-Slavery Institute.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, WHITEBORO.

MY BRETHREN—When, during the late protracted meeting in this village, I saw you tempted and exposed, by some, who in contempt of the principles they professed to honor, lent their countenance and aid to the special church-going and church-faring activity of a community, which has all along stood from you in your exertions to promote, in the midst of derision and reproach, the cause of a sound mind and a pure religion. I felt impelled to lift up the voice of warning. That voice, it is the object of those who repeat and prolong. It is high time, that a society, falsely so called, which refuses to come to the rescue of the earthling, the drunkard, the slave, the victim of persons, the dupe, and the victim of popular prejudice, the votary of the say-and-do-not philosophy, were understood that it might be abhorred, and such nuisances are endured, we must be exposed, and infected atmosphere. "It is time for thee, Lord, to rise; for they have made void thy law." Let us never, my brethren, forget, that "he who endureth unto the end," alone shall be saved. Yours in the Savior, affectionately,
B. GREEN.

Whiteboro, Feb. 1844.

DISCOURSE.

LUKE 10—17. Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah. To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, what shall I require of you? saith the Lord: to tread my courts! Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is filthy, even a solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a burden unto me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: ye, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean: put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, defend the fatherless, plead for the widow.

The prophet so describes and so exhorts the priests, here addressed, as to give us a clue to their character. They were just fit to be ranked with the men of Sodom. And how they were regarded, we may learn of Ezekiel. "Behold," he exclaims, "this was the iniquity of thy Sodom; pride, fullness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy." Idlers they were, inflated with pride, and bloated with luxury; playing the tyrant to the helpless and friendless. That this was the character of the creatures Isaiah had to do with, the exhortation shows, in which their sin is set forth. If they would put away the memory of their doings, and thus find access to the throne of God, they must "seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." The condition and claims of the "poor and needy," they must earnestly study; and take with the weak against the strong—with the oppressed against the oppressor.

Very different was the position, which these priests at present held. Their zeal for God was consistent with contempt for man. With the positive of religion was every thing; the

moral, nothing. In meeting-holding, psalm-singing, prayer-making, they were active and noisy enough. In these things they were all stir and smoke. The calling of assemblies, the solemn meetings, the appointed feasts they multiplied even to the wearying of Jehovah. Iniquity and a meeting. He could not away with. He loathed their services. We are thus taught that a MEETING-HOLDING ACTIVITY UNDER THE PRETENSE OF A REGARD FOR HUMAN SALVATION, ACCOMPANIED BY A DISREGARD FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, IS AN ABOMINATION TO JEHOVAH. For,

I. It implies rank absurdity and a flagrant contradiction.—In the constitution of man, the rights of man are involved. The attributes, the powers and capacities here found, are God-given endowments. These gifts imply fearful responsibilities. They are a sacred trust, for which an account must be rendered. All this supposes the right to wield our powers and use our capacities, according to our constitution—firmly to hold and freely to pursue the end of our existence. Whatever interferes with us here, injures us vitally. Health, vigor, useful activity are at once impaired. If our right to be what our Creator designed us to be, and to do what he requires us to do, is invaded, wrong and wretchedness must ensue. And this wretchedness must be deep and this wrong flagrant in the same degree as the invasion of such rights is far-reaching, violent and determined. Our salvation, of course, depends upon the full enjoyment of those rights, to which under God we are constitutionally and inalienably entitled. These can be enjoyed only in the free discharge of those duties which the rights imply. To employ our powers and capacities in a course of law-abiding activity, without let or hindrance, is the right of all rights, to which, both individually and socially, we are entitled. If we are assailed here, whether by inward passion or outward violence, our salvation is put to hazard. If the assault be successful, our very hearts are stabbed. If we are free here—free from the dominance of passion within and without—our own passions and other people's—free to discharge the Heaven-appointed duties, which our rights imply, which correspond with them and grow out of them, then are we among the saved. Then salvation sheds its light and pour its songs around.

The invasion of human rights is an assault upon human salvation. The oppressor is a destroyer. The constitution of man—the powers, prerogatives and prospects of man—his present and his eternal welfare, he acts at naught and tramples under foot. Whatever may be his condition and whatever his pretensions, this is his work. Whether he devour widows' houses or defraud the hireling of his wages, or hold in slavery the victims of legalized tyranny, he wages war with human salvation. He interferes with the discharge of Heaven-appointed duties, and does what he can to dry up the fountain of blessedness, which from the heart of these duties sends forth, pure and sparkling, its living waters. His success must be a triumph over human salvation.

To apologize for oppression under any of its varied forms, is to lend ourselves to the work of human destruction. A professed Christian, a religious teacher even, may permit errors, rank as dunghill weeds, to take root within him; the condition and the claims of the oppressed he may stupidly refuse to study; the cruelest, falsest things he may put forth to stifle whatever of generous indignation or manly effort the ravages of tyranny may have provoked: he may deny

to the oppressed their inalienable right to sympathy and assistance in the house of prayer; he may lend himself to revile and reproach and traduce the friends of holy Freedom: he may even make his religious profession or high station the occasion and the shield of his neglect of the claims of outraged humanity; but this he can not do without inflicting deadly blows. He acts himself against that, in which salvation consists: He breathes a spirit, directly and vitally hostile to human welfare. Just so far as he has influence and power, just so far salvation bleeds and dies.

Now what is it for such an one, to put on the appearance of zeal and activity in the work of soul-saving? He affects to lament the depravity and wretchedness of his fellow-men. With a long face and in solemn tones, he discourses about their condition and prospects. He calls for special efforts for their benefit. He girds up his loins as if he were a-going to do something. Coadjutors he enlists. And now what a scene of activity opens upon us. Assemblies are called. Meetings are held. Heaven and earth are invoked. What a stir! What expedients! What an agitation of the surface of the general sentiment! With what pretensions is the ear of simplicity and honesty wounded! "Sea and land are compassed to make proselytes." And they are made; drawn together, reckoned up, and gloried over. Proselytes! To what? To saintship without humanity! To saintship, which refuses to plead the cause of the victims of prejudice and oppression! To saintship, which contributes more than every thing else to the protection and growth of the worst forms of rebellion against God and injury to man! Alas, what have we here? What! the very same vision, as painted the eye of Isaiah, the son of Amos. What absurdities! A cold and cruel disregard of human rights, kindling up without losing a jot of its malignity, into a fervent regard for human salvation! Invitations to the weary, on lips laden with apologies for slavery! Such contradictions, Jehovah may well be weary of. They are too much for even His patience. Iniquity and a meeting, thus conjoined, must be a trouble to Him! Such glaring contradictions—such gross absurdities in His very presence! What else can this be than to make his house a den of thieves?

II. Such a meeting-holding activity as this discourse is designed to expose, is adapted, where human improvement and welfare are most vitally concerned, to confound things the most incongruous. Few things are as much insisted on in the Bible as a just discrimination among moral distinctions. Jeremiah on one occasion was greatly disheartened amidst the demands of his office. He knew not how to take another step. Amidst the disgusting forms of iniquity around him, his confidence in God was greatly impaired. He was ready, broken-hearted, to abandon his work. But what said the Lord? He encouraged him to enter anew upon his official course with fresh zeal and increased activity.—He described the condition, on which he might expect to speak with the authority of the God who sent him. "If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth." From a just discrimination among moral distinctions, his words would derive great weight and power.—This Jehovah regarded as all-essential to the success and fidelity of the prophet. In another connection, we are assured that divine influences develop and express themselves in making such distinctions clear and definite. "Then shall ye re-

turn and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not." The hypocrites around Him, the Savior once upbraided with a strange and hurtful negligence whose just discrimination had a vital bearing upon their character. They were sharp-sighted enough where weather-signs were to be disposed of; but dull as lead where with a little attention, they could not but see clear indications of the presence of the Messiah. "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?"

Whatever goes to confound moral distinctions, must be of harsh, if not of fatal, bearing upon character. The Law of Rectitude is the basis, to which, if good habits are to be formed and maintained, our temper and our activity must be conformed. Here is the model on which sound character is to be fashioned and matured. The more clearly and fully this model is presented, the higher will be its authority—the greater, its power;—the more radical and transforming will be its influence upon the understanding, conscience and heart. Hence, under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, proceed all healthful convictions—all well-directed endeavors—all sound reformation. Whatever goes to confound moral distinctions goes to obscure or misrepresent this model—to bereave it of its authority and neutralize its power. If confounded radically and vitally, the model disappears. No standard is left, by which moral character can be judged of. No ground remains, on which reformatory efforts can be made. As good and evil—right and wrong are confounded, the wicked cannot be convinced of their wickedness, nor the upright justified in their integrity. Indeed, the very significance of the words righteous and wicked has vanished. We are lost in a maze. We wander about without aim or object amidst endless confusions;—the sport of every idle wind, of every hap-hazard impulse.

The positive institutions of religion were designed to subserve the end of moral distinctions. Hence they derive their meaning. Apart from this end, they are unintelligible and worthless. From this, they derive whatever sacredness we ascribe to them—become hallowed in the eyes of men. As hallowed things, they are commonly regarded. "The calling of assemblies—the solemn meeting"—with what reverence they are looked upon. The temple of the Lord, the pulpit, the communion table—all the arrangements and exercises of public worship—how holy they are generally esteemed! Here men expect to find the standard of Rectitude—the model of sound character. And what if they find iniquity here excused, or countenanced, or justified? What if intemperance or oppression finds a refuge here? What if pride builds here a nest, and prejudice finds here a home? What if a worldly spirit and malignant passions riot and revel here? What if decisive measures to expose popular vices, to raise the depressed, to shelter the outcast, to relieve the oppressed, are discountenanced, are pronounced impracticable and ridiculous? What if the earnest and determined advocates of freedom—of temperance—of an effective and comprehensive philanthropy, are here grossly misrepresented and spitefully traduced? And what if in the midst of all this, special efforts at saving souls are proposed. Special expedients are hit upon. Meetings are multiplied and protracted. Zeal flames up on every side. Large success in building up the church is boasted. Scores of converts flock around the communion table. And all this, while the iniquity characteristic of the meeting-holders is cherished and maintained! A few vague, general confessions are made as a thing of course. But eulogies* on wine-drinking

remain unrevoked—arrangements to tempt the vicious and increase intemperance stand firm—the injured outcast is spurned as contemptuously as ever—church processes and decisions violative of the simplest principles of justice are not so much as called in question—and the cruel exclusion of the cause of the oppressed from the pulpit passes unexposed, uncondemned. In one word, iniquity and the meeting move hand in hand! Thus things the most incongruous, and just there, where human improvement and welfare are most vitally concerned, are strangely confounded! How on such ground, can sound character be produced? How even understood?

And what must be the various bearing of all this? What, upon those, who amidst the general excitement are reckoned converts? Here is one who has all along been driving hard after the world—an eager, greedy earthling. He finds in the church, and among those who are active in extending its limits and controlling its movements, sordid worldliness; baptized indeed, but sordid worldliness still. Will he, thus countenanced, break friendship with the world, which he has long worshiped? Will the slave of artificiality—the victim of respect of persons, struggle to throw off his bonds on entering a community where such bonds are worn by way of ornament? Will the convert who had all along been a wine-bibber eschew the dangerous draughts beneath a pulpit whence issue eulogies on wine-drinking? Or will he who had been a slaveholder, who had sold his fellow-men and lived upon the price of blood, enter a church broken-hearted for his sin, where the sin of slavery is denied or palliated? In the midst of good earthlings, good rum-sellers, good wine-drinkers, good friends of slavery—in the midst of such odd combinations, such gross incongruities, such inexplicable confusion, what standard can be found by which sound character may be formed and matured? If these things are consistent with the Law of Rectitude—with Christian habits, the Law of Rectitude must be a loose affair—Christian habits must be any thing or nothing, adapting themselves to the humor or convenience of the thoughtless, the frivolous, the selfish. Amidst such incongruities, who can "take forth the precious from the vile"—who can distinguish between shadow and substance—between empty appearance and solid reality? Nothing has any proper existence—any specific character—any intelligible description. The church becomes a very Babel, where light and darkness—good and evil are blended together—where utter confusion of tongues baffles and defies the listening ear—the inquiring mind. Proselytes are thrown into a hot-bed, where they are rapidly ripened for Hell. And the openly vicious can see no essential difference between themselves and the professed Christians around them. Such incongruities—can they be other than a trouble to Jehovah?

III. The thing, which this discourse aims to expose and condemn, moreover, involves a perversion of the means of human salvation.—The arrangements, usages, and institutions, which the prophet charged the Hebrews with profaning, were Heaven-appointed—God-given. The end to which they looked, was sublime and glorious.—

*Small part of it beheld him—doubtless for the benefit of the new married couple?

† To those who are familiar with the history of the Temperance reform in Whiteboro; and especially to those, who have exerted themselves to dry up those fountains of death among us, where intoxicating drink issued, this must be painfully intelligible.

‡ You don't go to the negro-church and favor the negro-school, do you?

§ I did say, that slaveholding was not in itself in all cases, and in its own nature, a sin. I hold the same opinion now, and I believe I shall always hold it, so long as my eyes and ears and intellect remain. In this I am happy to say I agree with the great mass of the most pious and intelligent Christians in America.

¶ I said that I did not consider the subject of slavery as coming within the bounds of the gospel, and that therefore the people need not expect to hear me discuss it. "Though I should not preach upon slavery myself, nor introduce any agents for that purpose."—See Rev. David L. Ogden's Review, pp. 9, 10.

In the midst of abounding iniquity—of widespread and fiery rebellion, they were designed to assert and support the divine authority. At the appointed feast, in the solemn meeting, the laws of the spiritual world in their application to the relations of the earth were to be defined, expounded, and insisted on. Here the will of God, enshrined in the active obedience, and commended by the sincere lips of His people, was to be continually held up as the model of character—the standard of action. Here, the prerogatives and requisitions of God—the rights and duties of man were to be presented in a clear and certain light in beautiful consistency and delightful harmony with each other. Piety God-ward was to animate philanthropy man-ward; and philanthropy was to nourish piety. The church was to be Heaven upon earth—transforming earth to heaven. All influences, common and special—all its exercises, ordinary or extraordinary, were to look directly and effectively to the spread of inward purity expressed in outward morality. Such was the design of the positive institutions of Christianity.—Where this design has not been overlooked, these institutions have been what Heaven intended they should be, a blessing to mankind. They have greatly promoted human improvement and the general welfare. They have been the admitted source of the most substantial benefits. Without them, little has been effected or attempted to make man worthy of his relations and prosper. It is not to be wondered at, that they should be regarded with respect, little short of veneration;—that in the eyes of almost all, they should be invested with an air of sacredness. Wherein and whenever these institutions are held subsistent to their proper ends, this feeling must be healthful—opening the way for good results.

But this feeling may be taken advantage of, in making a meeting the home of iniquity. Evil men may seek a refuge in sacred places—do evil under the cover of hallowed relations. They may, as they often do, assume the character to claim the honors of God's anointed messengers. Seizing on the high places of the church, they may affect zeal for its enlargement and prosperity. They suck her breasts of consolation—appropriate her honors and her revenues; why should they not deprecate with a jealous eye whatever might threaten to reduce her supplies and draw her to leanness. From her strength and authority they derive their wealth and splendor. Why should they not labor to extend the one and increase the other? Hence their eagerness to assemble—to hold meetings—to multiply preachers—to employ church-increasing expedients. Amidst these very things, they are cunningly busy in the work of iniquity. That, they never permit, day or night. The very temple of Jehovah they convert into a bulwark of evil-doing. Temperance-wise, the church must not be urged to exert her powers.* She is too sacred to be spoken to. Off, ye profane; and let her quench the cup of devils at the table of her Lord! The breath of rebuke from your uncircumcised lips would soil her white robes! The hateful offspring of murderous prejudice—mean as it is wicked—that consecrated moment of respect of persons—that cage of scornous stinging souls to death; you must not expose the absurdity and sin in which it had its origin.

* Another absurd attempt to interfere with the eucharist made at the State Temperance Society last week in the Ground was taken against the use of fermented wine at the communion table, by a minister by the name of Van Buren, at a meeting held in the Baptist chapel in Pearl-street, on the evening of the 10th. The next day a resolution was offered, commending those churches that had introduced "the real juice of the vine" instead of the fermented compound. The thing was opposed by Dr. Potter and Dr. Welch, and after a spirited discussion was lost, 73 to 17—showing a great deal of good sense in the body. The temperance cause has before this received a blow by the interference of temperance conventions with arrangements of churches; and we rejoice that in this case it was such an overwhelming amount of good sense to check a folly that would ruin any cause. There is great hope of a healthy progress of the cause under the control of such members."—N. Y. Baptist Register for Feb. 19, 1841.

* Malachi iii. 18. † Luke xii. 57.

* Eulogies on wine-drinking.—This allusion will be understood by those, upon whom a long paper was inflicted, first in the church and then in the presbytery, to show among other things, that the Saviour miraculously produced a large quantity of fermented wine at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, and left no

Though it is a toad, breathing venom into the ear of piety, you must not touch it with Ishmael's spear. The devil thus incarnate must not be exposed, because forsooth he has obtruded himself upon the grounds of paradise! The negro-pow is one of the conditions on which alone well-bred souls can consent to be saved; and so, cunning, noisy quacks, in dispensing their balm of Gilead, give the negro-pow a place among their pious frauds. Nor must the church be urged in the name of God and bleeding humanity, to abandon its position in support of slavery, and to wield its God-given powers in behalf of the oppressed. Abraham it may have slandered, by calling him the patriarch of slaveholders; and under this character claiming a place in his bosom. The existence of slavery in the church, it may be affirmed, impairs neither the soundness of its faith nor the integrity of its character.* Good intentions, it may be maintained, may convert slaveholding into a Christian virtue!† So that one may be under sacred obligations to violate the inalienable rights of his fellow-men! And to injure them at the most vital points for their special benefit! Such poison may have infected the very heart of the church; and quickened and strengthened a deadly hostility to the cause of holy Freedom:—may have made it a nuisance offensive to heaven and earth. Yet in any effort for its improvement and usefulness, you must not fix its eye upon the mortal sin, it refuses to repent of. General confessions, it may, in a general way, be exhorted to make. Thus all offense will be avoided. The tide of excitement may flow on. The church may be increased, while its old, son-of-God sins may be piously retained. The stream runs on smoothly. And the painful necessity of laboring to bring a pro-slavery church to repentance by preaching abolition lectures is cunningly avoided!‡

Now for what purpose was the mission of the Son of God undertaken? And why was he called Jesus? The object of his mission and the occasion of his name we have in the aim He vigorously held—in the purpose He lovingly cherished, of "saving his people from their sins." The Heaven-appointed, Heaven-honored means of grace, which in the cause of human salvation are to be employed, look of course in the same direction. A conversion, which leaves men at variance with the fundamental principles of a sound morality, leaves them unsaved. A defective morality is the natural offspring of a corrupt Christianity. If the former is defective at fundamental points, the latter is radically false and fatally corrupt. What must we say of a system of morality, which, in the very presence of slaveholding, receives at its enormities and even affects ignorance of its deadly tendencies? Which gives its countenance to the worst form, under which respect of persons and contempt for the poor ever marked this specter-ridden world? Are men saved from their sins, who make no scruple of living in them? who ingeniously excuse or stoutly defend them? who curl their lips or gnash their teeth upon every one who dares honestly attempt to carry out the principles of the gospel to their most natural and significant applications? When a meeting is held to countenance and strengthen such a Christianity, it is held to countenance and strengthen iniquity; an effort is made to convert bread to poison—to make the means of salvation a lure to despair.

IV. Such a meeting-holding activity as this discourse is occupied with, involves an attempt to bring Jehovah into the service of Satan.—Upon

the positive institutions of Christianity, he has impressed the stamp of his authority. They are adapted, as they were designed, to support his authority—to subserve the ends of his government. They are dear to his heart as the fruit of his wisdom and goodness. They are known by his name. They are identified with his cause. Often has He been known greatly to honor them, making them the medium through which his choicest gifts were imparted. From their relation to Him, they derive all their sacredness. Thus, as arrangements established by his hand and for his glory, they are identified in the minds of his creatures with his government—with Himself. By virtue of this relation to heaven it is, that bad men are enabled to force them into the service of iniquity. With long faces, and solemn tones, and loud pretensions, they sacrifice their pious frauds as to deceive the simple and the unwary. Hear them. It is the cause of God we are intent on promoting. These special means we use at his bidding. In his name, we make accessions to his kingdom. For his sake, we ask the countenance and co-operation of all his friends. By the Cross, we expect to conquer. The influences of the Holy Spirit, we implore and enjoy. To stand aloof from our exertions is to deny the Savior. These professions are made and these claims set up, to give effect to the artifices by which they would secure favor and support for a corrupt Christianity. In the name of the Lord, they render service to the devil. On his altar, they burn their idol sacrifices. The arms which were designed to subdue his enemies, they level at his breast. Thus they strive to force Him into the service of Satan.

With indignation and surprise, voice after voice exclaims—What have we here? We thought that Jehovah was the avenger of the oppressed; that he had no respect of persons; that, according to his word, to identify ourselves with crushed humanity was the way to enjoy his favor. We understood that Jesus Christ had given general notice, that in the final day, He would make the most bruised and battered form of humanity a test of our regard for Him. And the Holy Spirit, we thought, impressed upon all the subjects of his regenerating power the image of the all-merciful One. But if what we here witness be indeed what it claims to be, the work of God—his hand must be strangely at variance with his lips. In what is here ascribed to the Holy Spirit we see no indications of a power divine. And the effects do not imply the elements of a sound morality. Even those who were busy in producing faras effects, whatever saintship they may claim, have never yet even aspired to the dignity of men. In a generous and magnanimous regard for our common nature, they fall short of the attainments of many a deist. What a puzzle! If God be true, this is not his work. Ah, my friends, God is true; whatever becomes of human artifices. He is not to be seduced or forced into a denial of Himself. And He regards with utter loathing the union of iniquity with a meeting.

How, then, are we to regard the positive institutions of religion? Very highly for their end's sake. The holy Sabbath; the Christian temple; the sacred ministry; the communion table; the conference and prayer meeting; the pastoral walk—precious, all precious, for their happy bearings and healthful tendencies, in their relation to moral character. This gives them high importance—deep significance. With this constantly in view, we can hardly overrate them. Glad shall we be when they say, Let us go up to the house of the Lord. For his work's sake, we shall highly esteem the Christian minister. To the disciples of the Savior, we shall join ourselves in an everlasting covenant. The communion of saints, we shall earnestly seek at the sacramental supper. In our efforts to lead the heavy laden to the great source of rest, we shall be instant in season and out of season. On ordinary occasions

and occasions extraordinary, we shall not forsake the assembling of ourselves together. Fearing the Lord, we shall often speak to each other—stirring up each other's minds in the way of a grateful remembrance of what heaven forbids us to forget. Thus shall we seek light, and strength, and encouragement, in discharging our heaven-appointed duties. The frames, and feelings, and impulses, which bear us onward in the way of practical obedience, we shall prize for their healthful tendencies and happy effects. Thus the positive in religion will become for us the handmaid of the moral in religion. The excitement which melts our hearts will strengthen our hands. Our reverence for the Creator will be accompanied with respect for his creatures. Charily towards his children will flow from love to the Father. Our regard for his authority will be coupled with respect for their rights. Our delight in his blessedness will be joined with exertions for their welfare. What we approve in preaching we shall embody in practice. A meeting-holding activity will be followed by a duty-doing activity.

To divorce the positive from the moral in religion is to destroy both. The moral will be neglected if the positive is despised; and the positive must be insignificant if the moral is overlooked. If the end is forgotten the means are worthless; if the means are neglected the end is lost. Doing without saying, is a blind activity; saying without doing, is an empty sound. A proper regard for one will lead us to insist upon both. Give them tongues, and with one voice they would exclaim, United we stand, divided we fall.

A meeting-holding activity accompanied with a disregard for the claims of humanity, we ought to eschew for its hurtfulness and abhor for its wickedness. Just so far as we give it countenance we pervert the right ways of the Lord. We subscribe to the glaring lie, that on the ground where humanity withers, religion may flourish; that hearts dead to the claims of man may be alive to the requisitions of God!

How is it, that we hear of revivals of religion among the monuments of slavery? of successful evangelists among anti-abolitionists? of a fervent zeal with a lax morality? The excitement begins, goes on, and ends; the tide rises, swells, and ebbs, and leaves worldliness, and respect of persons, and alliance with oppression, and a league with intemperance, and contempt for the poor, and a compromise with popular follies, and party spirit, and sectarian zeal, and a spiteful opposition to all who sigh and cry on account of prevailing abominations. These things, and such as these, in the old church and the new proselytes, it leaves where it found them, unrebuked, unassailed; in full vigor and activity. No direct, earnest, and decisive reformatory efforts are here made, lest the excitement should be reduced! To expose and assail prevailing forms of sin would be prejudicial to the revival; would divert the attention of awakened souls from the one thing needful! And so men are to be reconciled to God with their eyes averted from the very point where their rebellion burns most fiercely! and to be reformed, without attention to the particulars where their violations of the law are most flagrant! Theatrical expedients are employed and a theatrical effect is produced! Realities are exchanged for romances. A great noise is made about iniquity, and repentance, and giving the heart to God, and being engaged in religion; but the sober realities which are involved in sinning, and turning to the Lord, are avoided, lest revival sermons should sink into abolition lectures, or temperance addresses, or expositions of the seventh commandment, or commentaries on respect of persons, or charges to the rich to distribute, and to the proud not to be high-minded, or attacks upon the settled order of things and the established usages of society! And so the revival does up its work without touching the strong-holds in which Satan is entrenched! What objection can he have to such

*The relation may still exist, *salva fide et salva ecclesia*—without violating the Christian faith or the church.—Prof. Stuart's Reply to Dr. C. K.

†The doctrine of good intentions—the old Jewish dogma, covering that the end justifies the means, is of wide application—covering and sanctifying the whole field where transgression of the divine law shows its face, and spits out its venom.

‡And you would have us commence a protracted meeting, by delivering a course of abolition lectures! To be sure, if a pro-slavery church is to be brought to repentance.

revivals? The more frequent they are, and the longer they continue, the more firmly is his throne established. Men may weep or laugh, be merry or sad, wear long faces or short faces, make long prayers, or swear long oaths, go to the church or go to the brothel, profess religion or profess atheism, preach or praise, it is all one to him, while they leave him unmolested, to multiply his murders. They may even hang him in effigy, if they will keep their hands from his person. They may, without offense to him, have as much religion as they please, provided they will keep it in what he calls its place—safely cloistered with their Sunday clothes; apart from the actual relations and ordinary business of life; where it may muse and meditate, sing psalms and pray prayers, without being annoyed by the dust of the market, the din of the exchange, the wrangling and contending by which the ballot-box is beset. His most efficient votaries have a religion of this sort; and can on suitable occasions bestir themselves to multiply proselytes. They may be zealous for God at the protracted meeting, provided always, that they are zealous for the devil, too, in bargain-making and negotiating; in-clinging to parties pledged to the support of slavery, and in opposing decisive measures to promote the cause of temperance. Whoever combines iniquity with a meeting may reckon on the countenance and co-operation of the devil.

But, my brethren, will you lend yours? Can you thus renounce your principles, and forget your vows, and dishonor your Savior, and trample on your Bibles, and turn to mockery the sacred things of heaven? Can you thus enter into a league with iniquity—a covenant with death? Heaven forbid! "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever ye sow, that must ye also reap." He is a tempter, who, under religious pretences, would betray you into inconsistencies at war with the principles which heaven requires you to honor. Here, especially, perils beset you. Never is the devil so dangerous, as when with scripture on his lips, he approaches us as an angel of light. Let us beware of his devices. Let us in a law-abiding way exert ourselves to build up the heavenly kingdom, that God may smile upon us; that Christ may own and guide us; that the Holy Spirit may refresh us with his life-giving influences!

A REVIEW.

PRESBYTERIANISM versus EPISCOPACY.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN DR. POTTS AND DR. WAINWRIGHT.

The recent discussion in the New-York papers, between these two able and learned clergymen, of the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, whatever else it may settle, or leave unsettled, can scarcely fail to decide, in the minds of the discriminating and the candid, one important and highly pregnant problem, to wit, the adequacy of Presbyterianism, as such, to cope with Episcopacy—the adaptation of the Presbyterian theory of church government to displace the Episcopal, or to continue community of the arrogancy of the Episcopal claim.

The facts that led to the discussion, were briefly these. On a public occasion, a "New England Dinner," (a festive gathering of the sons of the Puritans, in New York City, we suppose,) the orator of the day, in tracing the character and history of the Puritans, took occasion to speak of the persecutions under queen Mary, which drove them from their native land, to seek refuge in Geneva, where they found, said the orator, "a government without a king, and a church without a bishop." To the oration, toasts and speeches succeeded. Whether cold water or wine moistened the toasts, we are not told, but clergymen of different sects were present, and when "the Clergy of New England" were toasted, Dr. Wainwright, an Episcopal clergyman, rose to respond. In the course of his speech, he took occasion to controvert the statement of the orator above quoted, (and which had been applauded by the company) very distinctly affirming the contrary doctrine, that "there can be no church without a bishop!" This was of course underlaid to unchurch all churches except the Episcopal, and no little sensation was occasioned by this speech. The result was the

discussion now under review. Dr. Potts, of the Presbyterian church, enters the lists with Dr. Wainwright, in the columns of the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser. The N. Y. Evangelist, and other papers, copy the discussion, and thus it circulated widely. The debate, as such, was closed somewhat abruptly, to be sure, and before the merits of the grand question had been fully argued on either side, owing to the disagreement of these gentlemen, as to the proper mode of conducting the debate. But each gentleman continued to pursue the subject, independently, in his own way, in the same papers. They are both able writers. Both have shown themselves expert in the feats of gladiatorial fencing with the pen—both are learned, eloquent, quick ready to catch at any advantage that can be seized upon, to make an impression on the popular mind.

But though the discussion was not quite so well adapted to help the hesitant reader to a correct decision of the great question at issue, it was just the thing to test the point to which, we confess, our own attention had been more earnestly drawn. We needed no discussion to convince us of the arrogancy and utility of the Episcopal claim. On that point, our opinion had long since been made up, and we had little expectation of hearing any thing, on either side, that would be new. But we had a curiosity to see how, in the present state of the religious community, a Presbyterian would manage the Episcopal controversy without laying the axe at the distinctive features of Presbyterianism itself. We wanted to know how a broad and intelligent Episcopalian would handle a Presbyterian assailant of the "apostolic succession," at a time, when, as every well informed person knows, the question whether Presbyterianism shall retain even a precarious foothold in the interior of this state, in Ohio, and some other regions, is this identical question whether ecclesiastical power lies in the brotherhood of the churches or in the priesthood—whether valid ordinances and a valid ministry can be had, without a self-created and self-perpetuated clerical caste—without ordination conferred by those who were already clothed with the exclusive monopoly of the rituals and of the preached word. Only let the mass of the Presbyterian membership settle that question, by a decision against the claim of "regular succession" and the whole distinctive machinery of American Presbyterianism crumbles at once to the ground.

This, in common with others, we had distinctly in view, when the rumor of the discussion came to our ears. In common with others, we read the discussion with an eye on this distinct point. Nor have we, nor have multitudes of others, been disappointed in witnessing what we knew, well enough beforehand, must take place. We have seen the ardent and able adversary of the Episcopal claim, asserting principles, and urging arguments, which if correct and admissible for the purposes to which they are adduced, must prove forever fatal to the entire structure of the Presbyterian edifice, from the foundation to the top stone.

More than this we have witnessed. We have seen, as might have been apprehended, the wary champion of the Episcopal claim, greedily seizing upon this feature of the contest, and insisting that the argument of his Presbyterian antagonist is as fatal to Presbyterianism as to Episcopacy itself! We have found his Presbyterian antagonist utterly unable to meet this allegation, or even to answer the question, again and again urged on his attention, the question (in substance) whether Presbyterianism, equally with Episcopacy, does not involve the principle of a clerical succession. And finally, we have seen in obvious discomfiture, this same Presbyterian disputant, precipitately retreating from the discussion, for the obvious purpose of prosecuting his otherwise vigorous and effective warfare upon the Episcopal claim, without annoyance from an antagonist incessantly urging upon him the inconsistencies of his position, and demanding of him that the battle against Episcopacy should be fought upon Presbyterian, and not upon Congregational or Quaker grounds!

From such a spectacle, a double lesson of instruction is readily gained. The weakness of Presbyterianism in a struggle with Episcopacy is not more apparent than the power of common sense, Christian doctrine, evangelical piety, and the facts and precepts of Scripture, when skillfully employed, (as Dr. Potts has in part, employed them) in the same warfare. The tact of Dr. Wainwright, in parrying them off, with a shield formed of the inconsistencies of Presbyterianism, is not more remarkable, or evident than the bleeding wounds that rendered such an expedient a welcome and timely one! "Oh! Oh!" he seems to exclaim, "that missile was a terrible one. That arrow was a barbed and a pointed one. But they are unlawful weapons in

this warfare. I thought I was fighting with a man, who respected the rules of honorable combat! I would not use vulgar and savage weapons! I did not think that you broke one of my ribs with a drawn from the armory of the Yankee Congress! I thought that that drab colored cord that you have in your right arm with, must have been stolen from a Quaker meeting house! Why don't you fight with Presbyterian weapons? I came here to fight with orderly and orthodox old school Presbyterian—not in any manner of outlandish heretics!" And so went, with his tattered surplice round his waist, the advocate of prelacy frightens off his sturdy assailant with his hob goblin spectres of Independency and Quakerism. A contest in which two such combatants, and disasters like these, can scarcely fail to hasten the triumphs of that truth which the one opposes, and the other dares not reduce to practice. A few extracts show the true position of both, and should be regarded as pledges and preanges of the onward progress of correct sentiment.

Dr. Potts, in the early part of the discussion, addresses Dr. Wainwright:

"When you set up a claim, not to a superiority, but to a monopoly of the privileges belonging to the law of God—when you set up this claim in behalf of a fraction, a molecule, of the Protestant community, and when such confessedly stupendous consequences necessarily involved in the claim—it cannot escape the most unobtrusive reader, that to make out such a claim, its advocates ought to be prepared with proof, little of mathematical demonstration. And yet, as I shall after more fully show, the extravagance of the claim is equalled only by the contradictory, indefinite, and must add the absolutely ridiculous character of some of the arguments which are employed to sustain it. This aggravates the unprovoked assault you have chosen to make, and if, in the course of my future remarks, I shall speak of the high church dogma it deserves, I shall hold myself absolved from blaming an aggressor."

This application of the word "monopoly," which often occurs in the letters of Dr. Potts, we could not but notice, as being identical with the use we had frequently made of the same word, in the "Christian Investigator." We have insisted that the claim of Presbyterians and of Semi-Presbyterian Congregationalists, that none may preach or administer the sacraments without the ordination (without the leave) of the clergy, is a claim to an unscriptural and unrighteous "monopoly." For the use of that word we have been censured, but we now find Dr. Potts using it to describe the same claim as it exists in the Prelacy.

The position of Dr. Wainwright will be seen in the following paragraph. He is speaking in reply to a charge of attempting ecclesiastical proscription.

"I attempted no 'ecclesiastical proscription.' 'Unchurched' no denomination of Christians—God forbid that I or any of those who symbolize with me religious belief, should be guilty of such arrogance towards their fellow-men; or, what is more directly such bold assumption of the sole prerogative of God. The church is his, and he has constituted it according to his own will. Those who do not conform to its requisitions unchurch themselves. Instead of all this stale declamation, so often repeated to excite party prejudice—so often answered—'above from Scripture and ancient authors that bishops are not essential to the constitution of the Christian church, and then no work will be done, and effectually done. But until we have accomplished this, all the charges in which you liberally indulge about 'exclusiveness, uncharitableness, monopoly of privileges,' 'unchurching,' &c. are utterly irrelevant, and only calculated (if will not be designed) to divert the public mind from the true issue."

To this plea, Dr. Potts replies thus:

"I must now beg the reader's attention to a passage in your last communication, which can not safely be least observed, although it denies as slanderous the charges which I have brought against your species in the New England festival, of ecclesiastical proscription unchurching your fellow-Christians, defying them to prove that it is a church without a prelate, &c. monopolizing the rights and privileges of the church of Christ. Were this denial accompanied by any expression of regret that you had incautiously used the language ascribed to you, and did not mean it to be understood in the sense naturally attached to the terms, would at once relinquish my part in this controversy. But this you have not done. That language, in your own report of it, plainly conveys an assertion that the denominations of Christians in this and other lands who are not blessed with bishops in your sense of the word, do not belong to the church of Christ. Cu

language be plainer? And how do you avert the odium which must attach itself to such a position? By ascribing to them the guilt and shame of "unchurching" themselves. You have not unchurched them, forsooth; they have unchurched themselves. But who says this? Not themselves, but Dr. Wainwright and his coadjutors. This is a sophism too obvious to produce much effect in releasing you from the stigma against which you so vehemently protest, and which involves in it all the prescription, monopoly and exclusiveness which I have—fearless of the risk of uttering a slander—charged against your 'principles.' When analyzed, it is identical in meaning with a similar instance of bigotry, which I find in an Oxford Tractate. "How," he asks, "can we be justly charged with unchurching those who were never church'd?"

A very effective answer, we admit. But how would it do to use it over again, in reply to those Presbyterians and pseudo Congregationalists, here, in Western New York, who will by no means admit that they are prescriptive and monopolizing, when they deny that "a congregation of faithful men" (whom they would gladly retain in their churches) can possibly organize or constitute a church of Christ, without leave granted by themselves?

In the same letter Dr. Potts further says—

"The dogma which I have undertaken to resist and expose, is that which makes polity essential to the very being of the church, so that without prelates there is no church, and of course, no valid ministry and ordinances, no promises of God, no lawful reliance upon God's grace, no covenanted mercies, and no just and certain hope of reaching heaven. This is the dogma you have received from papist hands, and which I hold to be at war with the spirit and letter of the Word of God."

Let us now hear Dr. Wainwright, again.

"Episcopacy excludes Presbyterian ordination just as Presbyterianism excludes Congregational or lay ordination."

"But this reminds me that we have one or two questions to settle in relation to your exact 'position,' before we can proceed with a clear mutual understanding. I take it for granted that you admit a ministry by God's appointment to be necessary to the being of a church, and that this ministry derives its authority, not from men, nor from the church itself, but from Christ, the head of the church. We must, please, be very explicit on this point, or our discussion might soon assume a rambling and discursive character, which it is the interest (for the saving of time) and, I doubt not, the wish of us both to avoid. In the considerations you offer as 'necessary for a right understanding of your position,' you say that you are not the 'advocate of the ecclesiastical polity of the church to which you belong, except so far as that polity involves the ministerial rights of presbyters or parochial (i. e. parish or congregational) bishops.' Now what are these ministerial rights, and whence are they derived? I think that when you have answered these questions, the Congregationalists and the Friends, and some other denominations, will not find much to choose between us as to 'charity,' 'exclusiveness,' 'unchurching,' &c."

Dr. Wainwright proceeds to give some quotations from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, as follows. [Chapter xxv. Section 2.]

"The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to any nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ—the house and family of God—out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." Unto this visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry,

*Notice here, the recognition, by Dr. Wainwright, of the fact so well known to every student of church history, that Congregational ordination and lay ordination are one and the same thing, notwithstanding the introduction of Presbyterian usage into Congregational churches. No Congregationalist can deny lay ordination.

And so the children of church members, by the theory of the Presbyterian church, are church members also! What has become of the practice corresponding with this theory? Have the Baptists (as they claim to have done) driven them from that point?

And all who "profess" the true religion, too, are church members! Character has nothing to do with it! No wonder slave holders are retained in the Presbyterian church. They lack no "professions" of godliness. According to our notions (Antidivine) unitarians that we are) this is leaving the church rather at "loose ends!" The Presbyterian definition of a church is much more lax than the Episcopal, or church of England, when run through.

"The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the true word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered, according to Christ's ordinances, in all those things that are necessary are requisite to the same." But where shall we find an Episcopal "congregation of faithful men?"

oracles and ordinances of God for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world, and daily by his own presence and Spirit—according to his promise, make them effectual thereto."

"Thus Christ is represented! (recommends Dr. W.) as giving the ministry equally with the oracles and ordinances, and to the same end."

A little further on, he says,

"You have unchurched, then the Quakers, and left them to the uncovenanted mercies of God; you have unchurched the Congregationalists, you have unchurched the whole body of Methodists, you have unchurched large portions if not the whole of the Baptists, to the full extent that I unchurch you. Do you shrink in 'horror' from a proposition 'so monstrous'! If you can escape from it I shall be glad to learn how. If you do not confess that this is your position, so far as I can see, you must relinquish the doctrine of the ministry and the church, as maintained, I believe, in all the reformed creeds, and certainly in your own. Now this is a point upon which I should like some satisfaction—

And if the result of your reconsideration of the subject should be that we symbolize on this grand point, perhaps you will agree with me that we had better not proffer against each other any charges of 'unchurchableness,' 'exclusiveness,' 'unchurching,' &c., but since we both agree that there is warrant from the Word of God for making a particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God which are the distinguishing duties and privileges of the church of Christ, we calmly proceed to inquire what that external form of polity is. You will perceive that I return to you your own first argument against my position, requesting you to reconsider it and see whether it does not militate against fair inferences to be drawn from the standards of that church to which you belong."

This charge of unchurching Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and Friends, Dr. Potts, in his answer, promptly denies. He says—

"It contradicts well known facts. The only apparent exception is the case of the Friends; concerning whom, as a society, a variety of opinions exists. They are divided into two opposite parties, one of which rejects, as we both believe, the very fundamentals of Christianity, while the other holds fast (as far as I know) to evangelical truth, though with a mixture of doctrinal errors. It is only concerning the last that there can be any question in this connection. These do not reject a ministry, for they have ministers and elders, after their own sort; nor do they reject the ordinances of the gospel professedly, simply contending that these ordinances are to be observed spiritually and not at all externally. Now I consider these views as seriously defective, but if through these views they hold communion with the Head of the church, I dare not deny that they are living members of his body. This ecclesiastical organization may be defective, but not in such a sense as to destroy their hold upon the blessings of God's covenant."

As to the other bodies named in the above extract, — Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, — there is not even a faint shadow of authority for the assertion that I unchurch them, in any sense, least of all in the sense in which you unchurch me. To make this out, you must be able to adduce facts, not inferences. The facts to the contrary lie open to the knowledge of any man. The mutual interchange of ministerial services proves that it is not so."

This is, certainly, the first time we have ever known a Presbyterian Doctor admitting that the society of Friends were a church of Christ, with a valid ministry too, and ordinances of the gospel! In the progress of things, we shall perhaps yet see Presbyterian ministers in Western New York admitting that the new churches now forming in that region on the original principles of the English Independents: (and without any of the Presbyterian usages commonly incorporated into modern Congregationalism) may nevertheless be churches of Christ; that ministers not apart by "CONGREGATIONAL or LAY ordination" may be Christian ministers, and the administration of the ordinances by them, valid. Perhaps too, the time will come when the Oneida Presbytery will no longer deny the validity of ordinations by the Whiteboro' Association, on account of "the lay element of its composition; nor deny that the churches organized in connexion with such a ministry, may be churches of Christ! There is no knowing to what lengths this Episcopal controversy may yet drive them, unless they should follow the city fashions, and become Episcopalians themselves."

In the same letter, Dr. Potts has occasion to notice the interruption in the "apostolic succession" that might be made necessary by the apostasy of existing

churches! A very "delicate subject" just at the present time. Hear him.

"Conceive, again, of the possibility of an extensive apostasy from substantial Christianity, in any body calling itself a church, as to make communion with them no longer tolerable, so there no remedy? The English reformers thought differently, and so did the reformers of the continent, and so in turn did Wesley and his coadjutors, and a large body of the Puritans. — In one word, the exercise of the right of separation is to be justified or condemned, in the first instance, by the facts which caused the separation. If unnecessary, the separation is schism, and its immediate authors are to be held responsible; but if necessary, the sin of schism rests upon those who made it necessary. The grand point is not whether the seceders in any case carry along with them a ministry derived from the body they are quitting, but whether they carry God's word with them as the charter of Christian rights, organize themselves in substantial conformity to that, and then humbly ask God's blessing."

"I have neither time nor room to expand these truths, and apply them to the case in hand. Let it be sufficient to add, at present, that an apostolic ministry authenticates its title to the name by the fact of its transmitting apostolic truth and ordinances, and by the seal of God's blessing upon its services. No other title-deed can be compared with this. Who gave the better evidence of 'divine right' to preach the gospel and administer its symbolic ordinances, a Robert Hall or a Dr. An Swift, a Dr. Chalmers or a Lawrence Sterne? A crowd and thoughts crowd upon me here, but I must suppress them."

Quite as "ultra" and as "disorganizing"—quite as much at "loose ends"—quite as much in the line of "innovation" as any thing the heretical editor of the Christian Investigator has published! And all this from an old school Doctor of Presbyterianism! How shall we account for it? Simply in view of the fact, that Dr. Potts was framing an argument against the claims of the Episcopacy. And in no other way, and on no other ground, could the learned divine repel and expose the arrogance of Episcopal pretensions! But why are not the same suggestions equally good against the arrogance of Presbyterian pretensions?

That Dr. Wainwright understands Dr. Potts as we do—understands him as endorsing the substantial soundness and validity of the Congregational and even the Quaker church organizations and ministry—will appear from the following, in response to the preceding.

"I am compelled to infer that according to your theory it is not essential that the ministry should be divinely appointed. It may be self constituted by an inward call, or it may be constituted by the simple appointment, by a community of Christians, of one or more of their number, who shall give himself wholly to the work of ministering God's word and ordinances." Thus the Friends, you acknowledge, have a ministry. Their 'organization may be defective,' but still they have a ministry, and in your view, ordinances also."

In all the subsequent discussion, we find nothing from Dr. Potts disclaiming the views here attributed to him.

Dr. Wainwright, a little further on, proceeds as follows:

"Now, my dear sir, although I did not undertake to defend the Presbyterian doctrine against Congregationalism, and perhaps should I succeed in doing so, may receive no thanks for my pains, yet as this course will serve my purpose as well as any other, I shall endeavor to controvert the views you have advanced in relation to the ministry, by an appeal to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism."

"What then is the question now in dispute between us? I will state it again, and as distinctly as I can, with a view to a clear comprehension by those of our readers who are not familiar with theological subjects of this nature."

"It is not whether bishops in any sense, that is, diocesan bishops, having charge of many congregations, or parochial bishops, having charge of but one, are essential to the visible church—but it is whether a ministry of divine appointment—that is, a ministry receiving its commission from other ministers possessing divine authority to bestow the commission, in contradistinction to a ministry holding its sole authority through the appointment of the members of a Christian congregation, is essential to the visible church."

Dr. Wainwright then reverts again to the extract already quoted from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chapter xxv. section 3, in proof that Presbyterianism makes a regular ministry essential to a church. Having established this point, he proceeds to show the exclusive prerogatives and powers that Presbyterianism

conform on her clergy. And for this object he first quotes the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, chapter xxvii, section 4.

"There be only two sacraments, ordained by our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, baptism and the supper of the Lord, neither of which may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained."

Dr. Wainwright presently adds, "But power greater even than that of administering the sacraments is conceded to the ministry by the Confession of Faith, chapter xxx, sections 1 and 2: 'The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his church, hath therein appointed a government in the land of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.'"

It only remained for Dr. W. to show that Presbyterianism too, as well as Episcopacy, has her clerical caste,—that her "regular ministry" is distinct from, and independent of, the churches (the laity); yet, nevertheless consists in something distinct from the inward call and spiritual qualifications of the minister of Christ, some outward external appointment, not from the brotherhood of a church, and therefore, of course, from the clerical body itself. This would complete the chain, and make an "apostolical succession" as important to Presbyterianism as to Episcopacy. Another extract will show how this point was sustained, and how the charge of Episcopal exclusiveness was retorted upon Presbyterianism.

"Here are powers which no man certainly would take unto himself, and which it would be reckless contempt for the prerogatives of God for any congregation of men to pretend to confer. Nor is the Presbyterian church guilty of such awful presumption, for it is expressly acknowledged that these powers are derived from the Lord Jesus, and they are exercised in virtue of authority from him—and not by any delegated authority from the church."

"I go forward now with the Larger Catechism.—Question 63 is as follows: 'What are the special privileges of the visible church?'"

"Answer.—'The visible church both the privilege of being under God's special care and government; of being protected and preserved in all ages, notwithstanding the opposition of all enemies; and of enjoying the communion of saints, the ordinary means of salvation, and offers of grace by Christ to all members of it, in the ministry of the word, &c.'—The visible church being thus under God's special care, and being protected and preserved in all ages, can we suppose that he would suffer the 'ministry,' which he originally gave to it through Christ, to be lost any more than the 'oracles and ordinances' which he also gave? Again, the communion of saints, the ordinary means of salvation, and the offers of grace by Christ, are enjoyed in the ministry of the gospel. If these blessings are to be enjoyed in the ministry of the gospel, this is the channel through which they are conveyed; and the channel must be as permanent and continuous as the stream which is to flow through it, and therefore both channel and stream are of divine appointment."

"In the Larger Catechism, question 158 is as follows: 'By whom is the word of God to be preached?' Answer.—'The word of God is to be preached by such as are sufficiently gifted, and also duly approved and called to that office.' The inward gift alone, then, is not sufficient, nor the approval of this gift by the church, but there must be a call to the office. Of what nature is this call? The text referred to answers the question:—'And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.' Observe that this same text was cited in the Confession of Faith, in explanation of what lawful ordination is. To be 'duly approved and called,' then, is to be lawfully ordained, and to be lawfully ordained is to be set apart outwardly by those possessing authority to this end by divine appointment."

"I might here proceed to make other extracts from the standards of the Presbyterian church, and sustain those I have made by parallel passages from the standards of her sister churches around us, and illustrate the whole by unequivocal language from the teachings of her ablest doctors—proving that the undoubted doctrine of this church is, that a ministry divinely appointed by external ordination is essential to the visible church, and proving, moreover, that this doctrine

has the surest warrants of Scripture and sound reason—but enough has been said."

"So much for the principles maintained by your standards. As to the general inconsistency of your practice, as indicated in the array of facts which you have drawn up, that is your affair and not mine. However, if you will permit me, I will observe that I think instances are not wanting to show that other communities interpret the standards of your church, and the practice of that section of it to which I suppose you belong, in the sense I have expressed, rather in that which, unintentionally perhaps for the purpose of this discussion, you have asserted."

"The Congregationalists do not seem to think that you are one with them. In the Congregational Catechism, bearing the imprint, New Haven, A. H. Maltby, 1811, the last question of the book is: 'In what important respect does the Presbyterian church agree with those just mentioned, (viz. the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Episcopal churches) contrary to the primitive and Congregational systems?' Answer.—"

'In describing the brotherhood of each particular church of the government thereof, and vesting all ecclesiastical power in the hands of church officers.' What the Quakers and Baptists might have to say to your catholic practice, I will not undertake to determine. And whether in 'missionary' enterprises and the circulation of God's word you find yourselves in brotherly unity with the Methodists, I need not inform the public.—But I will say that the professions of your last letter, of catholic affection and practice, are strangely illustrated by the charge brought against you by 60,000 of your Presbyterian brethren, that in Anno Domini, 1837, you by an act of discipline cut them off from your church, because they adhered to a 'plan of union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists' for the work of the gospel; or rather because, as church members, they were embraced in a system which grew out of this union."

"Into the merits of this charge I do not enter—for I do not make the charge—but may it not be well for you to remember that while you are bringing accusations against me for 'exclusiveness' and 'uncharitableness,' and are ringing all possible changes upon the word 'unchurch,' 60,000 of your laymen and 500 of your clergy are hurling an accusation against you?—they employ the stronger word 'excommunicate.'—Does not this tend to show that whatever may be your mercy towards Quakers and others, this mercy has not been extended to these, your brethren? You 'excommunicated' them—without citation, and without a trial—not on the ground of apostasy from the essential faith, but on the pretension that the 'plan of union of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists' was unconstitutional, irregular and unnatural. You 'excommunicated' them all. This, I believe, is their charge against your church."

Dr. Wainwright sums up this part of his argument, thus:

"It may seem to you ungracious in me to adopt the line of argument to which this letter has been devoted, but I plead as my apology that I have been constrained to do it in self-defense, for so far as the doctrine goes, of the necessity for a divinely appointed ministry, deriving its authority from Christ, by external ordination by other ministers, I am a Presbyterian, in the sense which I attach to your standards. If you cannot come and stand with me on this ground, and there with me try our strength, whether I must remain with you, or you be compelled to go forward with me, I shall be forced to leave you in the latitudinarian region of Congregationalism till some other opponent from the Presbyterian ranks presents himself to break a lance with you; or in other words, I shall consider this point as sufficiently established, and in my future letters shall take it for granted, without further argument."

"Now, in a few words, let me say in conclusion, that it may be distinctly marked, that your own standards plainly and unequivocally set forth—

"1. That the ministry is given to the church by the selfsame authority which gives to it the Holy Scriptures, namely, Christ's authority. As Christ's authority must be binding in one case as absolutely as it is in another, it follows of course, that the Presbyterian church holds a divinely appointed ministry to be essential to the being of a church."

"2. That this divine appointment is given in an external commission, through ordination by other ordained ministers."

THE QUESTION.

Dr. W. concludes his letter thus:

"Now it is for you to say how the ordaining ministers are invested with Christ's authority to ordain.—Observe, the question is not concerning the internal

call and qualifications of the candidate for ordination, but concerning the qualifications of his ordainers to give him his outward call. The question is, not whether he hold the faith of Christ, but whether his ordainers have authority to give him the commission of Christ—so that the scriptural rule may be obeyed which is referred to by yourselves as bearing upon external ordination:—'No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that was called of God, as was Aaron.'"

"Do you, or do you not believe that you can, consistently with your standards, with the teachings of your accredited ministers, and the most eminent living doctors of your church, affirm that a minister can be lawfully commissioned otherwise than by external ordination by other ministers, who have themselves been externally ordained?"

"I am, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT.

"Monday, Jan. 22."

Matters were here, at length, brought to a focal point. A question was put to Dr. Potts, an answer to which, on his part, would test the question whether Dr. Potts himself really believed there was any substantial difference between the Episcopal and Presbyterian claims, after all. Let us see how he treats it.—We look over his answer without being able to discover any allusion to the question at all, though we do find a very labored attempt to convey the impression that Presbyterians are not as exclusive as Episcopalians.—We find moreover, an explicit repetition by Dr. Potts, of the arguments he had before expressed, and which Dr. Wainwright had noticed as being more like Quakerism or Congregationalism than Presbyterianism.—And this, too, without any effort to show wherein he differed from those sects, in his views of the ministry, or whether he disagreed with them, at all! We give an extract or two:

"The call to it consists, primarily, in the possession of a sincere desire to advance the cause of evangelic truth and righteousness; secondly, in the possession of the requisite intellectual gifts and qualifications for this purpose; and thirdly, in the voice of the people, inviting the individual to exercise those qualifications in their behalf. Ordination is the public recognition of such an individual as the possessor of such a call, and does not invest him with any sacramental and mysterious virtues which he did not before possess. Every denomination, for the simple purpose of securing order, and preventing the intrusion among them of persons who give no proof of possessing such a call as the one just described, has made its own arrangements, as it has an undoubted right to do, provided its rules be substantial and designed conformity with what they believe to be the principles and spirit of the gospel.—This is, in their sense of the words, lawful ordination, concerning which you say so much."

"Let us imagine the possibility that at the period when the Reformation shook the throne of the great spiritual despotism which had so long and wickedly usurped the holy name of the Catholic church, not one of the prelates or priests of that vast incorporation of anti-Christian errors had come out of its bosom. Instead of a number of ordained priests, such as Luther, let us suppose some noble hearted layman had first lighted the flame of reform, and had gathered multitudes of Christians around the reinvigorated Word of God, would it not have been the right and duty of those believers to organize themselves as a church of Jesus Christ, and to appoint and invest ministers to discharge ministerial duties for them? To deny this, would be to say that there is no remedy against a great error."

Dr. Potts then proceeds to urge, with great force and power, against the exclusive claims of the ministry of the regular succession, the argument drawn from the known fact that God abundantly owns and blesses with spiritual efficacy, the ministrations of ministers not ordained in the prescribed mode, or by the authorities claiming exclusive right to ordain.

But Dr. Wainwright finds it less convenient to answer this, and similar arguments, than to throw back again into the face of his opponent, the essentially Episcopal position (so far as this question is concerned) of his own Presbyterian church! And he means, if possible, to hold him to that point, and get an answer, if practicable, to the question he had proposed. His next letter opens with a reiteration of the question.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR:—I am constrained to call the attention of our readers particularly to the conclusion of my last letter, which is as follows: 'Do you, or do you not believe that you can, consistently with your standards, with the teachings of your accredited minis-

etc, and the most eminent living doctors of your church, affirm that a ministry can be lawfully continued, one otherwise than by external ordination by other ministers, who have themselves been externally ordained?"

"I had little expectation that you would answer the foregoing interrogatory, for I know and doubtless our readers perceived, that any answer true to its point would involve you in serious difficulty. Should you answer in the negative you must abandon the principle of your own church. Should you answer in the affirmative, you must abandon your own proposition, viz. 'that there is no warrant from Scripture for making any particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship and communion with God which are the distinguishing duties and privileges of the church of Christ.'

"You therefore did not find it expedient to answer the question—but instead of doing so, ran off into various digressions, &c. &c.

"When you volunteered in this controversy you took your ground against me as being an Episcopalian. I, on the other hand, accepted your challenge as from a Presbyterian. I had a right to suppose, therefore, that we should each be true to our own standards, and carry on our controversy under their sacred and binding authority. I had pledged conformity to mine, in the same spirit as I do not doubt you did to yours when you gave an affirmative reply to the question, 'Do you sincerely receive and adopt the confession of faith of this church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the holy Scriptures?' *Form of Gov. of the Pres. Chh.* Chap. xv, Sec. xli.

"When therefore in your fifth letter you advanced your first argument in support of the affirmative proposition, I met it fairly and directly. My course of argument was this—(the public, I trust, will understand it and feel its weight, if you do not)—I showed that the Presbyterian church did 'make a particular external form of polity a condition of that Christian fellowship,' &c. I quoted the standards of that church—I sustained their doctrine by references to scripture and by comment. I adopted this doctrine as far as it goes and assumed it as my own. To all this you offered not a single refutation.

"Now here I must solicit your special attention and the reader's patience, for the question presenting itself is of the utmost importance. It lies at the foundation of all this controversy. If the principle I contend for is not sustained by the most elegant and satisfactory arguments I need go no farther. If a divinely appointed apostolic ministry—I mean too in the sense of the Episcopal and Presbyterian standards—and I affirm that on this point they agree—is not essential to a church, then prelates are not essential—then the question of apostolical succession is as unimportant as can well be imagined. Therefore it is that I press this point home upon you, and demand a categorical answer to the question which concluded my last letter and which I repeat in this. If you can answer in the negative and sustain your negation; or in other words, if you can support your first argument that 'there is no warrant from Scripture for making any particular external form of polity a condition,' &c., then you knock down your own ecclesiastical mansion about your ears, and with the same blow you demolish the divine right of Episcopacy. But you have not done this, &c.

"Answer affirmatively or negatively to the question of my last letter, repeated in this. If affirmatively, then you are a Congregationalist and I leave you in the hands of the Presbyterians, to battle with them the question of divinely appointed ministry. If negatively, then your first argument is demolished and you must build up another.

"I affirm and you cannot deny that the Presbyterian standards teach that neither 'the inward call,' nor intellectual gifts and qualifications' (this is the Quaker doctrine) nor 'the voice of the people inviting to exercise their qualifications in their behalf,' (this is the Congregational doctrine) constitute a gospel minister; and that ordination is not merely 'the public recognition of such an individual as the possessor of such a call,' (this is the whole import of Congregational ordination) but that ordination does invest the individual with an authority which he did not before possess, and which he could possess solely and exclusively by the laying on of the hands of other ministers who have themselves been externally ordained. (And this is the Presbyterian doctrine.)

"That this is the Presbyterian doctrine I will not attempt to strengthen the proof by quoting more largely from your standards, than I have done in my last letter,

lest I should fatigue our readers, but I will refer to what may be of some interest to them, and what will greatly fortify my position. I will refer to the doings of the General Assembly held in June last.

"This very point now between us then came up, and was fully discussed, on the question of the rights of ruling elders to impose hands at ordination. On one side it was argued that they had the right, on the ground that 'they were members of the Presbytery, and ordination was to be by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.' On the other side it was contended that they had no such authority, inasmuch as 'ministerial acts could be performed only by ministers.' 'Ministers were the representatives of the head of the church, the elders the representatives of the body.' 'The ministers are Christ's representatives, the elders the church's.' We have here then the two elements of office—election by the people through their representatives the elders, and ordination by Christ through his representatives or ministers. And what, I ask, does the church give him (i. e. the ruling elder)? Not the power of ordination, for the Church herself, aside from the ministry, does not possess that power. Independents sometimes ordain without preaching elders, but that is not Presbyterianism. And here is the very point in question. The church has power to deliberate, advise and decide, but not to impose hands. This significant act of very ancient origin is an emblem of the transfer of ministerial power. But the church is not the depository of this power, and therefore she cannot delegate it to her representatives. Three were some of the arguments used, and sound arguments they were, and they prevailed, and they were sustained by your General Assembly, by the following overwhelming vote:

Yeas.....131
Nays.....8
Excused.....2
Absent.....15—159"

The next letter of Dr. Potts which occupies full two and a half columns of the New York Evangelist, contains no direct (or even indirect) answer to the oft reiterated question of Dr. Wainwright. It does contain, however, (and for the first time, so far as we can discover) a direct allusion to the question. Here it is:

"You seem to think that a certain query, which closes your last letter but one, contains something so formidable to my argument that I purposely avoided any notice of it. This is quite a mistake. I cannot perceive, in the question referred to, any Scylla and Charybdis, any sunken rocks, through which I feared to pass. In what I have already offered, the question had been answered again and again. It is in fact the very question in debate, viz: the necessary succession of individuals. If you require further satisfaction on this point, I hope my succeeding remarks will furnish it."

Instead, however, of undertaking to tell, directly or indirectly, whether he believes the Presbyterian church according to its standards, recognizes any church without an ordained minister, or recognizes any ordained minister without ministerial ordination, Dr. Potts only enters into a further repetition of his own views on that subject, evidently determined not to answer the question of Dr. Wainwright!

Dr. Wainwright, nevertheless, once more, undertakes to force him to the point.

"I submit to our readers that I proved, from the authoritative standards of your own church, as supported by Scripture, and the decision of your General Assembly, that a MINISTRY EXTERNALLY ORDAINED BY ORDAINED MINISTERS IS A DIVINE APPOINTMENT, AND CONSEQUENTLY NECESSARY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF A CHURCH, AND THAT THIS IS A SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE."

"In my last two letters I pressed upon you a question in regard to ordination, namely, whether a man can be a lawful minister unless he has been ordained by imposition of hands by other similarly ordained ministers."

"You say that you have answered it 'again and again.' I am obliged to reply that, to my apprehension, you have not answered it at all. Excuse me for saying my belief is that you dare not categorically answer it yes or no. At all events, I submit it to the judgment of the sound theologians of your own church, that you have not answered it."

"I pressed the point concerning ordination solely to get at the question concerning succession. I assure you there was no design to entrap you—no unworthy artifice in my course. I supposed, and I still suppose, that between a sound Presbyterian and myself there is no difference, either in regard to the necessity for an externally ordained ministry, or in regard to the apostolical succession of that ministry, but that the doctrine of both our churches on these two points is perfectly identical: that there is no difference in principle; and

that the sole question between us is—whether the ordaining power is given by Christ to all the presbytery, or limited to a certain number of chief presbyters or Bishops.

"The correctness of this supposition I also refer to the decision of the intelligent theologians of your own church."

But all to no purpose! Dr. Potts, in another long letter, containing, to be sure, much weighty argument against the Episcopal claims, makes no further allusion to the dreaded question, does not undertake to deny that Dr. W. has proved the identity, in principle, of the Presbyterian and Episcopal standards, on the point of ordination (evidently decisive at that point, in of the connected though distinct question of apostolical succession)—does not say whether or no he believes the Presbyterian standards require ordination by ministers previously ordained.

Instead of doing this, he opens his letter with the following very remarkable sentence:

"It is now perfectly obvious that my opponent does not mean to come to the point, and therefore, the idea of dignifying this correspondence with the title of a discussion, is worthy of ridicule only—a ridicule in which I am not at all inclined to share."

Dr. Potts therefore retires from the discussion with Dr. Wainwright, but will pursue his argument against the Episcopal pretensions, 'with his reader and not his opponent in his eye.' The reader will judge whether Dr. Potts was less unwilling to 'come to the point of the comparative position of Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, than Dr. Wainwright was to come to the point, (on grounds of Scripture and common sense) on the soundness of the Episcopal claims. On this latter topic Dr. W. entered, immediately after he found he could not make Dr. Potts adhere to Presbyterianism nor define it.

It strikes us that on one point, Dr. Wainwright might have made an additional and an effective answer to the defense of Dr. Potts, drawn from the liberal practices of his sect, especially the ministerial interchanges of Presbyterianism with other sects, the recognition of their ministry and ministerial acts, in proof that Presbyterians were not chargeable with any approximation to Episcopal exclusiveness. Dr. Potts should have been challenged to adduce, if he could, a single instance of this ministerial interchange of Presbyterians, or of Presbyterian recognition of the validity of ministerial acts, in cases where the ministers thus recognized have not been ministerially ordained. To Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists in America, at the present day, are as regularly accustomed to ministerial ordinations as the Presbyterians themselves. A practical compromise, or rather abandonment, on the part of Congregational churches of the vital principle of original independency or Congregationalism, lies at the foundation of that close intimacy between Presbyterians and Congregationalists by which the distinctive features of original Congregationalism have been almost wholly obliterated or modified—and as fundamental principles reduced to an empty abstraction, and held in abeyance. The refusal not only of the Oneida Presbytery, but even of the General Convention of (so called) Congregational ministers, in the State of New York, to fraternize with the Whitechapel Association that had adventured to admit laymen (thus uniting ministers and laymen in the ordaining body) is sufficient to settle that question. If a moiety of the lay element in the ordaining body view it as the ordination in their view, how much more when the entire body are laymen!—Let the Congregational churches return to the practice of their fathers and ordain their own ministers, without clerical aid, and we should soon see whether such a ministry would be recognized by Presbyterians, or even by most ministers professing to be Congregationalist. Let Dr. Potts, himself, with all his extraordinary Presbyterian liberality, be tested on this question. If he truly recognizes the Quaker ministry as valid, let him invite some of them to interchange with him, and this part of his argument will acquire new significance.

It is true that Presbyterian ministers in recognizing ministers of the Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational communions, recognize those who have not received their ordination, through an unbroken apostolic succession. In this they are not as strict or as consistent as their Episcopal brethren, and for a reason that looks in

"The reader of the subsequent articles of Dr. Potts, will notice however, that he afterwards keeps Dr. Wainwright 'in his eye,' and distinctly says he does not mean to let him escape from him!—to relieve himself of the trouble of Dr. W.'s annoying questions about Presbyterianism was evidently the object of Dr. Potts in declining to discuss with him."

"The only instance of lay ordination we know of, is regarded as alarming innovation, not only by Presbyterians but by many who call themselves Congregationalists."

another direction than their superior liberality. They cannot claim such an unbroken succession themselves, a fact that demonstrates the rottenness, either of their principles or of their ecclesiastical edifice, or both.

It is true too, that many Presbyterians are less exclusive than Presbyterians; in other words, that many of the crew and some of the officers of the ship are in a position to consider the propriety of quitting the old bulk, for a better. With this large and increasing class, the distinction so much insisted on by Dr. Potts, between the Scriptural *fulfillment* and the exclusive obligation of any particular system of church organization, will have little weight. Only let the mass of the Presbyterian membership make up their minds distinctly to this one point, that the sacraments and the ministry, upon the bases of lay ordination without clerical concurrence, are valid—let this point be conceded, and their right to remain under the control of a clerical caste will soon pass into the list of rights waived—rights not exercised! And besides, the public mind is rapidly waking; up to the obvious truth that if Christ has instituted any church government at all, he has described and defined it. On this point, Congregational Independence and High Church Episcopacy will shake hands; the question between them will be "What has Christ said?"—and the 18th chapter of Matthew, and 1 Cor. v., &c., will have to settle the question, while the low Presbyterianism of Dr. Potts and Garrisonian No Church Governmentism, (both founded on the opposite assumption that Christ has instituted no form of church order,) will have to settle their rival claims as they can.

In conclusion: Dr. Wainwright has fairly made out that the Presbyterianism of the Confession of Faith and of the old school General Assembly holds a regular ministry to be essential to the existence of a Christian church: That such a ministry must be ordained by those who were ministers before them: That such a ministry hold the exclusive right of preaching and of dispensing the ordinances: That "out of the church," (as thus constituted and defined,) there is "ordinarily, no possibility of salvation!"—In respect to these facts, his opponent cannot dispute him!

From these premises it is easy to see that Dr. Wainwright can readily make it appear,

1. That all good Presbyterians are bound to belong to a church whose ministers have been lawfully ordained by those who were ministers before them.

2. That ordinations, at the present day, to be valid, must be made by those who have been ordained by those who were ordained by ordained ministers, &c., in an unbroken chain, that can be traced back to the first ministers of the gospel.

[To say, as Dr. Potts says, that an unbroken succession of individuals is not necessary to valid ordination, is to say that the Presbyterian doctrine of ordination exclusively by ministers, is unsound, and that lay ordination is therefore valid.—And to admit, as all must do, that the Presbyterian church has not received its ministerial ordination in an unbroken chain from the first ministers of Christ, is to say that the present Presbyterian ministry, (on Presbyterian principles) is not valid and cannot become so, until it obtains ordination from those who have the regular succession.]

3. Dr. Wainwright is entitled to infer that the Presbyterian Church, equally with the Episcopal, holds the doctrine of "No church without a pastor." The Presbyterian church may indeed give the title of bishop to the local pastor, while the Episcopal church confers it only on the diocesan bishop.

4. Very evidently, the charge of "unchurching"—and delivering over to "the uncovenanted mercies of God," &c., so sensitively urged upon the Episcopal church, rests equally upon the Presbyterian, which says that out of the church—(the church with a bishop, too) there is, ordinarily, NO possibility of salvation.

5. It follows too, that all who believe the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, on these points, should forego any hope in getting into a church with a bishop, regularly ordained in the line of the apostolic succession!

No wonder the Presbyterian editors are obliged to expend so much of their time and strength in striving to keep their members and ministry out of the Episcopal Church.

If Presbyterianism be true, it is but a part of a truth, of which the unbroken and consistent whole, is to be sought in Episcopacy—PAXTON.—ROMANISM.

REFORMATION TRACTS.

TRACT No. 1. *Iniquity and a Meeting*, by President Green—3 pages, for sale at \$1.00 per hundred, for ready cash only. Orders to be addressed to Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario co., N. Y., or to E. Shepard, Printer, Rochester; or J. Mosher, Canandaigua.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, APRIL, 1844.

APPOLOGY FOR DELAY.—The matter for this number has been kept from the press, two weeks after it was in type, because the sickness of the Editor prevented him from visiting the city, as usual, to read proof and attend to the mailing.

Poor, Schmucker.—We have just received an interesting communication from Prof. Schmucker, of Gettysburg, Penn., on the subject of Christian union, and church organization, which we hope to publish in our next. Prof. Schmucker corrects an error into which we had fallen in respect to his views in one important particular. He is not in favor of erecting "another rival body over the existing sects, as a bond of union *between* them." This correction we are very happy to make.

GRANT SMITH'S VIEWS.—We have received (too late for this number) a communication from Bro. Smith, in reply to our review of the creed, &c., of the Church of Peterboro in our March number. We intend to publish it in our next. In the mean time, it may be proper to state that Bro. Smith very strongly disclaims the idea of "judging a man's Christian character irrespective of his doctrines and practices," or of being willing to "scoop in to the Church all professors of religion, be their practices blame-worthy to whatever extent they may." He also makes some other similar disclaimers, which will be best understood by giving them at length in his own language, and in the connection where he has placed them.

"INIQUITY AND A MEETING."

This discourse of President Green has been before the public, in pamphlet form, for some time; yet we think we cannot do the cause of Christian reform a better service than by giving it a place in our columns. By this means we think it will reach some hundreds of readers, in distant and distant portions of the country, who have never seen a copy of it; and very many of those who have had the pamphlet will be glad to have a spare copy for circulation where it will do good.

Though great excitement and much opposition have followed the preaching and the circulation of this sermon, and not a few Abolitionists have shrunk back, alarmed, at the boldness of its positions and the decision of its language, we have, as yet, met with no one who was prepared to disprove the correctness of the principles laid down, or to show that the present condition of the American churches did not loudly call for the application of them. The facts concerning the churches recently published in this paper should suffice, under this latter head, with all who know anything of the abominations and cruelties of slavery.

This sermon will be useful to some who congratulate themselves that they do not hold any formal church relations with slaveholders and their actors, but who, nevertheless, on the first appearance of a religious excitement, are ready to co-operate with the servile or the neutral, in attempts to promote religious revivals! Just as though the *substance* of ecclesiastical affinity was more significant of religious fellowship than active co-operation.

This sermon resembles some of those bold and aggressive publications of Luther, by which he astounded and overwhelmed, not only his enemies, but, for the moment, a large portion of his friends, giving occasion and opportunity for the hesitant and timid, if they thought fit, to step into the back-ground, and retire. Yet it was by such means, mainly, that the Reformer maintained his position, and saved himself and his cause from overthrow. Whoever would maintain the truth, or rather sustain himself by an adherence to it, must have the honesty and the courage to avow and proclaim the whole truth; for the

half of a truth is not the truth, but a lie; and "we know that no lie is of the truth."

How it works.—The following is extracted from an account in the Liberty Bells of March 25th, originally published in the Northern Advocate.

"An Episcopal Methodist Anti Slavery Convention was held at a 'Victor,' Ontario Co., N. Y. March 5th, 1844. The meeting was organized by calling Rev. Z. J. Back to the chair, and appointing Levi Stoughton, Secretary. Rev. J. Parker, Rev. W. M. Ferguson, and Rev. J. Mandaville were appointed a Business Committee." Among the "Resolutions discussed and adopted," were the following.

"Resolved, That no Slavery is a sin, and this sin is in the Church, and the Church a unit, nothing short of a speedy and entire separation of slavery from the Church, can satisfy the consciences of honest and faithful abolitionists."

"Resolved, That the dearest interests of the M. E. Church in Western New-York, are now being jeopardized by the circulation of Anti-Slavery papers among our people, which are hostile to the government and institutions of our Church; and that the only remedy is a calm and impartial discussion of the whole subject in the C. A. and J. of New-York, or a Methodist Anti-Slavery paper among ourselves."

"Resolved, That we all unitedly and solemnly pledge to God and each other, our zealous and unceasing efforts to purge the M. E. Church, and the land, from Slavery."

"Resolved, That we deem it the duty of every preacher and member of the M. E. Church, to memorialize the next General Conference, to take effectual measures to separate all Slavery from the M. E. Church, without delay."

The meeting was adjourned to April 16th, then to reassemble at the same place.

We take this movement to be an honest and earnest one. We cordially say to those brethren: go forward and purge the M. E. Church from Slavery, if you think you can. And if the circulation in Western N. York, of Anti-Slavery papers opposed to Episcopacy, can help to stir up the zeal of your Methodist brethren, use the argument and welcome. We will do what we can to give permanency and effect to that argument. But remember, "Nothing short of a speedy and entire separation of the Church from Slavery can satisfy the consciences of honest and faithful abolitionists;" for the "sin is in the Church, and the Church a unit." Put a pin there; and be careful to be found with honest and faithful. When you discover that the M. E. Church cannot be speedily and entirely separated from Slavery, announce the fact, and tell the honest, faithful, and conscientious Methodist Abolitionists, what they shall do next.

The movement for Anti-Slavery church secession if followed up, will prove the most effectual Anti-Slavery measure ever yet devised.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.

Twelve Lectures on Church Reform, being twelve numbers of the Christian Investigator, (including the proceedings and Declaration of the Syracuse Convention, instead of the first No. of the Lectures, now out of print) for sale by the Editor at *HALF PRICE*; viz. 25 CENTS for the 12 numbers.

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DECLARATION OF THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION, in the No. of the Christian Investigator for December 30, 1843—may likewise be had separately, of the Editor, at the same reduced price of the Lectures, viz: 25 cents for 12 copies.

THE ABOVE PRICES are somewhat lower, in proportion to the amount of reading, than the prices of Tracts. We put them at this rate, not because we can afford it, but because we wish to circulate speedily the balance of the edition on hand.

For the *Setts of Lectures*, we have had a brisk call, since we put them at half price, and those who wish for them should apply soon.

The *Syracuse Declaration*, too, should be circulated gratuitously by its friends, while the public attention is awake to that movement. A hundred misapprehensions are at rest respecting it, which could not prevail, if the documents were read.

The list of receipts and donations in type for this number, are crowded out. They will appear in the next.

To E. W. GOODWIN, Albany.—The two packages you ordered, the first in March, the other in April, were sent by Fomeroy's Express.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES. VOL. II—No. 5.
WHOLE NUMBER, 25.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., MAY, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—Isaiah lxv. 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, \$1.00, always in advance and free of postage.

For a person who will procure four subscribers, and forward money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy gratis. Or, if procuring one subscriber, shall have one copy. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, as follows, viz:

One dozen, \$3 50 | Sixty papers, \$12 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing any for papers.

LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

Peterboro, March 23, 1844.

Dr. Goodsell.—This day's mail has brought me March No. of the Investigator; and I have read the structures, which cover its first five pages. That after your long and intimate acquaintance with me, I should be construed on important questions as you construe me, is, I confess, deeply mortifying to me. And that one so eminent for wisdom and integrity, as William Goodsell is, should publicly charge me with being of a man's Christian character irrespective of his doctrines and practices; and with being, perhaps, if not indeed probably, willing to "cooperate" into the church "all professors of religion," be their practices blame-worthy to whatever extent they may; is, I admit, not a little trying to me, as yet, unextinguished regard for the late opinions of my fellow men.

ardon me, dear brother, for the thought, that these exceedingly severe things, which you have said against me, you have shown neither great share of your characteristic wisdom, nor Christian charity.

You have, doubtless, quoted correctly from one of the brief and hasty letters which I wrote you. The eve of the Convention held last December in Syracuse. I was in favor of having the Convention confine itself to the consideration of the duties of Christians; and was opposed to occupying any portion of its time with the inquiry what a man's doctrines and practices must be in order to his being a Christian. Now, I have been very injudicious in proposing to make this inquiry from the Convention: but either charitable or wise in you to infer from my proposition, that, in my judging of Christian character, I would overlook, or, in their judging character, I would have others overlook the elements of doctrine and practice.

And what more authority had you for making either of these two charges? It is true, that I published the proceedings of the "Church of Peterboro;" and that its creed requires the recognition, as a church member, of "every person who affords satisfactory evidence, that he is a disciple and friend of Christ—and this too even in the case of those who in their doctrines or practices or both are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may." But a violent wresting of language from its natural and obvious meaning to say that "every person who affords satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple and friend of Christ," means the same as "all professors of religion!" or is intended to mean any thing short of a real Christian! do you not deem as fit for church membership any person who is a real Christian, however great his errors? Certainly you do. But I need no more respecting these two charges, in the

making of which you were wrong, clearly wrong, wholly wrong, inexcusably wrong. It would have been in character for some sectarian bigot to have made them. But William Goodsell should always be in keeping with himself.

When we were at the Syracuse convention I hoped that our differences respecting Church Organization were small, and were in words rather than in thing. But now I am convinced, that they concern things; and that they are wide and radical. I will illustrate these differences. Suppose fifty confessedly Christian men and women were to emigrate to the centre of an uninhabited township. They have the peculiar notion that the "assembling of themselves together" for worship is not their duty. They spend the whole Sabbath in their respective closets. They employ, they designate no preacher of the gospel. Like the Quakers, they omit the ordinances of Baptism and the Supper. Further, they do not call themselves a church; and still further they are not willing to be called a church. Are they a church? Are they the church of that township? You answer, "they are not!" I answer, "they are." You add that they fail of the organization of a church; and are, therefore, not a church. I add, that they fail of some of the plainest duties of a church and are, therefore, a guilty church; but, that, unless they can cease to be a part of—to be members of, that mystical "body, which is the church," they are, and must continue to be a church. You believe, that the doing of the duties, which they leave undone, are essential to their church organization—to their being a church:—and I no more believe it, than I believe that the walking, running, working, of a man is essential to his organization—is a part of the man; or that the motion of a machine, is the machine itself.

You remark that man is not passive, but active, in his regeneration. Be it that he is so. Nevertheless, to infer from it, that he has an agency in organizing churches seems any thing rather than sound logic. The Federal Constitution is the organic law—is the political organization of this nation. The election of officers under the constitution—the assembling of the people for such election—the legislative and judicial proceedings—these all flow from, but constitute no part of that organization. A foreigner reaches America. He is not passive, but active, in his emigration. By that emigration he becomes a subject, but in no degree, and in no sense, an author of our national political organization. A man, is "born again." He thereby becomes a subject, but not a creator of the kingdom of Jesus Christ—a subject, but not an author of the heavenly organization. His part is but to act under and to act out the laws of that kingdom and that organization. When the Christians who compose a local church (and by a local church I mean nothing more nor less than the Christians of a given community) when they provide themselves with the preached gospel, and assemble themselves stately for public worship, and celebrate the ordinances, and mutually subject themselves to each other's supervision and discipline, they are obeying laws which they have had no share in enacting—they are carrying out an organization of which their Savior is the exclusive author.

For the information of yourself and the readers of your paper, I would state, that the resolution, of the adoption of which by the Syracuse Convention, you are not quite sure, was certainly adopted. And what more reasonable resolution could it have adopted? Suppose a man tells me that he has withdrawn from a church, because

it is sectarian—or, if you please, because it is proslavery? I ask him if he thinks it is an anti-Christian church. He answers that he does not. I rejoin that he must think it such a church or lack justification for his withdrawal—that no objections to a church, which do not extend to the destruction of its character, as a church of Christ, are sufficient to justify secession from it. Now in this rejoinder, I express no opinion, and in passing the resolution, the convention expressed no opinion, whether a church which is sectarian or proslavery is therefore an anti-Christian church.

If you interpret correctly the 3d position of the "church of Christ of Utica," I am, as well as yourself opposed to that position. If Christians are so numerous in all parts of Utica that they need the North church of Utica and the East church of Utica and the West church of Utica and the South church of Utica and the Central church of Utica, or, what would be to me more agreeable designations, the first church of Utica, the second church of Utica, &c. &c., I would not only approve of this multiplication, but I would have them all entirely independent of each other. You ask if Peterboro should grow to the size of Albany, must all the Christians of Peterboro constitute the church of Peterboro? My remark respecting the division of the Christians of Utica into several independent churches, is a sufficient answer to this question. You speak of the village of Siloam, which is a couple of miles East of Peterboro. If the Christians of that little village and its neighborhood think that there should be the church of Siloam, or think that it would be more convenient for them to have their local church relations with the Christians of Munsville, which is a village two miles East of Siloam, than with the Christians of Peterboro, then I would not regard the Christians of Siloam and its neighborhood as falling within the "territorial limits" of the "church of Peterboro."

You dislike the position that "all the Christians in Peterboro must constitute the church of Peterboro." And you say that if this position be just, it will follow that "all the Christians in Smithfield must constitute the church of Smithfield, and all the Christians in Madison county must constitute the church of Madison county, and all the Christians in the state of New York must constitute the church of the state of N. York; and all of the Christians in the United States must constitute the church of the U. States." This inference being drawn by you, there are no bounds to your alarm. Each of these churches, you say, must have its dignitaries and courts:—and what less can be the ruling power of the church of the United States—than a "conclave of Cardinals, a stated general council—or a universal bishop—a pope!" These are indeed great prospects for the little church of Peterboro, which holds its despised meetings in a room of a tavern! Well, if our little church should grow, as you apprehend, to the greatness and splendor of the papal power itself, this progress will be but another verification of the line, "tall oaks from little acorns grow."

I admit that there is a sense in which all the Christians of Smithfield must (do) constitute the church of Smithfield, and all the Christians of Madison county must (do) constitute the church of Madison county. If it is just the sense in which you mean, that all the Christians of America, or if you prefer, that all the churches of America constitute the church of America, when you of the American church. It is just the sense in which the creed of the "Church of Peter-

means "that the church of Christ in any nation is composed of all the Christians of such a nation." Suppose now that on some occasion when you speak of "the pro slavery of the American church," a person present says to you: "So you believe there is an American church, and hence, believe that there should be an American or National Bishop, and an American or National Ecclesiastical authority? Would you not regard his inference as utterly gratuitous and unjust? and as exceedingly wrongful to you? How then must I feel, when you practice toward me not a little of the very unreasonableness which in the supposed case you are yourself made to suffer.

Odious to you, as is the doctrine, and leading as it does in your eyes, to popery itself, I nevertheless rejoice in the doctrine, that those Christians of a given locality, who are not willing to be so regarded, are nevertheless to be regarded as members of the one church of that locality—be that locality the village of Peterboro or a whole sparsely populated township. To regard them as such is to accord with truth. Not to regard them as such is to fall in with their false position, their sectarianism, and schism. Because they will not occupy their heaven-appointed place, is no reason why we should consent to their leaving it. I know, my brother, that you hate sectarianism, and are fighting valiently against it; nevertheless, I do not hesitate to say that if the doctrine in question be surrendered; neither you nor any other person, can make effective opposition to sectarianism. Surrender that doctrine, and the Christian of Peterboro will be suffered to go five miles to Morrisville, because that church is more Arminian than the church of Peterboro; or ten miles to the church of Cazenovia, because that church is more Calvinistic; or eleven miles to the church of Chittenango, because in some other and perhaps very unimportant respect, that church suits him better. Surrender that doctrine—and you have granted to sectarianism every measure of indulgence, which it may choose to claim.

With the sovereignty of your language, against the association of churches with each other, I have no sympathy. I think such association wrong and dangerous, but to speak of it as very highly and glaringly criminal, I cannot. Every encroachment on the entire independence of a local church is unscriptural and sinful: but in an association of churches with each other, such an encroachment however much to be apprehended, is certainly, not of necessary occurrence.

In supposing as you do, that "the Church of Peterboro" keeps a roll of its members, you are in error. There is such a roll; but it is kept in Heaven; the name of every Christian within our "territorial limits" is upon it. He who looks upon the heart,—not they whose view is limited to "the outward appearance"—is alone capable of determining what names to write upon it.

You believe my "theories of church organization such, as exclude nobody from the church who think themselves suitable members." You are wrong: my theories are such, that none but Christians can by any possibility be in the church. It is true that "the church of Peterboro" is liable to impositions. Wicked men—deceiving and self-deceived—may presume to take part in her conference and prayer meetings, and to sit at the table which she spreads with the symbols of her Savior's body and blood. I know of no unailing process for their exclusion from such occasions. The sectarian churches have found their sectarian creed ineffectual to shield themselves from such evils—and I do not suppose that her lack of such a creed will shield the "Church of Peterboro" from them. Holy living on the part of those who recognize themselves to be members of "the church of Peterboro" is, under God, my only reliance for exemption from these evils. If they live as "children of the light," the children "of darkness" will, in very rare instances, be in-

clined to mingle with them, for darkness has as little communion with light as light has with it. Let the lives of the men and women who surround the Lord's table, be holy; and no creeds or contrivances can compare with the power of those lives, to repel and shut out intruders.

But I must close—and that too, ere I have written scarce as many lines, as the sentences in your extended animadversions. The weary cares which press upon me, from morning till night, leave me no time, no strength, no spirit, even for a brief exercise out of the line of those cares. Let me say, in conclusion, that I love you no less, because you do not see all things as I do—and that I subscribe myself as warmly as ever,

Your friend and brother,

GERRIT SMITH.

REPLY TO GERRIT SMITH.

MY DEAR BROTHER.—I have always thought it exceedingly desirable for Christian brethren to interchange freely, their views, on all subjects touching the interests of Christ's kingdom, and have believed it practicable to do this, without giving or taking offense. And I have not doubted that when the subject of "Christian Union" should be correctly understood, and the spirit of Christian union fully imbibed, this most desirable result would be reached, so that free investigation, without a compromise of truth, and without a breach in Christian charity, might perform and without cease, its allotted task of eliciting and disseminating truth, of detecting and confuting error, till an unanimity of sentiment should be produced, the description and anticipation of which would now be considered extravagant and strange. On this point, the 8th Resolution of the Church of Peterboro so fully corresponds with my views, and its language seems so appropriate to this place, that I cannot forbear to quote it entire:

"Whereas there is a prevailing delusion, that a Union Church requires a surrender of private judgment and a compromise of truth; and that but for this surrender and compromise, the contentions in such Church would be too great to be endured: Resolved, therefore, That the members of a Union or Gospel Church are not only free to entertain their respective views, both of doctrine and practice, but are bound to inculcate them on their brethren, and to rebuke the rejection of them; and that, while such freedom and faithfulness do not only not engender fatal strife, but do actually produce assimilation of character and that true peace which follows purity [James iii. 17], the barriers which sectarianism erects do, on the other hand, by hindering the mutual access, and fomenting the mutual jealousies, of Christians, obstruct the progress of truth, and maintain an increasing disagreement of sentiments and opposition or spirit between those who are commanded to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" [1st Cor. i. 10] and to merge their diversities of character even in oneness itself [John xvii. 21, 22, 23]."

I cannot doubt, brother Smith, that you will agree with me in saying that the sentiment of this Resolution applies to Christians living hundreds of miles distant from each other, as well as to the members of a local church, and that the press as well as the church meeting may be properly used in the work of free investigation and faithful remonstrance that it describes.

"IS IT PRACTICABLE?"

It will follow, if I mistake not, that when a brother honestly and faithfully inculcates, through the press, the doctrines and practices which he deems true and important, and even "rebukes the rejection of them" in a kind spirit, the fact of his doing so should not be deemed an offense by those whom he "rebukes." A brother, for such a cause should not be considered as wanting in "wisdom or Christian charity." He should not be represented as acting in "the character of a sectarian bigot" rather than his own! The right and duty of free discussion and mutual rebuke would otherwise be little worth, and lookers-on might well be tempted to conclude that: Christian Union "requires a surrender of private judgment, and a compromise of truth, and that, but for this surrender and compromise, the contentions of such" Christian Unionists "would be too great to be endured." "Sectarian bigotry" and want of "Christian charity" should doubtless be rebuked, as well as other errors and faults, but if the free investigation and rebuke, described in the 8th Resolution of the Peterboro Church are to be taken as evidences of such sectarian bigotry and want of Christian

charity, then such investigation and rebuke should cease, and the 8th Resolution of the Peterboro church should be reconsidered and negatived.

And if this be true, how much more emphatically would the same observations apply to the case of a brother who while inculcating his own peculiar views, and calling in question the correctness of opposite sentiments, takes special care that nothing shall escape him, which can fairly be construed into the language of the spirit of "rebuke!" Who, instead of "rebuking" the views which to him appear erroneous, covers himself with simply asking whether or no he can have correctly understood the writers whom he rebukes—expressing his real and honest doubts as to his meaning—inviting a further explanation of what he is not confident he understands, suggesting objections against the sentiments which, to his best apprehension, the language seemed to imply, pointing out "parent discrepancies" between some parts of a document and others—and ever and anon, declaring any intention of imputing to the authors of it, the wrong sentiments which the language seemed to convey and bad consequences which an adoption of their teachings (as he understands them) would be likely, in his judgment, to produce!

If such investigations, brother Smith, give evidence of a lack of "Christian charity"—if they are the marks of "sectarian bigotry"—then, I repeat it, the 8th Resolution of the Church of Peterboro should be set down among the dreams of Utopia; free inquiry should be hushed, to preserve the peace of the church, and we may hug the "barriers of Sectarianism" as low down to the inflexible decisions of "Holy Mother Church" as we may think best, despairing of any "Christian union" that can co-exist with free speech.

Am I right, brother Smith, in saying all this, or am I wrong?

If I am right, then I claim, and shall proceed to show that my Review of the Peterboro Document, and the other expressed views of Gerrit Smith, gave no proper occasion for you to intimate my want of "Christian charity" or acting in the character of a "Sectarian bigot" rather than in my own. I shall show, if I take not, that my course in that Review, was precisely the same that I have just now described.

"SECTARIAN!"

But before I do this, I will just observe that prominent writers on Christian Union, particularly the long correspondents and the late Editor of the Christian Herald, have abundantly insisted that the term "heretic" in the New Testament, signifies the same thing as our modern term "sectarian." If this statement be true, it follows, that to call a brother a "sectarian" is the same thing as to call him a "heretic!" That is intimate, somewhat more politely, than an acknowledgment that a brother acts more in keeping with the character of a "sectarian bigot" than he does with his character, is much the same thing as to say that, as a matter in hand, he appears more like a heretic than a Christian! All this brother Smith had a right to say if he thought the case required it, though I do not think it was his intention to say so "sovereign" a thing. I do not treasure it up against him, nor very seriously do I to heart. I will read him no homilies on the "freedom and charity" of the sentiment. I will not question the propriety of his "rebuking" me as he thinks deserve. But I will ask him to point out to me in any easy or sectarianism, the next time he rebukes me, show me wherein it consists. He will permit me to show to remind him that the cry of "heretic" or "sectarian" is but a sorry substitute for a requested explanation or a needed argument.

WAS THE DISCUSSION NEEDED?

Let me now ask brother Smith, and ask too, the readers of this correspondence, to look over again my Review in the Christian Investigator for March. Was the occasion of that Review? And what the spirit of my remarks, and queries?

A very important circular had been sent out by brother Smith to his numerous correspondents and friends containing the creed and resolutions of the Church of Peterboro. At the Syracuse Convention brother Smith had promulgated views of Church Organization in accordance with the Peterboro creed. The Convention could not agree with him in the adoption of his creed and resolutions, expressive of his views. And on account of the opposite sentiments in its Declaration of Sentiments, brother Smith declined giving that document signature, and stated publicly his reasons. All that had a right to do, and no man charged him with heresy or berecy or sectarianism for his earnest and conscientious dissent.

But here was an important difference of sentiment between brethren engaged in the same cause? Was

proper that those differences should be earnestly discussed? Was not the Peterboro Creed, and were not the Resolutions of bro. Smith, proper subjects for public inquiry and review? If they contained important truths that the Syracuse Convention had not understood, it was not important that they should be further examined, in order to their being better understood? If, on the other hand, the Declaration of the Convention was correct, and the Peterboro creed and the Resolutions of bro. Smith, in some important points, were incorrect, was it not proper that an investigation should be had, that should make this apparent to the minds of church reform?

Was there any lack of "wisdom and Christian charity" in my commencing such a discussion? or in my advocating the sentiments I believed to be correct? or in my calling in question the sentiments of the creed and of the Resolutions that I considered incorrect? Was there any evidence of "sectarian bigotry" in my taking such a course? I feel confident that you will answer, no.

MY MODE OF DISCUSSION.

What was there, then, of a sectarian or bigoted, or of a variable character, in the scope or language of that review?

Believing, as I had long done, that one of the very things in a discussion of this kind, should be a full and accurate mutual understanding, by the parties, of each others views, I set myself first of all, to the work of trying to understand the documents in question. Finding no small difficulty in this, and knowing that many others, including wiser men than myself, intelligent friends of brother Smith, together with (as I believed) a majority of the members of the Syracuse Convention, men who had been often instructed by his teachings, were equally puzzled with myself to accurately and distinctly and with certainty his views on this subject. I thought I could do the cause of investigation better service than in pointing out to bro. Smith what he had seemed to me and to others, some of the "apparent discrepancies" of his statements, and ask him to explain and reconcile them: In tracing out moreover some of the bad consequences that would be likely, in my judgment to arise from sentiments apparently expressed or implied in his writings, for the purpose of asking him whether his meaning had been rightly understood, and if so, how he would guard against the possibility that had been apprehended to arise from such statements. I spent, confidently to the Review in my next number, for the evidences that this was the true and spirit of the whole article. And I ask you to tell me, brother Smith, in what more respectful and reasonable manner I could have approached you, or in what better way I could have introduced or invited a discussion of the subject? I demand of you then my want of "wisdom and Christian charity" apparent in this, and wherein I showed myself to be acting in the character of a "sectarian bigot?" Is it in my want of capacity, (along with many others) to understand your meaning, and to reconcile some of your expressions with others? Or was it in my desire to possess a further explanation of your meaning? or because I feared certain bad results would follow from some of the sentiments you seemed to express? Was it because, with my best efforts to understand you, I fell into mistakes, and thought it possible you might have meant something which you now say you did not mean? It might indeed have been owing to our sectarian [that is, heretical] education, that myself and others were so backward to comprehend the more orthodox views you presented to us, but did it not have been better for brother Smith to have directed us by answering my honest inquiries, rather than to cut the matter short by calling in question my Christian charity? and intimating that I acted the part of a "sectarian bigot" in asking such questions?

"SEVERE CHARGES."

Now you complain that I brought severe "charges" against you, and it is doubtless on this assumption that you make such severe charges upon me, in return. I deny that I made any such charges, either in fact, or in spirit. And I maintain, moreover, that if I attributed or charged to you the same things that I think I did, there would have been neither "sectarian bigotry" nor want of "Christian charity" in so doing. Had I named occasion thus of "charges" or even "rebutals" you, I should have only done what the 8th resolution of the Church of Peterboro says I have a perfect right to do, and that without any breach of Christian charity at all!

The following extracts from my Review, will show that unfounded is the statement that I made severe charges against you:

"The church of Peterboro holds itself bound to recognize those who give evidence of being disciples and friends of Christ, even in the case of those whose doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may." Hence, at first sight, one might be led to suppose that none could be excluded from recognition who professed to be disciples and friends of Christ, let them believe or reject whatever doctrines they might, or maintain whatever practices they desired. But the meaning cannot be this! On a closer reading it appears that those who must be thus recognized, must give evidence that they are disciples or friends of Christ. But how is that evidence to be exhibited, while the persons in question, both in doctrine and practice, may be unscriptural and blameworthy, "to whatever extent it may?" Perhaps the meaning is, that those are to be recognized, whose doctrines and practices, however unscriptural and blameworthy, are not, on the whole, so unscriptural and blameworthy as to destroy the evidence of their being disciples and friends of Christ. But the language would seem to imply that no amount or degree of unscriptural doctrine or blameworthy practice should be considered decisive evidence that a person is not a Christian."

"On these points the Creed of the Church of Peterboro, we think, is couched in such terms, that the real meaning is not easily understood."

Again, after stating the results that, in my apprehension, would be likely to follow from carrying out the principle of the Church of Peterboro. I added—

"No one will understand us as charging all these results upon the good brethren at Peterboro, any more than we charge the Papacy upon those excellent "Fathers" who unwittingly laid the foundation of it. We have said, that we cannot be certain of understanding correctly the meaning of the Peterboro creed; but our best apprehension of its language involves principles the fruits of which have filled the pages of church history for sixteen centuries."

Then, again, notice the following:

"But we cannot consent to use the language he has used. We could not do so without seeming to sanction what we deem to be manifestly wrong. To say that Christians cannot organize Christian churches is to use the language of those who mean, by the use of it, to justify their practice of 'forsaking the assembling [organizing] themselves together, as the manner of some is.' By the statement that men cannot organize churches of Christ, it is commonly intended to affirm that it is anti-Christian and arrogant for the Christians of a given locality to enrol their names, elect officers, call themselves a church of Christ, and 'maintain strict church discipline.' That the practice of the church of Peterboro indicates a different construction of their language, furnishes no good reason why such language should be used."

"As the common use of such language apparently implies that in the matter of church organization, the local churches have no more right to choose officers and maintain church discipline than have national churches, and the church universal, the natural effect of a sure reaction would be, that the claims of organized national churches and of a church catholic, would come up anew, and be urged with fresh vigor."

"But our main objection to this language, in its connexion with other expressions already noticed in the Peterboro creed, and in the writings of brother Smith, is its tendency to favor the notion, which so many are known, (from such various considerations) to indulge, that Christians, as members of churches, (and whole churches of course) are under slight obligations, if under any at all, to know or to inquire into, the spiritual condition, the religious principles, or the moral character, of those with whom they are connected in church relations."

And yet again,

"Will brother Smith and the Church of Peterboro, as a matter of fact, 'recognize' men as Christians without considering whether their 'doctrines and practices are so and so?' without regard to their derelictions in these matters, 'be it to whatever extent it may?' Difficult as we find it to understand them, we feel quite confident that they will do so such thing. Why then, use language so calculated to confuse and mislead the reader?"

If I rightly understand your letter, bro. Smith, the following extracts comprise some of the most objectionable portions of my review.

"If Christians cannot organize Christian churches, cannot vote members into the church or out of it, if all those are invited to enrol their names who 'believe themselves to be members of the church,'—if those are to be held as church members who do not even con-

sent to be considered as such, (after the manner of the church of England) and whose 'doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may,'—if a Christian assembly ought not to 'intimate that a man's doctrines and practices must be thus and so, in order to his being a Christian'—if this language, as it would be commonly understood, should obtain general currency and favor, what limits would there be to church membership? What demands of Christian doctrine—what derelictions of duty—what abominations in practice, would be understood to be a forfeiture of church membership? Or, under what circumstances, or for what reasons, might Christians, without schism, secede from churches, as Anti-Christians, and re-organize anew?"

Speaking of the Resolution adopted at Syracuse, I said—

"This may be understood as saying that we should not separate from churches stained with these sins, unless we had come to the conclusion that their attachment to them was so settled as to destroy the evidence of their being Christians. This sentiment we should not oppose. But what is meant by saying that a church does not wear the features, nor exhibit the character, nor perform the office, nor deserve the name of a church of Christ? Are there no specifications in detail, that go to make up the aggregate? Is to be sectarian and pro-slavery and to adhere unmoveably to these and similar sins, to not fail in wearing the features, exhibiting the character, performing the office, and deserving the name of churches of Christ, by what particulars shall such derelictions be described?"

"What we regret is, that the language and the theories of brother Smith, and of the 'Church of Peterboro' should seem to countenance a vague and indiscriminate Catholicism, that (equally with a narrow sectarianism) overlooks or does not turn to practical account the divine discriminations between good and bad men."

"Dr. Smith has had his eye much on the evils of 'party' in the church. He has seen the spirit of sect despoiling the church of her power, and opening upon her the flood-gates of impurity and sin. To have churches without party lines and sectarian interests and rivalries, he justly regards as an object of unpeakable value. But surely the object will not be reached, by a Catholicism that would embrace the same impure elements that the old churches of sectarianism contain. Dr. Smith cannot suppose (can he) that by scooping into his 'Church of Peterboro' even without their consent all the professors of religion within its territorial limits" he their "practices blameworthy to whatever extent they may" (even to the cherished sin of voting for the Pharos of the times) he can by the mere process of superceding the churches of the sects, with their rivalries and the corruptions growing out of them, transmute all the base metal they contain into gold—and make good Christians out of men bent on their political idols:—That the anxiety of calling them church members, instead of coming out from among them, will allure them over to the correct ground. Such a philosopher's stone we do not expect to discover even in an anti-sectarian church."

And the whole was concluded with the following—

"Of the 'Church of Peterboro' we hope better things, though we thus speak. The happy inconsistencies between their language and their doings, leads us to hope much of them. Perhaps they may be wholly free from all those latitudinarian tendencies that we have described, and that, we think, some of their expressions favor. But that is no good reason why their language should pass without comment. Our columns, we are persuaded, could not be better filled by any thing we could write, than with cautions against those mistaken views of church organization and order which we have described. Whether we rightly understand the Peterboro document or not, we think we do not misunderstand the direction in which the rising anti-sectarian feeling of the country is, in many instances, inclined to float—the direction in which not a few prominent writers against sectarianism, have guided it. That direction we think is fraught with much danger. And of course we felt it a duty to express freely our views."

I ask you, now, brother Smith, to look over the whole of my Review and say whether you find any thing there that is not in keeping with these extracts? I ask you further to say whether these specimens look like the productions of a "sectarian bigot," wanting in "Christian charity" and candor? This repeated hesitancy as to your real meaning, this constant call for explanation, does that look like urging rash and severe "charges" upon you? This oft reiterated disclaimer of charging upon you or the Church of Peterboro, any of the bad consequences apprehended from the apparent-

ly in guarded language, you had used, as the threat you were understood to intimation, does not look like being "exceedingly avowed." Does that look like a violent wailing of your "language?" How could you find it in your heart, brother Smith, to say such "savage" and unjust things of me?

I know it may be said, and said truly, that charges may be brought in the form of questions. But I deny, utterly, that my question was of that sort, or was in language, or spirit, or intimation.

ANSWERS TO MY INQUIRIES.

My questions to you contained no latent irony—no covert meaning. They were a frank, straight forward, honest, open hearted questions to a friend and brother, asking information as to his meaning. They were "publicly" asked, because it was a public occasion that drew them forth, and public interests were involved in them. They were questions calling for explanations, calling for reconciliations of "apparent discrepancies." They called for direct and explicit answers in the same spirit of kindness in which they were asked, and they called for nothing else. But what do I receive in return? Very little, in the way of direct answers to my questions—and still less in the way of reconciling apparent discrepancies, of putting things together that had seemed to lack harmony and self consistency. But then, the lack of this is made up by plentiful reflections on my want of "wisdom and Christian charity"—of my "violently wailing" your language—of my resemblance to "some sectarian bigot" (some heretic, in other words) that you have in your mind! Now, brother Smith, if you really think that such "rebukes" are the best use you can make of your undoubted rights, according to the 8th Resolution of the Church of Peterboro, I shall by no means demur. But you will permit me to say that, as a logical operation, it strikes me as rather lame.

WHAT IS A "CHARGE?"

I neither made nor intimated any "charges" against the Church of Peterboro or yourself. My questions for information, along with my arguments against the sentiments your language "seemed" to convey, did indeed imply the possibility of your holding the views which I said the language "seemed" to express. But was that intimation a "charge?" Suppose I had gone farther, and instead of asking you whether you meant this and so, had said, without hesitation, that I understood you to mean thus and so—or even had I said (and made a mistake too, in saying it) that such and such were your sentiments—would or would not that have been proper for you to complain that I had brought a "charge" against you? Is it a "charge" against a man to repeat what we understand to be his opinions? If you deliberately think so, my brother, I shall never again dare to tell any one what I think your views are, on any subject, for I might always be liable to make a mistake. And of course, too, it would be impossible for me even to ask you whether you held such and such sentiments lest the question should be construed into a "charge."

POSSIBLE KNOWERS.

But you have hinted that my "long and intimate acquaintance" with you, ought to have prevented me from supposing it possible that you could hold the sentiments alluded to, in my questions. In order to judge of the force of this intimation, and in order to dispose happily of this whole matter, it is vitally important to understand correctly what I did, and what I did not, by my questions, suppose it to be possible that you believed.

I did not suppose, nor imply the possibility that you, or the Church in Peterboro would recognize, as Christians, or church members, any whom you, or they, do not consider to be Christians! Nor that "every person, who affords satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple of Christ" could possibly mean, "in your view," "the same as all professors of religion"—or "mean any thing short of a real Christian." Certainly not, brother Smith. Do not persist in believing that so absurd and offensive a thing could have been the meaning of the writer of the Review. Your "long and intimate acquaintance" with him should have made you hesitate, and read twice, before you attributed to him such a meaning.

But I confess I did think it possible that the Peterboro church and yourself believed that a person might properly be "recognized as a member of the church who affords satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple and friend of Christ," and this, too, "even in the case of those who—in their doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, as it to whatever extent it may." This was your language, in the creed.

And according to my best understanding of this language, it contained the implication that persons possi-

bly might "afford satisfactory evidence that they are disciples and friends of Christ"—"whose doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy as it to whatever extent it may." Otherwise "the case of those who—in their doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar," &c. &c.—would be a "case" that could never occur in a church, and the extraordinary liberality of the members could have no subjects to operate upon, and the profession of it, would be gratuitous altogether.

And if this were the true meaning of the Peterboro creed, it would be true, I suppose, that the church had some other way (if any) of obtaining "satisfactory evidence that" a person "is a disciple and friend of Christ" instead of their "doctrines and practices" which would not then need to be taken into the account.

This was the only result I could draw out of the language of the creed. But knowing that people often use language that does not express their true meaning, I took care not to "charge" upon the writers of the creed this meaning. I made another supposition in respect to it—the only alternative I could conceive. I said—

"Perhaps the meaning is, that those are to be recognized, whose doctrines and practices, however unscriptural and blameworthy, are not, on the whole, so unscriptural and blameworthy as to destroy the evidence of their being disciples and friends of Christ."

[I do not perceive, brother Smith, that you have accepted of this version as expressive of your meaning, nor that you have given any other explanation instead of it.]

As I thought it possible, however, that the first mentioned meaning might be the true one, and being persuaded that some such sentiment vaguely held, quite extensively prevailed, I thought it not improper to show how, if adopted as a principle, it would operate. I did mean to say that, if acted upon by the new union churches, they would embrace "the same impure elements" that had composed "the churches of sectarianism;" that the result, for aught I could see, would be equivalent, in reality, to the recognition of all "professors of religion." [And what could be more natural than this result, if a church should think itself able to discern "satisfactory evidence that" a person "is a disciple and friend of Jesus Christ" "even in the case of those whose"—"doctrines or practices or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, or blameworthy, as it to whatever extent it may?"] And I did mean to say that the process of thus working over the materials of the old sectarian churches into new union churches would necessarily transfer the base metal of the old churches into gold. But the saying of this was not charging all these results upon the churches that should adopt the false principle that would be the occasion of it, and making it their intentional work. Nor was it intimating an opinion that the Church of Peterboro had adopted that false opinion, or ever would adopt it.

AN INQUIRY—NOT GRATUITOUS.

And was I not right, brother Smith, in thinking that churches adopting such principles would lay a foundation for such results? And would not such results be most deplorable? I think you will answer, Yes. Then let me tell you I know of a Christian Union Minister, an abolitionist, too, who, I cannot doubt, is a worthy Christian, yet who is laboring to establish Christian Union churches, very nearly or quite, if I can understand him upon the plan that I have just now described. I cannot say whether he was led into this plan by holding more or less vaguely, the very popular sentiment that a man's Christian character may be judged of, irrespective of his doctrines and practices. But in gathering a union church, he told me distinctly, he would not inquire whether any or all of them would vote fetters upon the necks of the poor. His notion seems to be that *sectarianism* lies at the bottom of all the other evils in the churches, and his inference is that if the members of the present churches could only be prevailed upon to discard their sectarianism and come into Union Churches just as they are, in all other respect, they would presently become abolitionists and every thing else that is good. Or this, at least, is the process by which, chiefly, he hopes to abolish the religious community at large! It was no mere fancy sketch that I drew, brother Smith; no man of straw that I set up, for the amusement of shooting down again. I knew the sentiments existed that I meant to oppose. I believed they were on the increase, and that the bark

* You will gather from this, brother Smith, my response to the following, in your Letter. "And do you not deem as fit for church membership, any person who is a real Christian, however great his errors? Certainly you do." Most assuredly, brother Smith, I do not! And for this simple reason: there neither are nor can be any such Christians. A man cannot be "a Christian, however great his errors!" And the question which involves such a statement cannot have my affirmative response.

of church reform was in danger of shipwreck, that very shoal. Would you have me lead it?

EXEMPT FROM THE POSSIBILITY OF DANGER!!

But I ought to have known (their remarkable language notwithstanding) that the Church of Peterboro and Gerrit Smith, were in no possible danger from a quarrel. I ought not to have directed my voice against them, and hid them behind me. So it would seem.

Let me honestly tell you the reasons, then, for I will keep nothing back—why I thought it possible, even you, my brother, and the dear brethren at Peterboro, might do well, along with all the rest of us, to look into this matter, for a moment. Let me fully deliver my message, and if a whole of it, though my faithfulness may excite me afresh, to your upbraidings, and "the more abundantly I love you the more I love you."

I will say in the first place, that you may possibly be in danger of imbibing the sentiment I have described, because it is extensively and almost universally prevalent. In the second place, because, in this strange world of nominalists, the most enlarged and magnanimous, the most generous and conflicting temperaments, are easily enchanted and misled by it. In the third place, because, men of the most cultivated intellect, the best education, the most various and extensive reading, the most intimate intercourse with gifted minds at home and abroad, have been under peculiar liabilities to embrace it, and most frequently have done so. Truly every world, brother Smith, the world of general elegant society, and of refined thought, like every other sphere of human life, has, as you well know, under peculiar exposures and temptations. Need I tell you what is the peculiar exposure and temptation of the circles I have described? Need I name to you the constantly prevailing sentiment that is there imbibed and cherished? *Liberality* it is called. But what the thing? What is the truthful interpretation of the maxim? What, for example is the latent significance—the real sentiment of that popular couplet of Pope's—

"For modes of faith let graceful zealots fight,
His can't be wrong, whose's is the right."

Translated into the dialect of humbler life it tells "No matter what a man believes if he is only a *man*." Or with slight variation, "No matter what a man believes if he is only *sincere*." The sentiment may have less literary attraction in this shape, but the same sentiment still. The manifest implication some times openly expressed, is evidently this—"If I believe as little or nothing to do with human character." Pope's "Universal Prayer," blending in the same line, the worship of Jehovah and of Jove, imbibes another modification of the same idea. Yea, hymn of the disciples of Holmgren is devoutly repeated, in circles that we must not refuse to call Christian! "*Liberality* Christianity" is a very popular phrase in refined life. But what does it mean? What is the thing? I need not inform you, brother Smith, that the climax of liberality with the purer Christians of our own country has been, if not always included, more or less distinctly suggested, the same sentiment, to wit, that men's *characters* are not to be subjected to any test, but are to be judged by the *doctrines they believe*. Suggest, not courtaneously or kindly, to the Camels of this school, the possibility that some of their beliefs or beliefs may affect the very elements of vital god in the human soul—and what is the ready response? Instead of any attempts to show, from scripture or reason, that their beliefs or disbeliefs are "needless guidelines"—the more common retort, very elegantly dressed, to be sure, shall bid you hide your brother very shame, (in the sight of all liberal minded men) that you should have been so far behind the age, so barbarian and uncouth, so rustic and unrefined as to suggest any possible connexion between the religious characters of men and their *doctrines*! *Sectarianism* itself is defined by this school, to consist in the adoption and bigoted notion that a man must believe the fundamental doctrines of Christianity in order to be Christian! I need not remind you that some of the most gifted and polished minds in this nation, have voted a large share of their whole lives to the work of promoting a "*liberal Christianity*," of this stamp, and that all the changes of "bigotry!" "sectarianism!" "domination!" zeal and even of "persecution" itself, have again and again been rung against the who could not frame to pronounce the Shibboleth of such a liberalism, and call it the Christianity of Christ.

Nor need I tell you that this "*liberal*" spirit has become the intellectual *Daos* of the age, the all-pervading atmosphere of literary and ecclesiastical life—like the deluge it has, long since, broke up the first

tion of the great deep, that it no longer remains pent up in the little nest in and near Boston where it cherished to be first exhibited—that all the popular Universities and Seminaries can now via via old Cambridge, that "Orthodoxy" is claiming even more "liberality" than "Unitarianism" itself—that it spreads its communion table to those "guilty of the highest kind of itself"—that it bellows from the throat of the Colonization error, bidding us be "liberal" to Susan herself, to believe that Colonizationists and Abolitionists should all work together as brethren—that black to white, and the slave holder on Abolitionist—that it has sailed at the "narrow bigotry" of to-totalism—that it has moulded its temperance measures—the bidding of the drunk seller—demanded that anti-Slavery professions shall pass at par, for anti-Slavery actions—that professed Abolitionists shall not be rebuked nor distrusted on account of their pro-slavery measures—that a man is "as good an Abolitionist as any body," who believes slavery to be a bible institution and abolition to be treason—that the abolition "platform" (after the prescribed pattern of "liberal Christianity") must be "broad" enough to span the "broad way" itself and sweep up together every living thing that hath breath, as was done in the ark of Noah—and finally, that a Christian's principles, being only a part of his "baggage" which he can part with at convenience, shall not be permitted to enter, with its owner, into the rail car of the Washingtonian Society!

All this, brother Smith, you have seen, and much of it have seen, to deploro. And you have doubtless recognized in these ever varying phenomena, the one all unifying principle of a *spurious liberality*, that confounds moral distinctions, and does it by insinuating every where the pleasing sentiment that we may "JUDGE OF MEN'S CHARACTER, BY THE NATURE OF THEIR DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES." Perhaps you will hesitate at first thought, to agree fully with me, when I express my deliberate conviction that this false sentiment, (so justly abhorrent to you as it is, when once your eye is fastened distinctly upon its naked deformity,) is one of the most insidious and subtle sentiments that ever invaded the heart of man—that the person who can claim entire exemption from its influence, may decide, by his own example, the much mooted question of absolute sinless perfection in this present life—that no sentiment in our own age and nation is so widely diffused, so extensively cherished, so unboundedly popular, so decidedly predominant, so absolutely triumphant, so fatally destructive, in every department of ethical inquiry, or reformatory enterprise, confounding reformers themselves, as the lie did, the magicians of Egypt.

And let no reader startle at this, or rise up in astonishment and demand, "who and where are the men, who would maintain a proposition so manifestly monstrous, to richly sustain it?" I said not that, as a *logical proposition* such a thought was ever, for a moment, entertained, by the feeblest or rudest intellect ever found in the nursery or at the rural hearth stone. What I said was that as a captivating and all grasping sentiment, the same thought holds poets and philosophers, theologians and sages in its thrall, and that few, if any, human hearts, the most mighty and gigantic, the most disciplined and holy, escape wholly from its delusions! Was the implication an unpardonable one, Dr. Smith, that possibly you might be in some danger from such an enemy? An enemy from which no mere man ever wholly escaped?

LUCIFER HATES LOGIC.

The "logical proposition" that men's doctrines and practices constitute no part of their character! Let us assure ourselves that Lucifer knows better than to exhibit his most subtle poisons in the form of logical propositions! No lover of logic is that arch deceiver! No friend of "nice metaphysical distinctions"—nor of the "technicalities" that help to shape them, and fasten them on men's memories! Could he bring these into disuse and disrepute, (and not a little labor in this direction is being expended,) the whole airy region of undefined, impalpable sentimentality would be all his own; he might rule the poetic, the literary and the theological world at his pleasure, and with little obstruction from the coarse common sense that now so often blocks up his path; from the irreverent discrimination that presumes to analyze his subtle impalpabilities and inquire what sort of stuff they are made of.

UNWELCOME BUT NEEDED SERVICE.

No better service can any man render his brother than to seize hold, if it be possible, of the vague sentimentalities that he sees are misleading him, to strip off their any disguises, to subject them to the crucible, and by reducing them to logical propositions, reveal

the monstrosities that compose them. To be sure it may shock the persecutors of them. They may be horrified at the sight, and indignantly and honestly deny that they ever saw or came in contact with them—not recognizing them in their unwonted shape. But the operation will be healthful. A rectified vision shall ultimately reveal the true fact and the process. "Fetters to the wounds of a friend."

HAS THE ENEMY BEEN WATCHED?

I have said, brother Smith, that you must have witnessed, as I have, the ruthless ravages of *spurious liberality* around us, for the last twenty years. And very much of the night, as I have likewise hinted, must have been far enough from possessing any attractions for your eye. But are you quite certain that the frogs have secreted themselves in none of your kneading troughs—that, unlike all other men of your confiding temperament and high station, you have never inhaled into your lungs any portion of the polluted atmosphere they have breathed? If it be so, then the questions that next follow, will be superfluous. Nevertheless, I must put them.

Has the suspicion ever flitted across your consciousness, that very possibly, the same spurious Liberalism that had entered so largely, and at times so fatally, into all the other reformatory and religious activities of the age, might have obtruded itself into the field of attempted "Christian Union"? Have you ever trembled lest the same poisonous sentiment that for fifteen long years* successfully choked the embryo genius of the Temperance Reformation, and prevented the re-creator of the species from even being born, that afterwards strove to strangle the infant Hercules in its cradle, and even now barks and bites like a bull dog at its youthful heels, should possibly have the inclination and the ability to play the same part in misleading the well meaning pioneers of another and a kindred reform? Or have you reflected with solicitude, that the same false sentiment, the same counterfeit liberality that exultingly mingles the gains of oppression with the oblations of benevolence in the treasury of missions, and derides the "liberality" that rebukes it, would equally rejoice to mingle the incense of Isidat with the prayers of the Saints on the altar of a perverted and a misnamed "Christian Union"?

And what is there, I beseech you, Brother Smith, in the "Union" enterprise itself, that should secure it from the dangers to which all other Christian and reformatory enterprises have been exposed, and with which they have struggled hitherto? That very word, "Union," has it never been, and can it never become, the syren lure to a compromise on the smooth and easy slope of Ono?

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

As a historical fact, has there been no sort of connexion between the "Union" enterprise that now exists, and the proposed "Christian Union" first invited by the "liberal Christianity" already described—a liberality and a Christianity that shunned the light—that doted "metaphysical inquiry"—that dreaded a biblical scrutiny—that instinctively demanded a broad mantle of "Christian charity" to cover its unseemly proportions, that placed its main hope of propagation, not upon a revived spirit of theological discussion, but upon a delusive sentimentalism suggesting the needlessness of doctrinal investigation?

And has the current literature of the times, the writings of "evangelical" in distinction from Unitarian religionists, exhibited no tendencies of the same sort? Men love to be undisturbed in their errors. It is always popular to be "liberal." Unitarianism found popular favor on this score. And "Orthodoxy" must needs follow suit! Who has not marked the changed preaching of the last twenty years? And, by the by, who has not noticed, that "liberality" in theology, and "liberality" in ethics—the decline of "doctrinal preaching" and of stern moral rebukes, have kept even and rapid pace with each other? Could "Orthodoxy" unblinking and permanently sit down, in the glare of existing sun light, with "the highest kind of theft" in her "Holy of Holies," and without an effort for "discipline," if her theological "liberality" had not been

* From 1812 to 1827 the very "liberal" and anti-Sectarian sentiment of the old Massachusetts Temperance Society, the pioneer of all the rest, (and pilloved on the lap of a "liberal Christianity") was well known to be virtually, this—"No matter what a man believes concerning Alcohol, if he be only sincere!" And the Pledge and the "practice" of the Society were as "liberal" as the Creed!

Will the narrow bigotry of "see or as be cited to deprive the correctness of the picture I have drawn? The narrow bigotry I do not question. That narrowness and bigotry are manifest to their calling "doubtful disputations" to the high level of fundamental first principles—or rather above them. The false liberality I impute to them, does not conflict with the bigotry of the prominent sects. The same lax spirit does not hinder "liberal Christianity" as it calls itself, from being bigoted.

greatly improved since the date of her unedited letter, in regard to slavery? Who can believe it?

The efforts for Christian Union, in our country, for the last eight or ten years, have been much, perhaps mainly, on the part of "Evangelical Christians"—But has the half speech of A-b-ded never been heard from their lips? Have none of their strongly imbibed definitions of *sectarianism* made it to be chiefly in the insisting upon the importance, in the formation of Christian character, of *definite points of religious faith*? Has it never been taken for granted that men may unite in a "Christian Union" without mutually impairing or eating what each other believe?

I need not multiply questions of this kind. But I should be thought mistaken or unjust, I will say a few expressions from the leading journal of these efforts. I do it with no unkind feelings. The Writers I highly respect, and their intended enterprise I cherish. For that very reason I am bound to oppose their mistake. The atmosphere in which they moved, the religious atmosphere of the age, of the boasted "Orthodoxy" as well as the openly intimated churches of the times, seduced them into the position they took.

A DISCUSSION—WITHOUT HONESTY.

Before I proceed to my extracts, let me startle you, brother Smith, in my turn, as you sometimes startle others, with a declaration which may prove largely on your ears. You have often remarked the necessity as well as the difficulty of wholly divorcing ourselves of the "sectarian education" we have received. To this I heartily respond, with but this very needful precaution—that along with the *sectarian* education we have so unhappily received, we be careful not to throw away the *Christian* education that the good providence of God, to a certain degree, has mercifully mingled along with it. Pardon my asseveration, brother Smith, it is no unkind one—certainly no "charge"—that very "possibly" there is not a single person between Huccey and Peterboro—no, nor in either of those places—not even Gerrit Smith, that is fully competent, at the present moment, to "sort out" and separate correctly, the "sectarianism" from the true religion he has learned, and "tell which is which." Satan has been at work so successfully for centuries, to mix up his chaff with the wheat, that it will require more than one generation, I fear, to complete the separation. And in the mean time, many will throw away their religion and call it "sectarianism" while the same person or others will hug their *sectarianism* and call it religion. But this was not the declaration that was to startle you. Here it comes!

To divorce ourselves of the *Anti-Sectarian* education we have lately received (which, in large portions of it) is quite as necessary and as difficult a task as it is to get rid of our previous *Sectarian* education!

One grand truth indeed, has been nobly vindicated, in the late discussion on Christian Union. I mean the duty of all Christians to receive and recognize in their church relations, all who give *scriptural evidence* of being Christians? This is one letter, but not the only, nor yet the first letter of the alphabet we have to learn, before we can have a Bible Christian Union.

Beyond this one letter above mentioned, nearly all the rest of it has been taught us by learning Hucceyism has been taught, wrong, and must be unlearned. The only explanations I can add now, must be inferred from the extracts that follow, with such remarks as may be interspersed.

A FEW SPECIMENS.

I copy from various numbers of the late "Union Herald" now before me.

In reply to one of his correspondents who had criticised some of the leading sentiments of his publication, the editor said:

"You contend that doctrine forms a very essential part of the fruit to which our Saviour referred when he said, by their fruits ye shall know them. On this position, I am compelled to differ from my brother."—Union Herald, July 20, 1839.

To the same correspondent, the editor, in speaking of the divine rule of testing men's Christian character, said,—

"The scripture is entirely silent in relation to their theoretical views of truth."—Herald, Sept. 24, 1839.

And again, to the same correspondent, the editor said:—

"And does it accord with the wisdom and virtue which you usually exhibit, to make the doctrine of the Trinity, or any 'her point of doctrinal theology, the invariable test of Christian character?'—ib., 8 pt. 14, 1839.

You will perceive, here, brother Smith, that in that discussion (for I suppose you may remember that I was, myself, that correspondent of the Herald,)—you were

perceive that I fell under suspicion of a defect in "wisdom" — not for supposing it possible that a Christian Unionist might "judge of a man's Christian character irrespective of doctrine," but because I was so sectarian and bigoted as to decline adopting that popular mode of judgment, myself!

This only covers the point of doctrine. We will come to "practices" after a few more quotations to the present point.

"I denied the position that any system of doctrine should be made the test of religious character."

"A Christian Union of evangelical Christians is a sectarian absurdity."

"We shall be charged and I think justly, of making an effort to promote Trinitarian Union, and not a Christian Union."

An ardent Unionist writing, some time before, in the Herald, in describing the biased state of unity some-thing enjoyed among Christians, had this sentence, "Faith in doctrine is forgotten. All is forgotten but love."

"The question What constitutes Christian character? is an elementary principle of the enterprise of Christian Union." — *Ed. Union Herald, Sept. 28, 1839.*

It is true I did oppose the idea that discussion of the subject—"What constitutes Christian character?"—is a *secundum* enters the cause of Christian Union." — *The same, Oct. 5, 1839.*

The Editor afterwards called it a "collateral point," &c. And again, he said, "The particular point, 'What constitutes Christian character?' does not necessarily come into the account."

Now I maintain, brother Smith, that the question, "What constitutes Christian character?" involving the question, "What is Christianity itself?" is the very first question in the enterprise of Christian Union—the first letter of the alphabet to be learned.

This is the same question in substance, that you did not wish to have discussed in the Syracuse Convention, nor decided upon in its declaration: viz: "What a man's doctrine and practices must be, in order to his being a Christian?" It seems too from your letter, that you erroneously drafted the Resolution adopted at the Syracuse Convention in such a manner that, in passing upon it, no opinion was to be expressed, "whether a Church which is sectarian and pro-slavery is, therefore, an Anti-Christian Church." I do not see that the Creed and Regulations of the Church of Peterboro' contain any specifications either of doctrinal belief or of practice, as being necessary to the character of a Christian. The extracts I have made, show that the question was considered, in 1839, as not belonging to the enterprise of Christian Union—the gathering of Churches on that point. The same question, as connected with the Christian Union enterprise, was not a welcome question, in the Union Herald, at that time, though tolerated at my earnest request. I remember, too, that the same question was not thought appropriate to the "Union Conventions," held about that period. And now, I might ask *when and where* are the proper times and places for it, if Christian doctrine and practice are, at all to be taken into the account, in forming an estimate of Christian character? But my only object here, is, to show that I had some reason to suppose it possible that you held the sentiment which I am now happy to see you so earnestly disclaim.

An extract or two more, will show the practical workings of the Union plan, as proposed in the Union Herald, in 1839.

"It is wrong to erect a censorship around the Lord's table."

"Those persons who deny to those who profess to love the Lord Jesus, the Lord's supper, assume a prerogative, unwarranted in the scriptures." — *Herald of August 10, 1839.*

It's comes pretty near saying that "all professors of religion" are entitled to Church privileges and Communion—does it not, brother Smith? You may say, and say truly, that you are not responsible for the teachings of the Union Herald. I do not hold you responsible for them. But I am showing you the possibility that such sentiments might be held by Christian Unionists, and consequently by yourself. So that when your language appeared to lead in the direction of such results, it was not improper for me to ask you *whether* that were your meaning.

I might go farther. In eleven long articles in the Union Herald, (in 1839—40) and constantly commented upon by its Editors, I labored hard, but with dubious success, to persuade him to relinquish these and simi-

lars sentiments. I do not remember that Gerrit Smith, a principle person and occasional correspondent of that paper, ever seconded my endeavors, or pointed a syllable against the sentiments I have now quoted. I may have been misinformed, but I received, somehow, the impression that he was rather with the Editor, at that time, than with me, on these subjects. This mistake, if it be one, brother Smith can easily correct. "What answer doth make manifest, is of the light." And you can quite as easily correct my mistake, if I have made one, as to insist upon it that I have brought against you a "charge."

Thus much for the test of Christian "doctrines." We will come to the "practices" now.

During my debate with the Editor of the Union Herald, William Ware, among other correspondents, came to his assistance. (No Christian Unionist, that I remember, assisted me on the other side.) After advocating the extension of Christian fellowship to "all wearing the image of Christ," though they might be Unitarians, Universalists or Catholics, Mr. Ware proceeded to advocate the spreading of the communion table over for a Judas. Whether Judas was thought to "wear the image of Christ" I cannot say, as "no opinion was expressed." Presently after, comes the following:

"No one could be expected to invite the enemies of our Lord, or those who do not believe themselves his friends. If the slaveholder believes himself his friend, and is not evidently a heretic nor an immoral person, I think we shall gain nothing by excluding him. I think brother, you would, with me, rather entreat than crowd or exasperate, and hope more from the generosity and kindness of our brethren in truth at the south, than from the goadings of reproach and shame. Such a table would look, to me, quite as much like the table of our ever blessed Lord, although many a Judas was there, as it does to see his true and humble followers excluded by the commandments of men." — *Herald, Sept. 28, 1843.*

"AM I BECOMING YOUR ENEMY, BECAUSE I TELL YOU THE TRUTH?"

I regret exceedingly, brother Smith, that my next quotation, not from the Union Herald however, must be from your own pen. Your printed Circular Letter, headed, "UNION OF CHRISTIANS—NATHAN TO DAVID," is before me, bearing date, Peterboro', Dec. 4, 1841. Towards the close of it, this passage occurs. I have italicized a few words:

"You see, from what I have just written, why it is, that I cannot go along with abolitionists, in their disfellowshipping of all slave holding professors of religion. I believe that there are friends of God, who are so benighted as to consent to stand in the relation of slave holder; and I must give up my Christian Union principles, ere I can consent to the exclusion of any acknowledged friends of God, from Christian and church fellowship."

The bearing of this circular in the midst of the "Christian Anti-Slavery Conventions" at Lenn Yan, at Warsaw, at Auburn, at Clinton, &c., which you did not attend, and while the "test question" was under earnest discussion in them, and between the Christian Investigator and Friend of Man, on the one side, and the New-York Evangelist on the other, could not very easily be misunderstood. And now tell me, brother Smith, I beseech you, if the habitual practice of "the highest kind of theft" does not prevent a man from "affording satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple and friend of Christ," what practice would prevent it? If the excuse you have made for your supposed Christian man thief, in a land of Bibles, and in a nation that has declared inalienable human rights to be "self evident" may suffice for him, describe to me, I pray you, the transgressor that may not claim equal indulgence. And what intelligible meaning shall be put upon making the "practices" of men a test of their Christian character, if "satisfactory evidence" of such character can consist with the "practices" of man stealing?

It is quite evident, then, brother Smith, that "my long and intimate acquaintance with" you, should have assured me of the impossibility of your finding "satisfactory evidence of Christian character" in something besides men's "doctrines and practices!" And that, on this account, there was a want of Christian charity in my asking you the question?

And if the slave holder may give "satisfactory evidence" of being a Christian, why not the "professors of religion" in Peterboro, who continue to vote for Slavery, and with whom, until recently I suppose, you associated in religious worship? How could I tell, for certainty, that they were not the very persons intended, in my asking you the question?

Am I to be blamed, in a paragraph or two, the implied sentiment would blaze up again, as bright and as luminous as ever.

your Peterboro' creed, whom you still claimed as Church members, against their consent, with their practices "peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may?" There seemed to be wide scope enough to include them. At a time when the "test question" is felt every where, was there any harm in my asking how it was felt in the Church in which Gerrit Smith worshipped? Would there be any harm in my asking that question again, now? And would there be any harm, if that question should be distinctly answered? Very possibly the answer might interest the Christian public as much as to know whether Gerrit Smith considered William Goodell lacking in "Christian charity and wisdom," for asking such sort of questions.

The trouble, I fear, is, brother Smith, your "Christian Union principles" (if you stand now where you did in 1841,) do not harmonize with your Anti-Slavery principles. Gerrit Smith the abolitionist, in that case, does not agree with Gerrit Smith the Christian Unionist. I told you so, you remember, when you first issued the Circular from which I have just quoted. You thought me severe, then. And you think me severe, now. What I wrote you then in private, I now write you in public.—You will think me very arrogant. But I cannot help that. Men justly claiming a much higher reputation for humility and modesty than I have yet acquired, have thought it proper to hazard the loss of all that reputation, when the interests of religion required it; a Zuingli, for example, contending with Luther. Though not a Zuingli, I may imitate his faithfulness. Heaven helping me I shall do so, and if truth be stronger than error, that truth shall prevail. And should it chance to scatter your cherished theories, brother Smith, do not again mistake the operation, for a hostile attack upon yourself; you shall survive the wreck, unharmed.

I had hoped, that you had made great progress, since your Circular of Dec. 1841. You afterwards attended "Christian Anti-Slavery Conventions" where the "test question" in the Churches, was pressed closely, and seemed quite at home. At the Syracuse Convention too, you were zealous, cordial, and active; and though dissenting on the subject of Church organization, you endured fully our blows against a "pro-slavery Church." How much you then and previously did to sustain my own poor efforts, I need not now say, but the grateful remembrance of it reminds me of my redoubled obligation to be faithful and "keep back nothing that might be profitable to you." Substantial proofs, I thought I had, too, long before, that exhibitions of the "duty of Secession from pro-Slavery or apparently neutral Churches" did not displease you, nor the sentiment that such Churches are "Anti-Christian;" nor yet my views of Church organization, when (in my April number) I so largely insisted on the duty of Christians to organize Churches and answered the objection that they could not. But your old theories of Christian Union, brother Smith, have come over your vision again, and misled you. Your "Anti-Sectarian training" is yet to be unlearned.

THINGS UNSAID.—CONCLUSION.

There are twenty other things to be said. But I must draw to a close, now. I want to tell you how greatly you mistook in supposing that I would speak, unless by inadvertency, of "the American Church," instead of Churches—and still more greatly mistook in supposing that I wronged you in what I said on that subject. I want to show you how your illustrations of the Federal Constitution and of the emigrant, rightly stated, illustrate and confirm my theory, and not yours. Above all, I want to show you how much good will be done by your important, though earnest disclaimers, and also by your concessions, and in directions too, of which you have not, yourself, yet dreamed. Right glad am I to know, assuredly, that brother Smith believes correct doctrine and practice, essential to sound Christian character—that

Who else could I have supposed them to be? Good abolitionists would not answer that description. All such I did not doubt, were active and willing members of "the Church of Peterboro'." Brother Smith, I suppose, understands, that the "separatists" which I feared he would claim, were not such as I should call the members of the Church of Peterboro', because I do not call any such who do not consent to be members.

You may remember, brother Smith, that seven or eight years ago, I had to labor with you both in private and through the public press, to prove to you that your Abolition principles and Colonization principles, did not agree with each other, and could not be reconciled. You did not believe me then, but you found it true afterwards. And depend upon it, you will yet find that I am telling you the truth, now, if you live many years, and continue to make progress. Your circular of Dec. 4, 1841, involves the principle of continued Church relations with slave holders! A principle, were it possible, than continued political co-operation with them, in the same parties. The man is as wicked that you cannot vote for him, but you can nevertheless co-operate with him as a Church member! He cannot help you govern the State, but he can help you build up the cause of religion!

See Christian Investigator for February and March, 1852.

he would apply these tests, in the matter of Christian fellowship—that he is opposed to the Episcopal position apparently assumed at Utica—that he would apply the same principle to Peterboro—that he conceded to the Christians of Sileman, the right to say whether "there should be the Church of Sileman" or whether they shall go to Munnsville or Peterboro, &c. &c. &c. Hold you fast there, brother Smith. You have anchorage ground, there; and we shall see how the land lies, at day break, if the fog shall have cleared away. Of that matter of the Papacy, too, the "great prospects" of which, (for amusement, I suppose) you have so expertly and ambitiously transferred from "the Church Universal" (that should carry out your theories) to "Peterboro"—I may have a word to say. Put my feet by the side of your comment, brother Smith, and the occasion for your harmless pleasantness will disappear. Of the "Associated Churches" too (if you can find or describe them) that do not belong, from their very position, to "one of the most marked children of its father, the Devil"—to wit, Secularism, I have something to say, and to inquire whose "severity of language against" them, is greatest, yours or mine.

I close in full consciousness of cherishing towards you the same fraternal regards with which our "long and intimate acquaintance" has ever been characterized, and which, I will trust, our earnest debates will not mar.—If, in our future intercourse, I might hope to escape the charge of acting in the character of a "sectarian bigot," I should be gratified. An approbrious epithet I have never applied to you, whatever I may have thought of your possible or actual errors. But do no violence to your own conscience, dear brother, for the sake of sparing me. If you think I appear like a heretic, tell me so, faithfully, only adding your reasons, and such as will bear scrutiny. I shall love you none the less. Adopting the words of another, I shall respond, "Though Luther call me an hundred devils, I will yet reverence him as a messenger of God."

Yours truly,
WILLIAM GOODELL.

LETTER FROM PROF. SCHMUCKER.

For the Christian Investigator.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG,
March 30, 1844.

Dear Brother—I have during the last several years, read various articles from your pen, with feelings of special interest and gratification. Among the many subjects of ecclesiastical reform which have occupied your attention, there are several on which I have expended a good deal of thought, accompanied, I trust also, with suitable action. Permit me to thank you for the numbers of your Christian Investigator kindly sent to me. Inclosed I send you a remittance for the same. I have observed with much interest the development of your views on Christian Union, anxious to see whether you have found "a more excellent way" than that proposed in my Fraternal Appeal a few years ago. Whether I am prejudiced or not I cannot say, but I must confess that your plan promises less success and seems to me to be less comprehensive than the other. After all, your plan, if I understand it aright, amounts to the formation of an Independent or Congregational Church on very liberal principles, and with special reformatory references, and an invitation to all others to imitate our example. Of course, this, other churches will not do, except as fast as they become convinced that independency is the scriptural and obligatory form of a church government. As this will probably be a very gradual work, your churches will form another, though very liberal sect, in addition to the legion previously existing. Now the other plan proposed, at once to form all the different fundamentally orthodox denominations into a progressive union, by requiring a mutual recognition of each other, as fellowmembers of the one body of Christ; by urging actual cooperation in voluntary associations, for the promotion of all those objects of christian benevolence, which require a concentration of effort; by requiring them at once to relax the bands of sectarianism and abstain from disciplining a brother for any difference of opinion held by another one of the confederated churches; by agreeing to sacramental, ecclesiastical and ministerial communion; by consenting to a common

creed, containing only the tenets in which they all agree, and thus giving prominence before the world to their substantial unity of faith; by enjoining the use of the Bible as a text book of instruction in all departments of christian and theological education; and finally by leaving each branch of the church free to adopt any and every measure for its own reform, which, amid these kindly influences, and under the guidance of God's providence and Spirit, and the progressive lights of the age, it might be prepared to embrace. Thus no new sect would have been formed, the previously existing denominations would have gradually become more and more assimilated, those most nearly related would soon have entirely coalesced; and if it is the design of the great Head of the church, that all parts of his kingdom on earth shall eventually adopt one and the same mode of government, the way would thus be opened for this important consummation.

Under the influence of this plan, every effort of moral and national reform would have gained a more impartial hearing, as the coils of sectarianism would be relaxed, and the dread of ecclesiastical changes be diminished. Although I perceive an occasional extract from the Fraternal Appeal, in your paper, I fear from a statement in your last and truly excellent number, that you have not yet read it through. Your language is, "Prof. Schmucker, for example, would cement a union of the existing evangelical sects, by erecting still another ecclesiastical body over them, as a bond of union between them. This idea carried out could end in nothing but a Catholic church." Now, my dear brother, this is entirely incorrect. Not a word is said advocating the formation of "another ecclesiastical body over" the confederated sects. Indeed, directly the contrary is taught. I objected even to the convocation of a delegated representation of the different sects for the adoption of the proposed plan of union; and recommended that each denomination, and in the case of the Independents, each congregation should discuss the features of the plan for itself, and if they approve of it, should adopt it by a vote; and so soon as two denominations thus adopted the plan as a rule of action, they would form the nucleus of the Apostolic Protestant Church, to which others could be added in the same way. As to another ecclesiastical body over them, allow me to quote a passage from the work, on this specific point:

"As to one Supreme Representative Body, having even limited jurisdiction over all the confederated bodies, for which some may have been looking as a feature of this plan of union—There was none such in the apostolic age, and we need none. The tendency of such bodies is naturally to an increase of power; they are the foster-mothers of papacy, and dangerous to true liberty of conscience."

"Should any circumstances, in the providence of God, hereafter render it necessary; and the great body of the confederated denominations unite in the call, a mere advisory council might be convened, consisting of a small senatorial delegation, in equal numbers from each denomination, without legislative or judicial power; its advice to be confined to the general interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. Yet even such a council ought not to meet statedly nor often, and forms no part of the proposed plan."—p. 123, 3d edition.

From several articles of yours, which I have seen, I suppose we do not differ on many of the principles which lie at the basis of the various moral and national reforms; and should your new independent churches adopt the plan of union proposed in the "Appeal," they will be altogether unrestrained in their efforts to reform the age; and should other churches successively adopt the same plan, yours would have increased facility for operating on them. Yet, you would of course be required by the plan itself, to recognize them as Christian churches.

Praying that the good Spirit of our God may conduct us into all necessary truth, I remain

Your brother in Christ,

S. S. SCHMUCKER.

REPLY TO PROF. SCHMUCKER.

Honolulu, April 17, 1844.

Dear Brother—For your truly fraternal letter of 20th ult., I am greatly obliged, and in a personal have been highly interested and edified. My only regret is that an error of mine, in which I did you an unintentional injustice, should have been in any degree, the occasion of it. I cannot plead the excuse you kindly suggest for me, that I had never read the whole of your "Fraternal Appeal." Be assured I have read it more than once, deriving always new light and refreshment from its pages. But I had some how confounded your view of the subject to which I referred, with another "plan" suggested to me about the same time yours appeared. I ought to have referred to your pamphlet, while I was writing, as I always intend to do in such cases, but it was omitted that time.

One thing that may have led me to think you had proposed an ecclesiastical authority over the existing organization, may have been this. I consider many things as being, in reality, such an authority, which most others do not. A stated convention or association, composed of delegates or pastors, though nominally disclaiming "legislative or judicial power," do—as I think in reality, and almost of necessity, exercise such power. Some of the most oppressive ecclesiastical action ever put forth in this country, if I mistake not, has emanated from bodies constituted in that way; and all along disclaiming any power, at all. I overlooked the fact that your proposed councils were to be only occasional, as circumstances required, the body dissolving into its original elements, at the end of its sittings. A very important distinction, in my view.

As to your general plan of Union, I have not time or room now, to discuss it, as its importance demands. On very many points, we agree, and I confess myself very greatly indebted to you for the weighty suggestions as well as important information which your deep reflection, along with your truly learned researches, have enabled you to contribute towards the great work which has engaged so much of your attention. If the plan I advocate, or any thing like it, should succeed, it will be much in consequence of the general light which your book has diffused over the religious community, on the subject. So that your labor will not have been lost, though your plan, as a whole should not, in its own proper form, be realized. You will have placed many a massive timber in the edifice, though its shape should vary somewhat, from your model.

Yet in very many things, we disagree. I had intended, long ago, to point them out to you, and discuss them, in a Review of your work, as you requested me to do, when you kindly sent me a copy. But other labors interfered, and the task will perhaps never be done. "Of making many books (and papers too), there is no end." I will just intimate to you, now, the point where, I think, we diverge, and from whence we about off in such widely different tracks.

In D'Aubigne's invaluable "History of the Protestant Reformation," the following parallel is drawn by the author between Zuingli and Luther:

"Luther was desirous of retaining in the church all that was not expressly contradicted by scripture; while Zuingli was intent on abolishing all that could not be proved by scripture. The German Reformer wished to remain united to the church of all preceding ages, and sought only to purify it from every thing that was repugnant to the word of God. The Reformer of Zurich [Zuingli] passed over every intervening age till he reached the times of the apostles; and a blotting the church to an entire transformation, labored to restore it to its primitive condition. Zuingli's reformation, therefore, was the more complete."—D'Aubigne's Hist. p. 342.

The religious community will be divided on the comparative merits of Luther and Zuingli. Those who prefer the characteristics of Luther, will like your plan of Christian Union better than the one I am advocating. Those who give the preference to Zuingli, will probably range on the other side. These two eminent men may be considered as the representatives or specimens of two distinct classes of minds, in every age of earnest reform.

For my part, I must go with Zuingli, and looking directly to the primitive model, invite an immediate and uncompromising return to that divine standard. Short of such a return I cannot find Christianity itself. And without Christianity, I can find no "Christian Union"—nothing to be united in—nothing to be united about—nothing to be united for, nothing to be united with. It is only in the light of a restored Christianity that sectarianism can be displaced, or exposed, or even defined.

The gathering of local churches on the plan I advocate, appears to you like the starting of another sect. Let me ask you a question which your learning and con-

dar cannot but enable you to answer correctly. Suppose Paul and Peter and James should be raised from the dead, and preaching among us, or on our borders, just as they once preached, should gather churches upon the same model they first planted churches upon—and do all this in the presence but without the co-operation of the existing sects (which probably they could not get) would not the new movement appear like the starting of a new sect, just as much as in the case you alluded to?

Let me ask another favor of you. Point out to us wherein our plan of church order and organization varies from the primitive model, (as very likely it may vary) and thus help us, by correcting what may be unsatisfactory, to carry out our intentions. Do this friendly work for us, and we will be greatly obliged.

You think it a slow process, to establish a Christian Union, by a method which requires a return to Church Independency, on the part of those who are engaged in the enterprise. But to my mind, the least departure from original and absolute Church Independency, is, in itself, the erection of a sect, and I see no way of escaping from Sectarianism while retaining a place within its enclosures, and abiding under its authority.

Your plan, as you perceive, would not answer for those who believe that the present church organizations, in general, and as such, and on the whole, have essentially departed, and at vital points, from the faith and practice of the gospel. For, as you justly observe, they would be "required to recognize them as Christian churches." This they could not do. And few in numbers as those persons are, I apprehend they include a majority of those who would make any strenuous endeavor or heavy sacrifices, for the downfall of sectarianism, or the restoration of Christian Union. The same persons, too, could never consent to modify or mould their church discipline, by the creeds or usages of other churches, instead of going directly and solely to the Scriptures, for direction, even though they considered those churches, to be Christian churches, and governed by good and wise men.

While my plan seems to you, the erection of a new sect, yours appears to me but a modification of the sects already existing.

Starting on the idea that D'Aubigne attributes to Luther, and considered as a system of expedients adapted to all vices existing and acknowledged evils. I do not know but your plan is the very best that can be devised. I am willing to believe that it is so. The marked and very extensive approbation it has received from those best qualified to judge, I mean the leading men in the principal sects, leads me to think that it may be as near perfect as any thing of that kind.

Whether it will sooner be put into operation than the plan I advocate, is another question. I have my doubts of it. From its very structure and object, it looks for action, to the high ecclesiastical authorities of the several sects, (except in the case of thorough Independents who acknowledge no such authorities.) Such large ecclesiastical bodies are slow to act, if at all, in any matter of ecclesiastical reform. Any thing requiring self sacrifice, or involving innovation, finds little favor, in any age, with the majority of those standing already at the head of the existing order of things. They instinctively dread change. While the adoption of your plan depends upon such—a mine appears more directly to the people. You attempt a union of the sects—I ask for the union of Christians. You ask the leaders of the sects to lead forward the people. I ask the people to go forward, whether with or without their leaders.

I do not mean by this, that your appeal is not directed to all Christians, asking their co-operation and aid; and the people, if true, if convinced that your plan is best, might do much towards influencing their chief men to adopt it. But my meaning is that the shape and scope of your plan looks to action through the existing ecclesiastical bodies. So I understand it. If in this or any other particular I have again mistaken you, please to correct me.

Whether your plan, if adopted by the existing sects, would do the work you expect of it, whether it would be a stepping stone to a more thorough and perfect reform, or, on the other hand, by lopping off the more unwholesome branches of a wrong system, reconcile men more to the system itself, and thus prevent its being displaced by a better, is another question, on which different conjectures might be made.

I cannot think there is any better or more prudent way than to find out as near as we can, the primitive, the Apostolic model, and go to work directly and patiently to restore it. Hoping to hear more from you, I am, dear brother, most respectfully yours,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

Erastus Shepard, Book and Job Printer, Rochester.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, MAY, 1844.

THE POSITION OF THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION.

Is at length definitely settled. The Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Presbyterian Church (Old School and New,) the latter dragging along its kite-tail—the so-called Congregational but semi-Presbyterianized Churches of New England—to grace its descent, had, long ago deliberately identified themselves in the action of their great ecclesiastical bodies, with the organized forces of the Slave power. But the Baptist sect was claimed by the abolitionists connected with it, as presenting a more hopeful case. The Triennial Convention, three years ago, had indeed been guilty of the high handed act of casting out the anti-slavery Members of its Foreign Missionary Board. But that very act had roused such a sensation at the North, and such active anti-slavery efforts were in progress, that a revolution in favor of freedom was confidently predicted. For some time past we have witnessed an apparent despondency, and decline of these efforts, and now, the late sitting of the Triennial Convention, has settled the controversy, to the satisfaction, we are told, of nearly all concerned. In the shape of an apparently impartial compromise, every thing is given, as usual, to the Slave Power. Here it is—

"Whereas, there exists in various sections of our country an impression that our present organization involves the fellowship of the Institution of Domestic Slavery, or of certain associations which are destined to oppose this Institution, therefore,

"Resolved, That in co-operating together as members of this Convention in the work of Foreign Missions, we disclaim all sanction, either expressed or implied, whether of slavery or of anti-slavery; but as individuals, we are perfectly free both to express and promote our own views on these subjects in a Christian manner and spirit."

"The resolution, without debate, was adopted almost unanimously."

"The Rev. Mr. Davis, of N. Y., moved that, in consequence of the happy termination of a question so fraught with excitement, the Convention have seasons of prayer."

To cap the climax, the Christian Reflector, the organ of the Baptist Abolitionists, like another N. Y. Evangelist, exults in the compromise!—Cyrus P. Grosvenor earnestly dissents, but the great mass of the denomination are satisfied! The boasted local independency of the Baptist Churches, only seals their condemnation the stronger, while they cling to the *Denomination*, fraternize with it and support its *Triennial Convention* and its *Missionary Board*. The question whether a missionary is a slaveholder or an abolitionist cannot be asked, *now*, by any adherent to the sect! No wonder our good brother Elton Galusha despairs of ever realizing a Baptist Millennium, in this sublunary state. The question of a *Christian* Millennium, we beg leave to suggest, is quite another affair. A downfall of the sects was an essential precursor to such a millennium, and in that point of view, these developments are rather encouraging than otherwise.

RELATION OF TRUTH TO ERROR.

Every false appearance in the spiritual or religious world is an index, a finger board pointing to a reality!

If there were no substances; there would be no shadows; if there were no realities there would be false appearances. If there were no valuable coin, there would be no counterfeit.

Hypocrisy, so far from proving that there is no true religion in the world, is among the surest indications both of its reality and of its value. And hence, hypocrisy has been justly defined to be 'the image which vice pays to virtue.'

False doctrines too, like false professions, bear an indirect testimony to the truth, and indicate the direction in which the truth lies.

One class of false doctrines are evidently the subterfuges and refuges of guilt and wickedness. The invention of them bears witness that the inventors had con-

sciences ill at ease, under a consciousness of the truth, and sought to persuade themselves that the truth was a lie, and that a lie was the truth—that bitter is sweet, and that sweet is bitter—that darkness is light, and light darkness—that evil is good, and good evil. To translate such error into truths, all you have to do is to reverse them; a very simple and easy process. If any proof were wanted that men have consciences, the fact that men have tried to *disprove* the existence of conscience would be sufficient to prove its *existence*. If men had no consciences, they would be under no necessity of trying to get rid of them. Another class of false doctrines are the semblances, the appearances of truths, and bear the same relation to them that a counterfeit does to the true bill. If you have detected the counterfeit, you have shown that you have some just ideas of the true bill, the variation from which led you to make the detection.

Many hurtful errors are the fragments, the distorted images, the halves, quarters, and eighths, of murdered and dislocated truths. Every truth, in order to be a truth, must be a *whole* truth, and when any portion of it is clipped off, it becomes, in some measure, a lie.

Some errors, too, are truths, with bits of something else tacked on to them. A truth, in order to remain a truth, must be nothing but the truth. As food may become poison by having poison mixed with it, so truth itself does the work of a lie when it is mingled with error.

The so called "*eclectic philosophy*"—that undertakes to build a system of truth out of the fragments of contending errors, is an approximation to the true philosophy—yet being but an approximation, is, itself, a lie.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS.

For the support of the Christian Investigator, up to May, 1844.

Or W. H. Stebbins, Brock-	E. A. Alberty, Lockport,	0 50
ett's Bridge	Hannah Alberty, do.,	0 50
T. W. Martin, Rochester,	Edgar Gregory, do.,	0 50
G. Goodrich, Rochester,	Jacob Blosser, do.,	0 50
for Mrs. Harriet Good-	S. Buchanan, do.,	0 50
rich, Whitesboro,	G. F. Horton, Terrytown,	2 60
L. B. Woodward, Canan-	do.,	
dahus,	J. H. Paine, Half-day, Ill.,	0 50
T. Stratham, Ditto,	for self and O. Hitch-	0 50
J. Musher, Ditto, on pledge	cock, Libertyville, Ill.,	1 00
given at Syracuse Con-	J. W. Bishop, Warranburg,	0 50
vention,	L. C. Lockwood, Platts-	7 20
A. S. Leaton, Johnson,	Kill,	0 50
G. C. Judson, Kingsboro,	A. C. Hitchcock, Marshall,	0 50
S. H. Wells, Gloverville,	J. Page, do.,	0 50
T. D. Nichols, De Kay,	J. Kemp, Hartford, O., for	0 50
C. Root, Gilbertsville,	J. R. Keep, Franklin,	0 50
Orion & Payson, Eaton,	N. Y.,	0 50
E. Law, Louisa,	And for T. J. Keep, Mec-	0 50
Dr. A. Crumwell, Mercer,	co, O.,	0 50
Mo.,	H. H. Parmelee, Russell's	0 50
C. W. Livingston, Rochester,	P. O. O.,	0 50
G. G. L. Colby, Newbury-	B. Church, Talmadge,	0 50
port, Mass.,	Mich., for self and J. H.	
P. Hayes, Bristol, by H.	Blackfield, do., and J. Ro-	
Blackmer, Lyonia,	gers, Kent,	1 00
H. Blackmer, Lyonia,	S. Gilbert, Pittsburg, Wt.,	1 00
W. L. Chaplin, Ulen,	A. K. Brayton, No. Scituate,	1 00
Ed. A. Woods, Hamilton,	R. I.,	1 00
Dr. J. Munn, Massville,	E. Reynolds, Phillipsville,	1 00
Dr. Cook, for Mary A.	P. B. Hopley, Lyons,	1 00
Ward,odus Point,	James Sperry, Mendota,	1 00
E. Gregory, Lockport,	J. F. Clarke, Sandwich,	1 00
T. Alberty, do.,	Mass.,	50
T. Atwater, do.,	P. Stowe, W. Bloomfield,	50
B. S. Kuney, do.,	Of D. Hic for	50
M. Atwater, do.,	Jared Foster, Venko,	50
P. Hawley, Cassenova,	for J. Babcock, Scott,	50
do, for Lock numbers,	and for Jacob Best, Pul-	50
J. Brainer, New Haven, Ct.	askt,	50
R. Durfee, Fall River, Mass.	also for himself,	50
C. P. Williams, Albany,	Hiram Chamberlain,	50
do, for A. H. Wilson,	Ohio,	50
Cross Plains, Wis.	W. Burr, Charleston, O.	50
A. Ward, Holland Patent,	H. Livermore, Cheshire,	50
L. Woodbridge, do.,	N. E. Randall, do.,	50
G. Clark, do.,	J. Mosker, Canandaigua,	1 50
J. O. Harbert, do.,	M. Mitchell, for L. King,	1 00
J. C. Harbert, do.,	Lisbon, and for	50
E. Clark, do.,	A. White, Edwards,	50
L. Wells, do.,	E. Houghton, Windsor,	1 00
R. Pratt, Westmoreland,	Dna. Woodruff, do.,	1 00
S. Wells, Peterboro,	S. S. Sheldon, Rupert, Vt.,	50
Alvan Leggett, Richfield, O.	A. Johnson, do.,	50
J. Hills, Vergen Center,	J. Noble, Honeoye,	1 00
J. Ward, do.,	C. Arnold, do.,	1 00
J. Tryon, do.,	D. Hic, including 50 cents	1 00
M. M. Hills, do.,	each for H. Gordon and I.	1 00
V. F. Childs, do.,	Works, Clyde, J. Stout,	50
P. E. Allen, do.,	E. Fulton, Baradine,	50
J. Miles, Perryville, by A.	E. Palmer, Honeoye Falls,	0 50
King-bury, Cassenova,	Papers sold,	0 50
W. Hall, Little Valley,	do.,	0 50
Tues Hall, Lockport,	do.,	0 50
H. Norton, do.,	do.,	0 50
Prof. Schmucker, Th. Sem.	do.,	0 50
Gettysburg, Pa.	do.,	0 50

Amount, \$90 25

Commissions of Agents, 1 50

\$91 75

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 6.
WHOLE NUMBER, 26.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JUNE, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built upon, and the wall, even in the old times."—DANIEL IV., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward to the publisher, shall have one copy of the paper free. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,
Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, - \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

SECOND LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH.

HONEOYE, April 30, 1844.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

You have recently discovered, it seems, that "our differences respecting Church organization," so far from being "small, and in words rather than things" do indeed "concern things, and that they are wide and radical." So much so that if your views should be "surrendered" and mine should prevail in their stead, neither myself nor any other person could make any effective opposition to sectarianism, however much we might "hate it and fight valiantly against it." More than this, you believe that the adoption of my "two, as you understand them, would be to "fall in with Sectarianism, and Schism: that very "Sectarianism," which you doubtless regard as identical with heresy, and which you have so recently characterized as "one of the most marked children of the father, the devil!"

This is pretty strong ground, brother Smith, and I now suppose that in consequence of your taking such a position, I should complain of your want of "wisdom and Christian charity," and (especially if it appeared that you had misapprehended my meaning) should speak of the "severe charges" you had brought against me—of your "violently wresting my words"—"practising unreasonableness towards me, and acting more in keeping with the character of a "sectarian bigot" than with your own? Suppose I should do this, would you not think it absurd? Be assured, brother Smith, I should do no such thing, for I do not think there would be any just occasion for it, any more than there was in your taking a similar course towards me, and I think a full, patient and free investigation of the points in difference between us to be a more excellent way.

But, brother Smith, when you discovered such a "wide and radical difference between our views of church government," a difference leading in your view to such vastly important and totally opposite results—how came it to pass that you did not reflect that your brother Goodall, without any breach of "Christian charity," on his part, might suppose it possible that the difference between us, if investigated, might turn out to be as "radical" and as momentous as you had discovered them to be? Why did you not consider, that, in such a case, his "extended animadversions" were by no means impertinent, uncalled for, or out of place? Why did you not see that his questions to you were demanded by fidelity to yourself and to the common cause of Christian and church reformation which we both have at heart? Why did you not understand that the distance of Peterboro from Honeoye was as great as the distance of Honeoye from Peterboro? That Gerrit Smith differed as widely from William Goodall, as William Goodall did from Gerrit Smith? That if the latter might tell the former how heretical and destructive he considered his views to be, the former might inquire of the latter whether his views had been rightly understood, and suggest the bad consequences that might arise from such views in case they should prevail?

But enough in this direction. I have been already too long detained from the discussion itself by a vindication of the propriety of such a discussion and the mode of my commencing it.

The first thing, as I said in my first letter, in a discussion of this kind, should be a clear understanding of each other's views. Let me ask your attention to some statements.

DIFFERENT THEORIES OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

FIRST THEORY. Let me first state the theory which I hold to be according to the teachings of the New Testament and apostolic usage. The word church means assembly. A Christian church is a Christian assembly. In the New Testament the word is used in two distinct senses, which distinction should be carefully noted and kept constantly in view.

1. The entire body of true Christians on earth, or sometimes, all the true Christians on earth and in heaven, are called the church—the body of Christ—the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven, but cannot be written by men on the earth. The church in this sense of the term is on earth. The plural form of the word, churches, is never predicable of the church in this sense, and in the New Testament is never thus used. In this sense of the word church, it means a body wholly and strictly spiritual, of whom it may truly be said that "none but Christians can by any possibility be in the church." This church is so purely spiritual that none but the Omnipotent One knows who are its members, and none but Jesus Christ holds any office over it. It has no outward, tangible, visible organization, either divine or human: that is to say, it has no earthly officers, such as bishops, pastors, elders, or deacons, either chosen by the people or ordained by them or by Apostles or Presbyters, to exercise official functions for the whole body. It has no "strict church discipline," administered either by the brotherhood or by officers. No one but Jesus Christ can receive members into this church, or turn them out of it. The thing is not only improper but impossible. It cannot be done. No such event ever took place. No person ever was turned out of the church—using the word in this sense, by any of his fellow men, no, not even by Diotrephes himself, who is reported on good authority to have cast men out of one of the local churches. iii. John, 9, 10.

2. Run by the writers of the New Testament, and the Christ himself (in the 18th chapter of Matthew,) the word church, including sometimes the plural, churches, is used in a very different sense. It means local and organized assemblies of Christians, worshipping in one place.

The reason of this distinction in the use of the word church is founded in the nature of things. While Christians remain in the body, and remain on the earth, they sustain relations to each other and to the world around them, which involve their relation to things tangible and visible, the things of time and of space. They have bodies as well as spirits, and the spirituality of their religion does not divorce them from the laws of time and of space. They know but in part. They cannot know each other as they are known of God. They cannot positively tell who are Christians and who are not Christians, but they have duties to discharge to Christians distinct from their duties to other men. They must not knowingly treat worldlings as Christians nor Christians as worldlings, for in so doing they would make no distinction between the righteous and the wicked, and would co-operate, indiscriminately, with good and bad men, in promoting religion. To men being peculiar wants of Christians as imperfect in knowledge, and as subject to the laws of time and space, Christ has instituted the local churches, spoken of in the New Testament as distinct from the one universal and purely spiritual church. These local churches are to be organized (not instituted) by Christians themselves, by

* I do not deny that apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers were provided by the Great Head of the Church, for the benefit of Christians in general, the perfecting of the saints, the entire body of the church universal. This would be the result of providing pastors and teachers for the local churches, and apostles, prophets, and evangelists, for the brotherhood at large. But the church universal, in the apostolic sense, had no outward visible organization, no officers for exercising an official supervision over the whole.

* Instituted. Appointed—erected, &c. Noah Webster. Christ instituted churches 1800 years ago, and enacted the laws of their organization. But the process of organizing them under those laws is still going on.

their mutually recognizing each other, assembling together at convenient places, and electing their officers, preparatory to "strict church discipline" in accordance with Christ's laws. All persons who "afford satisfactory evidence that they are disciples and friends of Christ," according to the tests of Christian character contained in the Bible, have a right to membership, on the footing of an equal brotherhood, in these local churches. This "satisfactory evidence" must be considered by the brotherhood and the applicants received into the church or rejected, (recognized as members or not recognized) according to their best understanding of the evidence, judging the tree by its fruits. The brotherhood of course know who they have received (or recognized) and who they have not received, and it is therefore practicable, and commonly convenient, if not necessary, to keep a roll or list of their names. (See Acts i. 15—17.) And as applicants may be thus received or rejected, [See Acts ix. 26—28,] so members proving to be wicked men may be excluded from the church or assembly, and not permitted to assist in controlling its action. [1 Cor. v.] It follows that in the local churches, under the best "discipline" of fallible men, there may be recognized members who are not real Christians, [See 1 Cor. v. 12, 13. Acts i. 15, 20—v. 1—11—viii. 23,] and it is possible that real Christians may fail to "afford satisfactory evidence" to the brotherhood, and be excluded from the assembly or church. [Acts ix. 26.]

But no persons have a right to membership in the visibly organized local church, but such as "afford satisfactory evidence" of membership, in the spiritual church universal "whose names are written in heaven." And all who do afford a reasonable evidence of this, have a right, and cannot, without schism, be excluded.

3. It should be noticed that the Christians of a given territory, province, state or nation, are never called in the New Testament the Church of that territory, province, state or nation; and for this plain reason; such language would be liable to convey the impression that these provincial or national churches, like the local assemblies might have their officers and exercise church government, to the subversion of that local church government of the one worshipping assembly, convened in one place, which is the church universal in the New Testament. Of the one spiritual church universal it was useful to speak, but the language used never conveys the impression of an outwardly organized body, with officers, exercising church discipline.

An examination of all the passages in which the words church and churches are used in the New Testament, will further illustrate this idea.

The one spiritual church universal is spoken of in Col. i. 18—Eph. iv. 15, 16—Eph. v. 23—30 where no intimation is given of church officers exercising church discipline over the entire body. The term church in these texts, conveys no other ideas than are conveyed in the following parallel passages, where the spiritual union of Christians with Christ is spoken of, without any use of the word church at all: viz: John xv. 5. 1 Peter ii. 4, 5, 6. Eph. ii. 20. Rom. xii. 4, 5—and Rom. vii. 4. No allusion to any outward visible church organization is contained in these texts.

The organized local churches, as visible, tangible bodies, in distinction from the one spiritual and invisible church universal, were such as the church of Rome, the church of Ephesus, the church of Corinth, the seven churches of Asia, &c. &c, each of which had its distinct officers—and each of which exercised church discipline, independent of each other, and of any other body. These were all local assemblies, or congregations, in the strict literal sense of the term, worshipping in "one place."

We read of "the churches of Asia," of Macedonia and of Galatia; but no where of "the church" of Asia, of Macedonia or of Galatia, or of any other extended territory or province—nor in it proper or scriptural in modern times, to speak of such churches.

* These local churches, while remaining true churches of Christ, are properly called, in a sense, spiritual churches, because a spiritual religion predominates among them and unworthy members are not knowingly retained in them. But they are not so purely spiritual as to "know as they are known." They are not so spiritual as to have no outward organization—no officers—no "strict church discipline" administered by fallible men, who may err in receiving or excluding members.

Such must have been the theory of church organization prevailing in the times of the apostles.

SECOND THEORY. Another theory of church organization, in opposition to the preceding, is that which, overlooking or confounding the distinction between the invisible spiritual church (i. e. the entire Christian brotherhood, of the whole world, as known to the searcher of hearts) and the visible church, the brotherhood of those who consider each other as Christians; (thus making the church visible and invisible one and the same thing.) infers from the universality of the spiritual, invisible church, as described in the Bible, that the church visible and tangible, with its officers and church discipline, must be equally comprehensive and universal. The laws of organization, (the election of a bishop, &c.) given in the New Testament for the local assemblies or churches, is accordingly transferred to the Holy, (i. e. Spiritual) church Catholic, (i. e. Universal) and hence comes the Catholic or universal church, with its Bishop or Pope, as we all know. Granting the premises, the conclusion follows of course. For if the church on earth is to have its officers and church discipline at all, and if the church visible and tangible be the same as the church spiritual and universal, then the organization and government of the church must be co-extensive with the church itself. Those who believe in "strict church discipline" and at the same time believe that the church visible and invisible are one and the same thing, without any distinction except the more or less comprehensive, in numbers or territory, will probably find it difficult to show their self-consistency, unless they make some general arrangements for exercising church discipline over all the Christians of the one church universal, on earth.

THIRD THEORY. A third theory of church organization is that first evolved by some of the early Protestant Reformers, who, finding that the idea of one universal church, with its officers and its authority over all Christians, (a delusion all powerful with the people) had its origin, and still entrenched itself in the false notion that the church visible and invisible were one and the same thing, insisted, at first, on the wide distinction between them,* but having no clear views of the local church government and discipline described in the New Testament, and misled by the notion that ecclesiastical and civil authority should be combined, transferred to the national church, as connected with the civil power, the ecclesiastical authority that had been vested in the Roman See. This union of civil and ecclesiastical power over the churches planted by the Reformers, in a short time, and as a matter of course, restored the Roman Catholic idea of the identity of the visible and invisible church, since the authority, were, of course, recognized and treated as Christians—*as liberality*—by the by—of which the advocates of the church of England, have not yet ceased to boast. Whatever their doctrines or their practices, the Church of England claimed all Englishmen as church members, whether they were willing to be members or not. The church establishments of Protestants, on continental Europe, were similar.

But this restored idea, in the national establishments, of the identity of the visible with the invisible church, was in bad keeping with their refusal to submit to the government of the one universal church! Another and still more delporable effect was produced by the same idea. If the visible and invisible church were one and the same thing, if every member of the outward, visible church, was also a member of the mystical body of Christ, the great mass of the populace, whatever their principles or their practices, were in a safe state! And thus the populace settled down in the darkness and influence of a second Romanism. Evangelical Christianity still lived, and her struggle to throw off the incubus pressing upon her vitals, gave birth to the

FOURTH THEORY. Protestant dissenters, in England, first introduced this theory of church organization. The Protestant doctrine of a spiritual, invisible church, in distinction from all outward organizations, was, for a time, restored; and its restoration, as before, and during its restoration, was as life from the dead. If scriptural views of church organization cannot beget a spiritual life in the church, they can often remove the obstacles which prevent a new spiritual birth; and the true form, as an appropriate symbol, may shadow forth, even before hand, the spirit of the true worship. Not until the just proportions, the symmetry, and order of the temple shall be patiently ascertained and scrupulously restored, shall the glory of the God of Israel, from the way

* This distinction, was not only visible but prominent in the Evangelical preaching of Luther and Zwingli, who started the thoughtless with the declaration that their connection with the church could not save them, and, at the same time, broke the fetters of the Papal power by reminding the people, that they could have salvation by Christ, and not by the church.

of the east, and lightening the whole earth, fill the house of the Lord. [See Ezekiel, chap. 43, as compared with the three chapters preceding.] The English dissenters, from the first Protestant reformers, insisted much upon the wide distinction between the church visible and invisible, between outward church organizations—even the best of them—and the one invisible spiritual church of Christ—they insisted that membership in the former could not imply certain membership in the latter. Yet they sought to render the former, as nearly correspondent to the latter. The Puritans took their name from their seeking to restore a pure church.

The rock upon which the English dissenters made shipwreck, was *sectarianism*. In their misdirected zeal for a perfect church, they exalted incidentals and "doubtful disputations" to the same high level with the fundamentals of Christianity. They overlooked the heavenly distinction between mercy and sacrifice! At least their institutions were shaped upon that model. The result is before us. On the same equal footing, sacrifice and mercy, incidentals and fundamentals, cannot long be. One or the other must predominate. When men refuse to give a decided precedence to mercy over sacrifice, to the spirit over the letter, to fundamentals over incidentals, the sure result will be that mere incidents shall triumph over fundamentals, the spirit shall be lost in the letter, and mercy shall be suffocated by sacrifice.

Thus has it proved with the churches planted by the English dissenters and with their American imitators, and progeny. And the spirit of *sectarianism*, wherever other spirit, has found out its own appropriate body and form. *Sectarianism*, in its modern forms, (and its name is legion) like the church of Rome and the church of England, has almost lost sight of the distinction between the outward organized, and the invisible spiritual church. To belong to the organized church is almost the same, in the eye of *sectarianism*, as belonging to the mystical body of Christ. Very manifestly, the favor of the organized church is more sought than the favor of Christ. The "peace of the church" (in the outward organization) is more highly prized than fidelity to Jesus Christ. You may trample upon all the commands of Christ "as to whatever extent it may," and escape censure, if you will only be true to the sect—to the church. But no holy obedience to Christ shall shelter you, if you disobey the law of the outward organization, the church! All this must proceed on the assumption that the visible and the spiritual church are one and the same thing—that obedience to the Church is obedience to God!

The corresponding theory of church organization, with the *sects* is manifestly this. Whatever they may admit concerning the church spiritual and invisible, the outward organization they seem to think may be managed as the church leaders please. Episcopacy, Presbyterianism even Independency itself (if it can be Presbyterianised) find almost equal favor, with the spirit of sect. No possible form will it admit to be of divine origin or New Testament institution, yet it claims divine authority for almost all the various modes of church government which men see fit to invent, an absurdity which could scarcely fail to drive men, (as it has recently done) into a denial of all divinely instituted church order and church discipline whatever.

The spirit of sect always at war with local church independency and almost totally unable to live in company with it, in its purist form, never fails to subvert it, and to grasp at as wide an extent of territory, for its ecclesiastical arrangements, as it possibly can. Despairing of universal empire, in the presence of the church Catholic, and in the midst of its own rival developments, its next first best is found in the idea that the church of Christ in any nation, as an organized body, is composed of all the Christians in such nation. And therefore each sect, conceiving itself to be the true church, makes arrangements to govern all the Christians in the nation whom it can persuade to recognize its claims. In America, the civil power of the nation, from the structure of our government, cannot be connected with any national church. But rival national churches are nevertheless organized. The Protestant Episcopal church, the Methodist Episcopal church, and the Presbyterian church of the United States, are specimens of national churches of this kind.

When the sect is not sufficiently numerous and extended, or when it seeks a more efficient exercise of church power than the direct action of the national organization admits, then there comes in to its aid, the sentiment that the (organized) church of Christ, in any state, district, province, or county, consists of such Christians within those territorial limits as can be brought voluntarily, under the yoke. Conferences, Synods, Presbyteries, Associations, Conventions, are organized under this idea.

* See Christian Investigator for April, 1841.

And this belongs to the present crisis of this spirit of a living Christianity, not quite extinct, is struggling to throw off the chains and fetters of existing organizations, and find development under some new forms. Those of the existing sects, the church of Rome, and self-denial, must be abandoned of course. They are crumbling from their own rottenness. But what shall come in their stead? A return to the dead principle of the Roman church should seem to be the answer to the question. Equally so, a return to the imperfect theory of the Protestant Reformers. What can we do? Can we grasp the full and distinct idea of the apostolic model? Or shall we, amid the wreckage and fragments of the past, and the dust of existing confusion, pick up almost at haphazard, and put together, for present expedient, such an assortment as may come first to hand? Or shall we, in despair give up all outward visible church organization and church discipline, and cling only to the spiritual and invisible church? This last thought has already found a reason, in what I shall shortly say.

FIFTH THEORY.—No outward church organization at all—no church government—no church officers—and no church discipline, are among the well understood, and distinctly unimaged outlines of this theory. In its starting point, it strikingly resembles the starting point of the second, or Roman Catholic theory. It denies the distinction between the one universal, invisible, spiritual church, and the outward or visible church. It uses the word church in only one sense, as the Romanists does, and as the Church of England and many modern churches of *sectarianism*, practically do. But along with this idea, there stands another, which turns it into the most opposite channel of application. Believing that the church spiritual and the church visible are strictly one, and finding that the universal church spiritual has no outward organization, church officers, or church discipline, it concludes that the church visible can have none. Granting both the premises, the conclusion must follow of course. The promulgators of this theory have largely insisted that it can be no voting into the church or voting out of it—no enrolling of members—no method of keeping Christian assemblies pure, but by the individual holiness of each member—no responsibility in the Christian assembly for the principles or characters of those who may worship and join in religious activities with them, and as could lay a foundation for the expulsion of offenders by the body—nothing, in a word, like "strict church discipline," as the phrase is commonly understood.

Some of the advocates of this theory have appealed to the New Testament in its support, but others have, distinctly, appealed from the New Testament to the "immediate" and "ever present" divine influence which they think they enjoy. They admit that outward local church organizations, and officers, and church government and discipline, existed in Paul's day. But however useful these may have been in the infancy of Christianity, they think they have now arrived at a more mature state—that they have no more need of the institutions of the New Testament than of the Old, and are under no more obligation to conform to them.

Would it be strange if, at such a time, there should be some such confusion and hesitancy, in the minds of great and good men, as to the path they should pursue, as has already been supposed to exist? Is it incredible that brethren unwilling to go the full length of the outward church organization or church discipline theory, should nevertheless be charmed with some of the plausible and even truly excellent things written in behalf of a spiritual Christianity, by the advocates of that theory, and thus led to embrace so no of their sentiment, which are unsound? Should I utter any thing like a paradox, if I should intimate the possibility that able and excellent brethren, in their honest and earnest attempts to restore the order of Christ's house, should mingle together some of the elements of various and conflicting theories, and thus mar the beauty, the symmetry, and even the consistency, the soundness, and the durability of the edifice? In an attempt where Martin Luther, and Zwingli, where Baxter and Wesley so signally failed, would "Christian charity" be violated, should I suggest that ("amid the weary cares which press upon him, from morning till evening, leaving him no time, no strength, no spirit, even for a brief exercise out of those cares") Gerrit Smith, too, may possibly have failed? I pass to the statement of a

SIXTH THEORY.—In order to state this theory correctly, I will copy from an authentic document before me.

CHURCH.
We learn from the Holy Scriptures, which are the only infallible guide in all questions of morality and religion, that Christian and church relations spring, not from external fellowship and human arrangements, but from the union of those who

subjects of such relations with James Christ, who is "the
 chief of the body, the church," (Col. i. 18; 1 J. 15, 16; v.
 20; John xv. 1) 1st Pet. ii. 4, 5, 9; Eph. i. 20; Rom. xii. 4,
 5; 1 J. 14. Hence we believe, that the church of Christ on earth
 is composed of all the Christians on earth; that this church of
 Christ is not a compartment of all the Christians in such a
 manner that the church of Christ in any smaller community,
 or in one single family, (Rom. xii. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13,) is
 a part of all the Christians in such community. Thus be-
 lieving, we declare that the Christians at Petoskey and its vicin-
 ity, are part of the church, that, following Apostolic usage, we
 jointly call it the "The Church of Petoskey."—(The
 church of this name, and also the propriety of declaring that
 the Christians of a given locality constitute the church of
 locality, are justified by the following and other texts:—
 1 J. 1; Col. i. 24; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 2, connected with
 v. 15; Gal. i. 24; 2d and 3d Rev., "Church of Ephesus,"
 &c.) As a consequence of the beliefs which we have ex-
 pressed, we acknowledge ourselves bound—not to vote into our
 church, if we can neither vote into it, nor out of it—but
 wherever there can be a number of its every person without our
 aid, men, who afford satisfactory evidence that he is a
 true friend of Christ, and bound to do this even in the
 case who do not consent to our thus recognizing them,
 in the case of those who, in their direct or indi-
 rect, and peculiar, more or less, blame-worthy, be it to
 extend it may. Another consequence of the beliefs
 we have expressed is, that, while we are to regard the
 "discipline, and to bind, and to loose each other as
 well call for such fidelity, we are to deem no person
 as being dis-fellowshipped by us but those whom we have
 regarded as Christians."

"In view of the Creed we are further told by the Synod, that it was adopted by persons in Peterboro who were the Christians therein, simply because they were Christians—do or were divine organizations, and not strangers to the contrary notwithstanding. constitute the Church of Peterboro." We are silent.

At the close of the meeting, the report was made that all
ness of the doctrine and dogmas of the creed, believe
to be a summary of "The Church of Peterboro," should
name the Secretary of the meeting. In accordance
with a number of persons gave their names."

we have since been informed by the same writer the Church of Peterboro has no roll of its members; there is a roll, but it is kept in heaven."—Further told that "none but Christians can by right be in the church"—that though "wicked, deceiving, and well deceived, may presume to sit in her conference and prayer meetings, and eat the table which she spreads with the symbols of Saviour's body and blood," yet "holy living, one of those who recog no themselves to be members of Church of Peterboro, is under God, their only chance for exemption from these evils."

REMARKS ON THE PRECEDING.

g by other remarks and inquiries that natural-
ly themselves here, let me ask you, brother,
whether you think my mistake, (if I did mis-
supposing that your Poterborn creed made no
a between the two different senses or significa-
the word church that have been described, was
nable," "gentle," "unjust" or "exceed-
ing" to you?"

the language of the creed adapted to comprehension? Did not its logic require that it receive such a construction? Have not other brave not great men, and good men, of almost every sect, held the view I understood you? Why then should you have thought it a wrong and unjust imputation upon you, when I understood that view?

ed to take notice that I no where attributed you seem to think I did) except as "appeared and implied," the doctrine that "the Church" or that the "Church Universal" its outward organization, its "general council," its Bishop, its Pope I said distinctly *be* charge upon you and the good brethren at Pe *intentional* support of such usages, any more *ed* upon those "excellent Christian Faith-*el*ification of the church visible with the *achie*, led to those results.

... what I understood to be the facts, that
... creed, and your theory of church organi-
... on the assumption, that the local church
... in the same sense with the church of the
... church of the state, the church of the na-
... church universal, to which direct refer-
... in the creed. And I said that if this

re had understood brother Smith to hold even *this* does not know that eminent and pious Protestants, but held more or less definitely, this sentiment, then have deplored what they admitted to be the going out of existing *schisms*, of a breach in the unity of the "Church of Christ on earth." Martin Luther, at a time, made a broad distinction between the Pope. He appealed from the Pope misinformed Peter informed. And after he renounced the Pope, he appealed to a general council, of all *Christendom*, and appealed to its decisions,—thus admitting discipline in a Universal Church.

principle were correct, and if the local church ought to exercise "strict church discipline," and have its "Elder, or Bishop, it would follow that the county, and we nationally, and the universal church should have, each its Bishops, and extreme church "strict discipline," also. And I said that this was the principle on which the Pagany was! Was there any flaw in my logic, brother Smith? Was there any mistake in the historical fact? Turn to the questions in which the public have a deep interest. For whatever may be the position of the Church of Petersburg, the distance is between the different senses in which the word church should be used, in very extremely distant—distant, among others, by advocates of Christian Union, who think the opposite continents in best accordance with their theories.

And had I no occasion for supposing that such were your views of the local and the more extended church, and that you consider them all to be churches in the same sense? How came I to *speak* of equity, state, nation, and universal churches, because the creed of the Church of Pezoboro had used similar language?—Had said that “the Church of Christ on earth is composed of all the Christians on earth—that the Church of Christ in any nation is composed of all the Christians in such nation—and that the Church of Christ in any smaller community” (we sisters, I, mothers, and it was ships) “even down to a single family, is composed of all the Christians in such community?”

Was there any motto given in all this, that you used the word Church in a *different sense*, when speaking of "the earth"—"the nation"—"the smaller community" and the "single family"—than when speaking of "the Church of Peterboro'?" Did not the argument of the creed require me to understand that you reasoned from the *one to the other*? That you claimed for all the Chris-

ans in Peterboro that they constituted "the Church of Peterboro" on the same principle of organization that all the Christians of a nation constituted the church of that nation, and that all the Christians in the earth constituted the church universal? On any other supposition than that you held the local and the national and the universal church, to be churches in the same sense, what argument could I have understood you to derive in favor of your theory of local church organization, from the analogy or example of the national and the universal churches? Or what significance or force could I give to the phrase "THE CHURCHES" by which your views of the national church and of the church universal, &c., &c., is connected with your view of "the Church of Peterboro."

In your circular of Dec. 4, 1841, upon the "Union of
Christians," and headed "Nathan to David," you ad-
dressed to the common distinction between the local or orga-
nized church, and the spiritual church universal, and this
was your language:

You will perhaps refer me to the different meanings which the New Testament puts upon the word "church." On this point I have but to say, that whatever, as the most comprehensive sense, the church includes all the blood-bought in heaven and earth, so in its least comprehensive sense also, it includes all of that church, who in the given locality, be that locality a city, a village, or a family. All "the beloved of God" in Rome were comprised in the Church of Rome; and "the church that was in their house," included all the piety in the family of Priscilla and Aquila. Would you see one of the striking differences between the local churches of the apostolic age and of this? You see it in the fact, that whilst the former were the component parts of—namely the whole of Christ's church on earth," the adding together of the later leaves in my, very many, of the friends of Jesus uncounted. Thousands and tens of thousands of these friends, because they cannot promulgate the *Unbiblical* acts, are denounced to stand without the pale of these self, instead of Christ-constituted churches.

Was there any thing in this language of yours, bro. Smith, that should lead me to infer that you made any distinction in the different senses of the word church, in the New Testament, except the *more* and the *less* comprehensiveness? Any distinction that could admit of different principles of church organization? Did not your language imply, and your argument require, that you would be understood as not recognizing any such distinction?

But in your letter of March 23d you do make such a distinction—(how much in consistency with your theory and your former language, I do not say here) You say that you hold to a church of Madison county in "just

* Whereas the local churches of the apostolic age comprised all the true Christians "scattered abroad," it might be difficult to determine. Paul seems to have "joined himself" to the disciples at Jerusalem, before he went into Arabia; but I could not affirm that every new convert, in those times of copiousness and of flight, had an opportunity to do likewise. One thing is evident on the face of the apostolic records and writings. The local churches (as at Jerusalem, Corinth, &c.) had members "within" them, and "were bred among" them, whose conduct proved so opposite to Christianity, that they had to be "voted out of the church"—thus proving a wide distinction between the church visible and invisible, which "Nathan" has overlooked. More of this, in another connection, by and by.

the union" in which others mean, that all the Christians or churches of America, constitute the church of America, when they speak of the African church,"¹⁰ but without including in that term the idea of any outward organization at all. And, strange to tell, you think yourself wronged because I had not in force understood, that in *your* theory of Church organization, you held to this wide distinction between the sense of the word church, as applied to "the Church of Petersburg," and to the "African church," or the church universal! Whose fault was it, brother Smith, yours or mine, that your meaning was not better understood? When, before the receipt of your letter, of March 25th, had I ever heard this distinction recognized by brother Smith?

"GREAT PRODUCE!"—"ACCORD!"

"This place may be the proper one for looking, one moment, at the pleasantry in which you have indulged at my mention of a "universal test—a paper." At the revival of this, your action—

"There are indeed great prospects for the life Church of the future, which holds its destined meeting in a room of a universal World, if our little Church should grow, as you are permitted, to the grandeur and splendor even of the papal power itself, then a general will be but another verification of the line—'Tall oaks from little acorns grow!'"

And pray, how did you hear, brother Smith, that I "apprehended" my such growth and prospects for "the little Church of Peterboro'?" Not from anything in the Review in my March number, most assuredly. I neither said nor intimated anything of the kind. What did I say?

Having copied the statement, (not my "inference") that "the church of Christ on earth is composed of all the Christians on earth—that the Church of Christ in any nation is composed of all the Christians in such nation, and that the church of Christ in any smaller community, even down to a single family, is composed of all the Christians in such community," and having noticed that the Church of Peterboro, with its "elder" elect, and its purpose of "maintain[ing] strict church discipline," was claimed to be founded on the same basis of organization, I proceeded to apply that principle, thus avowed by "the Church of Peterboro," to "the church of Christ on earth," to "the church of Christ in" a given "nation," and to "the church of Christ in any smaller community," where I specified counties and townships, and might properly have specified the "single family" named in the creed. I then added,

Now for the operation of all this. If the Church of Peterboro say "maintain a strict church discipline" over all the Christians in Peterboro, without their consent, then the church of Addison County may do the same; so may the church of the State of New York, the church of the United States, and the church universal. And from neither of them could there be any evasion without sinning. The constituting jurisdictions of the village, town, county, state, national, and universal churches, would need to be harmonized; and how could this be done without an ultimate court of appeal, or an universal discipline?—concilio of cardinals, a stated general council, or an universal bishop—a pope!

Here was nothing said of the "growth" or "prospects" of the Church of Peterboro; (though in another place the question was asked, how the Church of Peterboro, on its own principles, could, without running into Episcopacy, be subdivided; and it was said, too, that a church planted on the principle of the Church of Peterboro, at New York or at London, might occupy the same position once occupied by the Church of Rome;) and I stated, that as a matter of fact, the same principle originated the hierarchy of the British Church, and if again adopted and carried out, would do the like again.

The problem for brother Smith to dispose of was, to show how the principle adopted by the Church of Peterboro, if adopted and "carried out" by a church in New York or in London, and becoming the mother or model church of a renovated Christianity in these latter days—would fail to produce the same fruits again which it once produced at Rome. To show, moreover, how the same principle, if adopted by the "church of Christ on the earth," "the church of Christ in any nation," "the church of Christ in any smaller community," (state, county, or township;) and all of which the Pe-

* I do not forget that the term "American church" conveys an idea of a church less spiritual than the one church universal, composed of all true Christians. But this circumstance only makes it the more natural to apply to "the American church" the same principles of organization appropriate to the local church. And this gives additional force to the suggestion, that the term "American church" ought not to be used.

Let it never be forgotten, that the Romish hierarchy reached its height, before the union of the church with the State, under Constantine. It was in Rome, as the central point of Christian missions and of evangelizing enterprises, not in Rome as political mistress of the world, that the Romish hierarchy arose, not at the bidding of the Caesars, but in a *free* of their! Under the ban of imperial persecution the papacy grew, till its power overshadowed the throne, and made it necessary for the emperors to do it homage, as a means of retaining its scepter.

(2) We cannot in the matter of organization, reason by analogy, in one sense, to churches in another sense.

(3) The fact that the Church Universal is composed of the Christians in the earth will not prove that "the Church of Peterboro" either is or must be, composed of all the Christians in Peterboro.

(4) The fact that "the Church of Christ on the earth" keeps no roll of its members, and has none except what is kept in heaven, will not prove that the Church of Peterboro keep an such roll, and ought to keep none.

(5) The fact that in the Church universal, men cannot vote into the Church, nor vote out of it, does not prove that the Church of Peterboro cannot and ought not to do that thing.

(6) The fact that men may be members of the Church of Christ on the earth, or the church universal, without their consent, (if it were a fact, which it is not) would not prove that any persons can be members of the "Church of Peterboro" without their consent.

The constitution of the Church Universal could not be a model for the local church, in any of these particulars, if, as your disclaimer concedes—they are not churches in the same sense. It could not be, any more than the absence of an universal bishop and of church discipline, in the universal church could furnish a model, in these particulars, for the local church.

Thus much results, if I mistake not, from your disclaimer of the sentiment that the church universal and the local church at Peterboro, are churches in the same sense.

3. I pass now to another disclaimer or concession contained in your letter. To the "3d Position of the Church of Christ of Utica" if rightly interpreted by me, as involving a prospective Episcopacy, or plurality of subordinate churches under one larger church, in case of a future subdivision, for the sake of convenience, of that church, you are opposed as well as myself.

Let me ask of you, then, to be opposed, as well as myself, to the false principle in which that notion of prospective Episcopacy owes its origin; that false principle which, in the circumstances supposed, must either be set aside, or inevitably result in the Episcopacy described. I allude to the principle, that all the Christians of a given locality, as at Peterboro or at Utica, must, of necessity, or rather do, constitute the one Church of that locality.

And here, allow me again, to put the sentiment of your disclaimer into the form of a proposition, for logical use.

You think it improper that all the Christians in Utica or in Peterboro, if too numerous to hold worship in one place, and actually worshipping in different houses, should be considered churches "in an accommodated sense" in subordination to the one church of Utica or of Peterboro. Instead of this, you would have the several congregations constitute so many distinct churches "all entirely independent of each other."

This is your position. It follows that if a statement of church order, in the Peterboro Creed is incorrect, when it affirms that "all the Christians in Peterboro" do, simply because they are Christians, do, of more divine organization, all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding, constitute the "Church of Peterboro."

For if this statement were true, there could be no place for any such "human arrangements" as the sub-division of the Church of Peterboro into a number of distinct and independent churches. And should such a thing be attempted, the original "divine organization" of "the Church of Peterboro" would remain unaffected by the process. It would remain "the Church of Peterboro" (and not the several churches in Peterboro) "all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding."

By admitting the propriety of sub-division, "by human arrangements" you have virtually overturned, if you have not given up, your favorite principle that local church organizations are wholly independent of "human arrangements."

4. This appears still more clearly in another concession you have made in the same connexion. It is distinctly admitted by you that "the Christians of the little village of Siloam,—a couple of miles East of Peterboro" and the same distance West of Munnsville, have it in their power, and at their discretion and option to say whether or no "there should be the Church of Siloam." What becomes of the principle, then, that "the Christians therein, do, simply because they are Christians—do, of more divine organization—all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding, constitute, the Church of Siloam?" [For "Peterboro" does not differ from Siloam I suppose, in this matter.] Do you not see, brother Smith, that by admitting that the very question of the existence of "the Church of Siloam" depends on the judgement and action of the Christians in Siloam,

you give up, in effect, my, I suspect, true, do principle that all the Christians of a given locality, do, of necessity constitute and are members of, the Church of that locality, whether they "consent" to belong to such church or not? And since the Christians of Siloam may determine whether "there should be the Church of Siloam"—may they not, must they not, determine whether the Church of Siloam shall be organized? It cannot be organized unless it exists.

Your admission goes on to state, that the Christians of Siloam may determine to "have their local church relations with the Christians at Munnsville" or with the Christians at Peterboro, as they judge "convenient." And can the "more divine organization" of the Church of Siloam, "all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding," be superseded by human limitations of human "convenience?"

And if the Christians at Siloam may "have their local church relations" at Munnsville or at Peterboro, as "convenient"—why not at "Morrisville," if they prefer it?

And suppose some of the Christians at Siloam should deem it more "convenient" to "have their local church relations with the Christians at Munnsville"—and some should deem it more "convenient" to have them with the Christians at Peterboro—and others with the Christians at Morrisville—and others, not preferring to travel from home, should have their church relations with each other at Siloam? Who should forbid it? And why should not the "Christians of Peterboro be suffered" to exercise the same liberty if they please? [Whether for such other reasons as you have specified, instead of convenience, is a question, the discussion of which I must reserve, for the present.]

To my own mind, I confess, it appears evident that these concessions and disclaimers are broad and comprehensive enough, in the principles upon which they are founded, to cover almost, if not quite, the whole ground of controversy between us, and to decide the main points of that controversy in favor of the positions I have hitherto maintained. The very foundation stones of your theory of Church organization, so far as they differ from mine, seem shaken and removed from their place, if not annihilated, on their first contact with the principles admitted by you, in these disclaimers and concessions.

But I perceive that this view of the case is not yours, for by a number of illustrations and arguments, you still labor to maintain your former positions. Those arguments and illustrations I hope to examine in another letter, and in the mean time, remain, with undiminished affection,

Your friend and brother,
WILLIAM GOODELL.

Reformation Tracts—No. 2.

ARE YOU A CHRISTIAN?

A solemn question is put to you, dear reader! It is a question whether you are a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven, or whether you are still dead in trespasses and sins, and under the condemning sentence of God's law.

Be careful to understand the precise meaning, and full import of the question. I do not ask whether you are a professor of religion, or a member of any particular church—whether you have been baptized in infancy, by sprinkling, or in maturer age by immersion—whether you partake of the Lord's supper, attend meeting on the Sabbath, or hold to an orthodox creed. Such things may be well in their place, may be proper means and methods of impressing your mind with the things of the kingdom of Christ, or of expressing the resolutions, affections, and promises, you ought to make, to maintain, and to fulfil. But these things, of themselves can neither make nor prove you a Christian.

I do not ask whether, at some time in your life, you have been greatly alarmed, in view of your guilt, and danger of perdition; and then, after a while, have felt comforted and relieved; have been joyful, and thought that your sins were forgiven. If you are a Christian, it is most likely that you can remember having passed through something of this kind. But all this does not certainly prove that you now are—or ever were—or ever will be, a Christian! For thousands and millions have been alarmed and convicted, and then have found comfort in the belief that their sins were all pardoned, who never truly loved God or man, nor repented of their sins, nor believed on the Savior, nor over translated out of darkness into light, or from

the power of Satan unto God. And the melancholy proof of this is seen in the fact that they do not live the life of faith—the life of the right-earn—are not crucified to the world—do not keep God's commandments—do not deny themselves—do not serve God—do not forsake their idols—do not renounce the hidden things of dishonoury—do not follow the Savior who went about doing good—do not abandon their sins—but are still selfish and worldly-minded, self-seeking and hard-hearted, perverting man's wisdom to Christ's precepts, and loving the praise of men more than the praise of God.

I do not ask whether you sometimes, or often, have good feelings, and good frames of mind; whether you have affectionate emotions, in view of divine truth, that bring tears into your eyes, or joys and ecstasies that almost or quite constrain you to shout aloud, and give "glory to God." If you are a Christian, you probably, at times, have strong and delightful emotions; have affectionate and joyful feelings, in view of religious truths. And no marvel if they should sometimes bring tears into your eyes, or cause words of exultation to break forth from your lips. Some Christians exhibit much of these symptoms of feeling, some exhibit less, and some very little at all. In these things the natural temperament, or the intellectual training and mental habits of men, greatly differ. But neither any or all of these frames, feelings, or sensations, make a man a Christian, or prove that he is so. Christians have godly sorrow, holy love, holy joy. And these affections are more or less productive of emotions, perhaps tears, and other manifestations of emotion. But thousands and tens of thousands exhibit these same symptoms; are the subjects of strong emotions; can weep, can shout—may, can scarcely refrain from doing so—who know nothing at all of the renovating power of divine grace; that power which strikes deeper than the mere surface of the soul, and changes the heart, itself, not content with working upon mere emotion or its symptoms. Emotions are often involuntary, and the subjects of them may be passive. But holy love is a free, spontaneous, active, voluntary exercise. It is an act,—something that the soul does, and not merely experiences, or suffers to be. The emotion and the outward manifestation of it, (in tears, or sighs, in shoutings or groans) may all be the same in the regenerated, or the unregenerated man (so far as human observation can discover) and yet these manifestations and emotions may spring—do spring, from very different, nay opposite moral exercises or affections of the heart: the one from that benevolence or love, which is the fulfilling of the law, the other from that selfishness which is the essence of sin. This fact is proved, to a demonstration, by the opposite characters, aims, actions, fruits, works and lives, of persons, exhibiting, to human appearance, the same religious emotions, tears, sighs, ecstasies and transports! Every person acquainted with men and things, knows very well that no degree of mere religious emotion, decides the character of the man! He may be the subject of the most powerful sensations—emotions—all this may be real, and no affectation, or mere pretence—the man may be eaten up—the very victim of his emotions—and yet (possibly from this very cause) not fit to be trusted, in any situation, where appetite, lust, or passion can assail him. The passive subject of mere emotion, (even religious emotion,) is, not unfrequently, at intervals, the slave of fleshly appetites and lusts. Religious fanaticism and licentiousness, so frequently combined in the same persons, are manifestly akin to each other. In both cases, mere impulse has usurped the throne of conscience, of principle, and of reason. To follow their emotions, their feelings; to be lawless, and beyond control, is the comprehensive definition of both these classes of men. Sensuality is the domination of impulse, of sensation, of emotion over the body. Fanaticism is the domination of

the same power, over the soul. How lamentable, then, that more impulse, sensation, emotion, and the various manifestations of them, should be mistaken for true religion, and for the evidence of its holy and all-controlling reign!

Understand then, beloved reader! When I ask you whether you are a Christian, I do not ask you whether you are subject to strong religious emotions! When religious emotions spring from true religion, from holy love, they are always healthful and salutary, however powerful, because they then spring from the foundation principle of the divine law that orders and sustains. But do not mistake mere emotion for true religion. "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God." In Roman Catholic cities, the times of periodical religious excitement are said to be commonly the signals for the most heastly debaucheries, the most atrocious crimes. Nor are the most fanatical and superstitious (for superstition is nothing but fanaticism stereotyped) the least to be suspected, and guarded against, at such time! The Romish priest, mid crowds of weeping penitents, dispensing his absolution, understands the prudence of leaving his purse and pocket book at home. The jealous husband keeps his eye upon the priest. The weeping, nevertheless is not mere pretense. The emotion from which it springs is not unreal. The fault is not in the degree, but in the kind. Dream not, dear reader, that spurious and worthless religious emotion, is confined to the Romish communion! The barbarities, the robberies, the cruelties, the persecutions, the nameless abominations of slavery and the slave trade, habitually perpetrated, justified, apologized for, consented to, and supported, by ardent and zealous religionists and promoters of religious excitements, in the prominent Protestant sects of America, northern and southern, (Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist,) bear witness that it is not so! And men of business know that many of the same class are not to be trusted, and dare not trust each other.

Nor do I ask you whether you are pleased and gratified with clear and correct exhibitions of divine truth, "in the abstract"—whether you admire the character of God and of Jesus Christ, as exhibited in the Bible. All this, the Christian will of course, do. But others, too, often do this, who are not Christians. The most glowing eulogies of the character of Jesus Christ, have been written by the worst of men—by infidels, by slaves of sin and Satan—by such men as Rosseau. God has so constituted men that they cannot help admiring the sublime and the beautiful of moral character, as well as the sublime and beautiful in the scenery of nature. This is one of the ties by which the Creator binds all intelligent moral beings, to his throne, and lays them under obligation to be holy as he is holy. In these capacities, to perceive and appreciate what is right, and true, and lovely, their moral accountability consists. And it is no sign that men are Christians, because they have not blotted out their moral nature, which even lost souls in the pit, cannot do. Thou believest the truth "in the abstract"! Thou dost well. "The devils also believe, and tremble."

When I ask whether you are a Christian, I do not ask you whether you maintain the reputation of a decent, respectable, honest, moral man—a good citizen—a good neighbor—a kind friend, as the world commonly uses these terms—as the world commonly judges of respectability, and kindness and good morals. All the qualities that deserve these names, enter, of course, into the character of the Christian. But to be a Christian is to be *more* than is commonly understood by this description of human character.

And the question "Are you a Christian?" means something more than the question whether, in addition to all the things before mentioned, you engage actively, in every benevolent and reformatory work. All this, the true and consistent Christian will of course do. But mere selfish and

worldly considerations, not unfrequently impel men who are not Christians, to do the same things (so far as the mere outward act is concerned,) that true Christians do, from holy love to God and mankind.

The goadings of conscience, the fear of future punishment, the hope of meriting salvation, beget, in many persons, a very laborious, pains-taking, legal religion and morality, into which the true love of God and man—the love of holiness, and of duty and virtue, for their own sakes—does not enter, at all. They would be glad to get rid of the duties they perform, if they thought they could neglect them without the loss of their souls. The proof of this is seen in the fact that they are afraid of doing more than their proportion, for benevolent and religious objects, and are ready to excuse themselves from self-denying and expensive labors, just so far as they can, and keep up their credit with others, and with their own consciences, as good Christians.

The reader, by this time, will perhaps, be ready to ask, What is meant by the inquiry—"Are you a Christian?"

A Christian is one who loves God, and mankind—who loves God supremely, and his neighbor as himself—who regards with impartial and disinterested benevolence all beings capable of enjoyment, and loves with complacency and delight all beings who are holy. The Christian loves God for what he is in himself—for the excellencies of his nature, and the moral glories of his character. He loves to do right because it is right and because it is the will of his Father in heaven. He loves to do good for the sake of doing good. He loves to deny himself for the benefit of others. Benevolence, or good will to others, is the life of the Christian, and without the active exercise of such benevolence he cannot be happy. He hates sin because it is "exceeding sinful." He fears to do wrong because it is wrong, and because it is hateful to the infinitely holy Being whom he supremely loves. He loves the divine law, because it is the divine will, and reflects the perfections of the divine character. His own will is swallowed up in the divine will. He obeys, because he loves to obey, and because the law is holy, just, and good. He loves Christ for the glories of his character. He repents of his sins, embraces the gospel, and confides in the atonement, because he needs a salvation from sin, and because this method of salvation displays the divine glory. He serves God because he delights in his service—he discharges the duties growing out of all his relations to God and his fellow men, because he delights to cherish those relations, as dear and sacred bonds that bind him to his Great Father in heaven, and to his equal brethren on earth. Reader! Are you a Christian?

Do you love God? Before you answer this question, consider, it is the living and true God—the God of nature and of the Bible, and not the God of your own vain imagination—that you must love, in order to be a Christian. Remember! he is the universal and impartial Father of all men. And those who love him, must love all his equal children, impartially, as he does. Remember! he is the God that has made of one blood, all nations. He has created all men equal. He has endowed them with certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These inalienable rights, his irrevocable law was intended to guard and maintain. The measure of your regard for his law, is the measure of your regard for the rights that the law was intended to guard! You have no more regard for the divine law than you have for inalienable human rights. Whenever you disregard any of those rights, you disregard the divine will—the divine law—you disregard God.

Do you love such a God? He is the God of justice and of mercy. He hates all injustice and oppression. He requires you to love what he loves, and to hate what he hates. As he loves your

neighbor as much as he loves you, so he requires you to love your neighbor as yourself. Having created you equals, he requires that you should love and treat each other as equals. The man of darker complexion than yourself, he loves as he loves you. He regards you both as his equal children. He is no respecter of persons, and does not permit you to be. Do you love such a God?

He is the God of the oppressed—the refuge of the poor and needy. A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is God, in his holy habitation. He abases the proud, and gives grace to the humble—He lifts the poor out of the dust, and the beggar out of the dung-hill—He is the avenger of the poor—He will arise and set them in safety from them that pull at them. He requires you to cherish the same affections, and pursue the same objects with himself—to co-operate with him in his gracious designs towards the oppressed. Do you love such a God?

He has said, "The righteous considereth the cause of the poor, but the wicked regardeth not to know it." He has said, "Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction. Open thy mouth: judge righteously; and plead the cause of the poor and needy." "Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor." Reader! he says this to you. Do you love such a God? And will you serve and obey him?

Do you love God? If you despise any of the human race, his beloved offspring, you cannot love him. "He that despiseth the poor, reproacheth his maker." "If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also."

Do you love God? Have you considered what it is to love him? "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous." The love that God requires, is conformity with his will; and his will is expressed in his law. "If ye love me, keep my commandments." "How call ye me, Lord! Lord! and do not the things that I say." "If I be a father, where is mine honor? And if I be a master, where is my fear?" "His commandments are not grievous!" Reader! depend upon it, if you could wish, or even endure to have the commandment of God, in respect to your poor brother, any thing different from what it is, the love of God, and of man, is not in you.

Do you love man? Do you love humanity? If it is *humanity*, human nature, human being, that you love (as Christ loved it and gave himself for it,) then you will not stop to inquire after its color, or its condition; no, nor even its character, before you plead earnestly for its elevation, its equality—the restoration of its plundered rights—"While we were yet enemies, Christ died for us." The depth of our degradation and infamy did not repel him. Nor will any depth of human degradation repel you, reader, if you have Christ's spirit; and without his Spirit you are none of his—i. e. you are no Christian. If you can look on, unmoved, inactive, silent, while the immortal soul of man is chattelized, brutalized, heathenized, do not dream yourself a Christian! Such a hope, must be as the spider's web, when God taketh away the soul.

Do you love man? Or is it merely the trappings, the circumstantial, the appendages, the accidents of the man that attract your regard?—If it is *man* that you love, then *humanity*, stripped of all that can make it attractive—humanity an hungered, thirsty, a stranger, naked, sick, and in prison—humanity in its utmost need—humanity standing alone and unpitied, battered, and crushed, cannot fail to excite your attention, and secure your active and benevolent regard. "In-

such as you did it not unto one of the least (the most degraded,) of these," says the Savior, "ye but not unto me."

Reader! Are you a Christian? He that is of rest, heareth Christ's words. Will you hear him? Will you—Do you regard them?

If you are a Christian you love Christ—the first of the Scriptures—not the imaginary first of the formalist, the fanatic, or the mystic, but Christ who was anointed to preach the gospel of deliverance to the captive—the opening of the prison door to them that are bound—the recovery of sight to the blind—to set at liberty them that are bound—to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God.

Are you a Christian? If no, you are the disciple, the follower of Him who went about doing good to the bodies and souls of men; who rested his claim to the Messiahship on the fact that through his grace, the blind saw, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the dead were raised, the poor had the gospel preached to them.

Are you a Christian? Then you are enlisted under the banners of Him who was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil, and with him, you are contending against every form of oppression and sin. If you are a Christian, is THIS Christ that you love. You are doing his work, not of constraint, but of free choice; and the wealth, and honor, and pleasure of the whole world—nay, of a thousand worlds, would not make you to relinquish this work—the work which Christ left the throne of his glory, took himself the form of a servant, became a man of sorrows, had not where to lay his head, and obedient unto death—the work of elevating the most degraded and depressed of mankind.

Are you a Christian? Do you live the life of Christian?—The life of faith upon the Son of God—the faith that purifies the heart—that conquers the world—that banishes the love of the world, which is enmity to God? Do you live the life of the righteous? Be not deceived! He that doeth righteousness, is righteous! The righteous considereth the cause of the poor. Do you consider the cause of the poor? Or are you among the wicked, who regard not to know it? Are you a Christian? Are you crucified to the world? Are you no longer governed by worldly notions, worldly maxims, worldly customs, worldly aims? Have you renounced the wisdom of the world?—the praise of men? Do you no longer cherish other interests besides the interest of Christ's kingdom, the interests of humanity, of righteousness, and of truth?

Are you a Christian? Do you serve God?—Do you delight in his service? Do you delight in doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly in God? Is it your meat and drink to visit the low and fatherless in their affliction, and keep spotted from the world? Do you choose this service of God, for its own sake, and not through vile fear, or to pacify the remonstrances of a led conscience? In keeping these divine commandments do you find great reward? Is the blessedness of this divine service the highest blessedness you desire? Do you love to think of the glories of the New Jerusalem as described by the beloved disciple when he says, "The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him?" [Rev. 22: 3.] In the supreme authority and perfect dominion of God and of Christ, in this active performance of the divine will, do you seek and anticipate the joy of heaven of heavens? Do you hunger and thirst after righteousness?—after perfect conformity with right?—after a full and complete harmony of soul with all the rights of all beings in the universe?—after the security, under the discipline of law, of the rights of each and of all? Is this that you hunger and thirst after? "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Righteousness

they shall possess—Righteousness they shall see maintained, and triumphant.

Are you a Christian? Do you deny yourself, take up your cross, and follow the Lamb, whithersoever he goeth? Do you cheerfully renounce ease, surrender wealth, forfeit public esteem, and lay yourself a willing sacrifice upon the altar of the right and the true? Do you joyfully take the spilling of your reputation and your good—do you give up your own selfish interest for the good of others, for the highest good of mankind, for the interest of Christ's kingdom—for the glory of God?

Understand me. I do not ask whether you think you could do this, if Christ should require it. Many persons, and indeed most professors of religion, would surely answer such a question in the affirmative! The most selfish of men readily persuade themselves that they could make great sacrifices for Christ, if he should require it! but they can never persuade themselves that he does require it, at their hands. They think he required it of martyrs and saints in former ages, but little do they think that he requires the same of them, now. Be not deceived—God is not mocked, and he does not mock others. There is nothing of hypothesis in this requirement.—The commandment is without an "if." Christ does at this moment require you to forsake all that you have, in order to be his disciple. They who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. They shall have an opportunity to test their sincerity, without an "if." Let any one who doubts or does not understand this, make the experiment, and he will soon learn. Try it, reader, and see. Follow the foot-prints of your Savior, who was rich, but became poor, that you, through his poverty, might be made rich. Love your fellow men as he loved them. Be ungrudging as he was magnanimous. Be faithful as he was faithful, and see how much of the world, or of the world's favor you will have left. One work of experiment, of obedience, would give you a better insight into the meaning of Christ's requirement than a whole lifetime of dreamy romance and musing over an "if." It is doubtless true that God, in his providence, requires certain specific sacrifices of some, that he does not of others. And all conceivable forms of self-sacrifice never centre in any one person. It is nevertheless true, that all Christ's disciples forsake all that they have, and give up all, including themselves, into his hands, in order to be his. Whoever lives without self-denial and self-sacrifice, does not live the life of the Christian.

Reader! Are you a Christian? Have you forsaken your idols? Have you taken the Everlasting God for your portion? Is your soul joyful in the possession of that portion, and do you cease laying up treasures on the earth? Is your enjoyment in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and not in the things that perish with the using? Are you no longer living to yourself, and laboring to secure selfish interests? Do thoughts of God and of Christ, and of the sublime truths of religion, refresh, and animate, and nourish, and invigorate your spirit, and make you active and cheerful in the service of God and mankind? Is your heart fixed, trusting in God? Have you the faith that unites you to the Savior? Do you confide in him? Do you venture to follow his directions, to imitate his example, to carry out into consistent and persevering action and practice, the great principle of divine truth he has revealed to you? Have you learned, experimentally, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of Jehovah? Dare you follow that word, without taking counsel of human wisdom, without consulting maxims of worldly and time serving expediency—without a calculation of consequences to see whether it would be profitable or prudent to obey God? Do you walk by faith and not by sight? In a word—Are you a Christian?

Christian Investigator.

THE CASE OF JESUS, 1843.

"AT HOME" ENDING.

One reason, we understand, why a certain church, in this region, established upon the principle of receiving all Christians, is thought to be "at home," and in danger of "opening the door to Universalism," is because it does not make a subscription to the *Confession of Faith*, or any other paper, of human origin, a test of church membership. But some churches, recognized members of that Church, unless they profess to believe in the full and apparently receive the fundamental doctrines it contains. Have any of the sects indicated a more full, and more explicit, and better adapted document to keep out heresy than the Bible? But let us read that all sorts of errors claim the Bible to be on their side, we admit the truth of the statement, but we desire to know whether all sorts of errors are equally claimed by other documents—the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England and the Presbyterian Confession of Faith—as being on their side? As a matter of fact, all sorts of theological sentiments are found in the Church of England and in the Presbyterian Church in America—Written creeds cannot keep out heresy. They are convenient maxims by which churches, from time to time, may express their sentiments and define their position. Any thing beyond this must be futile, because it attempts an impossibility. Papers and parchments of mere human origin cannot bind the conscience by virtue of their inherent authority. They cannot and should not restrain independent free thought. And besides, it would be noted that the signing of a Creed does not make men think alike, nor prove that they do. Human skill cannot draw up an extended statement of theological doctrine, touching the topics commonly dwelt upon in Church Creeds, in such a manner that intelligent, independent, conscientious Christian men, (in the present state of theological science) will not, on some points, differ. But if the Creed is very brief, (like the *Apostles' Creed*) then a variety of important topics must be omitted entirely, and thus the matters involved in them, left "at large"—such topics, for example, as Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the Sabbath, and the institutions of the Ministry and Church.

As a matter of fact, those who are required to sign or assent to extended Church Creeds as a condition of Church membership, do not commonly understand themselves, and are not commonly understood, as professing to believe them, in every particular, but only as general statements of doctrine. How far such a practice tends to open-hearted Christian simplicity of profession, we will not stop now to discuss. We have to do, here, with the known fact, that in most if not all the churches of sectarianism, the authorized creed does not accurately express the sentiments of all the members. Why then make it obligatory on all to assent to it, or subscribe to it? In the very church, some of whose members bring against the new church the objection now under consideration, it is known that the pastor has said that persons holding the Methodist or Arminian views would be readily received into his church as members. Would they then be required to express an unequivocal assent to the decidedly Calvinistic creed of that church? If so, then (as is true in many cases) the candidate is required to tell an untruth, in order to get into a church! But if such an unreserved assent is not required, why then is not the Sectarian Church as much "at home" as the one established upon the principle of receiving all Christians? Why not make the written documents of the Church correspond with the actual facts of the case? If, in reality, a subscription or assent to the Church Creed, is not made a condition of church membership, why not let the document itself honestly and truthfully say so, instead of being so framed as to convey

the impression that an assent to it is necessary to church membership?

If Presbyterian and Congregational Churches mean to bind their members to a rigid and strict conformity with their church creeds, let them do so, and abide the issue. This they must do, before they can consistently charge Christian Union Churches with being "at loose ends." And they must see to it that no one enters their churches or remains in them, without assenting to every item of their creeds. On the other hand, if they wish to gain the credit of that liberality and Christian fraternity which they sometimes find it convenient to profess, when charged with the sin of sectarianism and schism, let them act in conformity with their professions, and let their church creeds state their position as it is. They will then find themselves as much "at loose ends" as the churches of which they complain. But let them not hope to secure all the purposes of sectarianism and reap all the advantages of open communion, fraternal Christian Union, at one and the same time! Let them not charge Union Churches with being "at loose ends" while professing, themselves, to act on the same fraternal principles!

The real trouble, however, about the churches charged of being "at loose ends" and in danger of opening the door to all sorts of errorists, is the fact that they are raising the standard too high for the convenience of the Churches of Sectarianism, instead of denouncing it too low. The rule of receiving all Christians carries along with it the rule of receiving none but Christians! And the rejection of mere paper creeds, of human invention, as standards of church membership, is understood to result from the principle of insisting on scriptural evidences of Christian character as the grand, the sole test of church membership! Here is where the shoe pinches. And this is the true cause of all this consternation and terror. So long as assent to a stereotyped creed, and submission to certain rites and ecclesiastical arrangements can retain their present prominence, as tests, in the churches, so long the searching test of Christian character, by Christ's rule of judging the tree by its fruits, can be kept in the back ground, and the "peace of the" proslavery "churches" left undisturbed! It is notorious that if the rule of receiving all Christians and none but Christians into the churches, judging of men by their fruits, and retaining all such and only such, should obtain prevalence, the present controversy would have to be decided against the churches of Sectarianism. The best and most intelligent men and ministers in them, will not pretend that these churches can claim to be Christian churches, by such a rule. It is admitted by many if not by most professed abolitionists connected with those churches, that they seem farther than ever from espousing the anti-Slavery enterprise, in any form—that they seem settling down in a deeper hostility to the cause, than they have ever exhibited before. And the men and ministers who by common consent of all parties would be selected as the most pious in the churches, if pressed to tell their honest convictions, would not pretend to believe that one half or even one third (probably not one fourth) of the ministers and members of these churches give evidence of being Christians. Nothing, most plainly, can keep these pious men and ministers in the present sects, but their substitution of some other church tests, instead of the Bible rule of receiving all—and none but—Christians. Such a substitute the present creed system or the sectarian churches furnish them. To this, therefore, they cling, with a death grasp, well knowing that if this fails them, a general breaking up must ensue. The feature of the new churches, therefore, that makes Bible evidence of Christian character, every thing, and assent to a mere paper creed comparatively nothing, becomes the most formidable feature of all, in the view of such men. If this standard is to be erected and maintained, the present churches must be weighed in the bal-

ances, by an enlightened public sentiment, and found wanting.

One thing more we feel bound to say, in this place, though it will seem severe. But it ought to be said, and we shall sustain the charge we are about to make, with an undeniable fact. We affirm then, that the apparent concern lest Universalists and other kindred errorists should creep into the churches said to be so lamentably "at loose ends," is only an apparent and not a real alarm. In proof of this we will not rely merely on the practically Universalist position of the churches which these men continue to endorse and support, the position involved in their religious fraternity with the worst of men. We have another evidence at hand, to prove that the dread of heresy, in actual existence, and in close contact with them, does not trouble these men. One of the most prominent churches of the same sect with these alarmists (the Congregational) in the very heart of the same county of Ontario, has all along held open and avowed Unitarians and Swedenborgians in its communion—the circumstance is known to the public, but no alarm has been heard that this church is "at loose ends." It is needless to comment upon such a fact. We happen to know that a very eminent minister in this state, opposed to abolitionists, and holding a high post in one of the professedly evangelical sects, has intimated the propriety of admitting Unitarians into the churches, and such propositions, frequently made, have created no alarm.

FRAGMENTS.

Excessively timid persons are peculiarly liable to be very imprudent. Persons who plume themselves much on their prudence, are often found to be rash; for rashness is frequently the result of perturbation—of an over sensitive and precipitate flight from supposed danger.

The Bible is a vast store-house of facts, and of principles. Its principles are illustrated by its facts, and its facts are accounted for, by its principles. There is little danger that persons well versed in the great facts of human history as connected with the principles that govern them, will be tempted to think lightly of the Bible. The difficulty is, that class of men who have never been enlightened by the study of the Bible, are seldom sufficiently skilled in the science of human nature to appreciate the claims of the only book in which the heights and the depths of humanity are adequately grasped and measured.

There is no occasion to dispute, as some do, whether wicked men should be visited with censure or with pity. Their case calls for both, and neither would be proper without the other. Did they not deserve censure, they could scarcely need pity, and our pity would do them more harm than good, if it did not accompany censure. They are to be pitied because they deserve censure—and they are to be censured because they will never cease to need pity, until the weight of censure shall have impelled them to reflection.

As those who use alcoholic drinks, always think the description, the quantity, or the circumstances of the use in their peculiar case, an exception to the general rule, so those who resort to artificial modes of Church Government, instead of the divine mode, always think their usages an exception to the general rule by which such devices should be condemned.

There are three sorts of readers. The first read for amusement—to drive away their own unwelcome reflections; the second read the thoughts of others, in whom they repose confidence, and whom they employ (and sometimes pay) to do up their thinking for them; the third read to be incited and assisted, in the art of learning to think for themselves.

GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Some of our abolition brethren, particularly Methodists, are in ecstasies, almost, because the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its late sitting, and after a protracted debate, did conclude, on the whole, and by a vote of 117 to 66, that it was not expedient, under existing circumstances in that church, to take a new and advanced step in favor of slavery—the usual step (as it would have been, had they taken it) of reversing the decision of a Southern Conference—the Conference of Baltimore, who, in accordance with its usages and constructions of the "Discipline," had suspended a Mr. Hardin from the ministry for refusing to emancipate some slaves that had come into his possession by marriage. Marvellous indeed would it have been, if the General Conference, controlled by the prevailing voice of northern members, including abolitionists, should have gone against a southern Conference, to break down the last remaining appearance of opposition to slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Discipline—a Discipline which has never been understood, at least in Maryland, (where a strong anti-slavery sentiment has always existed) to tolerate slave-holding in the ministry, whatever it might do in the brotherhood. If a pro-slavery influence has prevented such cases from being brought before these ecclesiastical bodies, it has never, that we know of, produced any decisions of such bodies, in the direction attempted by Mr. Hardin. Such an insult to a General Conference was perhaps never offered before. Yet it would seem that it required a strong effort to prevent so unprecedented and downward a step, on the present occasion.

Since writing the above, we learn that Conference has suspended Bishop Andrew, for being a slaveholder. Here, again, the M. E. Church only holds old ground, and that, too, after a long struggle, in which the danger of Anti-Slavery secession was the principal argument used.

THE PENDING DISCUSSION.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER.—"This discrepancy between the views of Church order set forth by the Church of Peterboro and those entertained by yourself and other honest men, is disheartening only to the superficial. The attrition of honest minds, all in search of the truth prepares them for closer adhesion to it, and once a truth these differences are the unavoidable incidents of the present imperfect state. Let us toil on, strengthened by the gracious assurance of the Saviour—"If any will do my will, he shall know of the doctrine which it be of God."

GERRIT SMITH'S SECOND LETTER may be expected in our July number.

AN HONEST MAN.—O. A. Bowe, late Editor of the Herkimer Journal, a whig paper, has resigned his position, because he cannot, conscientiously, support Henry Clay, the Slaveholder. He says, "I cannot any party hereafter, that is leagued with Slavery."

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS.

For the support of the Christian Investigator, to June 10, 1841:

Of O. Peacock, Troy	0 50	J. Mosher, bal, Pledge for
T. Hins, Ditto	0 50	Canandaigua, at Syracuse
J. Turner, Allegany City,		Conventions
Pa.	0 50	J. Keep, for Ditto, (back
Dr. Hanson, Ditto	0 50	numbers)
S. Gray, Pittsburgh, Pa.	0 50	J. Kellum, Princeton, Mass
H. McKee, Ditto	0 50	A. Beach, Oyster River
D. Burgess, Constitution,		M. Mitchell, for 4 sets last
O. (short postage)	4 03	vol., sent as directed
J. Keep, for A. Griswold,		
Kinsman, O.	1 00	Amount

REFORMATION TRACTS.

TRACT No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting, by Priscilla Green—8 pages, for sale at \$1.00 per hundred, for cash only. Orders to be addressed to Wm. Goodenough, Ontario co., N. Y., or to E. Shepard, Rochester; or J. Mosher, Canandaigua.

Erestus Shepard, Book and Job Printer, Bocha

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 7.
WHOLE NUMBER, 27.

HONEOYE, "ONTARIO" CO., N. Y., JULY, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL IX., 23.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, \$2.00, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy of the volume free. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies free. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies free for his services.

DIED

At Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y., June 13th, aged 61 years, Mrs. Letitia Pitts, widow of the late Mr. Gordon Pitts, one of the pioneer settlers of that region. Mrs. Pitts was truly "a mother indeed," an ornament of the Christian profession, a friend to the oppressed, a guide of her own household, an intelligent and earnest pioneer in every enterprise of Christian reform. She was a member of the Church of Honeoye.

For the better understanding of this Correspondence, the reader should distinctly bear in mind the date of each letter, as the publication necessarily covers a long time afterwards. This letter being written before the receipt of Gerrit Smith's second letter, could not, of course, be modified by its contents. And it was thought unadvised to change it, in the publication, from the original draft, because, in that case, the natural course of the argument would be marred. The new light thrown on the position of Mr. Smith, by his second letter will receive attention in its season.

THIRD LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH.

FURTHER REPLY TO HIS LETTER IN THE INVESTIGATOR OF MAY, AND DATED MARCH 23.

Honeoye, May 8th, 1844.

In my last letter, dear brother, I promised to review the illustrations and argument by which, in your letter of March 23d, you still labor to defend your theories of church organization, notwithstanding those theories are, to my own apprehension, overthrown by the concessions and disclaimers which you have made in that same letter.

CHRISTIAN ACTIVITY IN ORGANIZING CHURCHES.

The first thing I shall notice in your letter is contained in the extract that follows:

"You remark that man is not passive but active in his regeneration. No it is not so. Nevertheless, to infer from it that he has an agency in organizing churches, seems to be any thing rather than sound logic."

The soundness of such logic, (if I had used it) would depend, in some degree, I suppose, upon a decision of the question "In what does the organizing of churches consist?" If church organization consists, as I maintain it did, in the voluntary assembling of Christians together, mutually recognizing each other as Christians, willing in an agreement to walk together in church relations, and electing the proper officers for that purpose, then, to be sure, the mere fact of their activity in regeneration, (leaving out of view the fact of their activity in doing the things above specified) would not be sufficient to prove that Christians have an agency in organizing churches. This I admit. [Such logic, however, I did not use.]

But if it were true, as brother Smith teaches, that "the Christians of" a given locality "do, simply because they ARE Christians, constitute the church of" that locality—then it would be true that the fact of their becoming Christians (or a regenerated persons) would be identical with the fact of their becoming an organized church; and if they were active and voluntary in the one, they would be active and voluntary in the other. Their agency in organizing Churches would be the same thing with their agency in becoming Christians. They could no more be church members without their consent, than they could be Christians without their consent, if, to be Christians and to be church members are, as you say, one and the same thing. Can you detect any flaw, in this "logic," brother Smith?

Be pleased to understand, that my argument was designed to meet your views of Church organization and not mine. When I stated my own views of the activity of Christians in organizing Churches, I did not omit what you have failed to record in your statement of my logic, the activity of Christians in meeting together, recognizing each other, (on Scriptural evidence) as Christians, uniting in Church relations, and choosing their officers. As this was what I called the organizing of a Church,

I thought it sound logic to say that as Christians were active and voluntary in doing these things, wherein Church organization consists, they had an agency in organizing Churches. And do you think this logic unsound?

And so having ("FIRST") framed the argument upon my views of Church organization, and then ("SECOND") upon yours, or before stated, I supposed I had covered the whole ground, and proved that on either theory of the essence of Church organization, yours or mine, the active agency of Christians in organizing Churches was a well known matter of fact that could not be set aside, without denying that there are any organized Churches at all. And pray how will you make it appear that this link in the chain of my "logic" is unsound?

The primary object of my logic, however was directed to another point than that of proving my own doctrine to be correct, the doctrine that Christians actively participate in the organization of Christian Churches. I was intent chiefly, on showing you that some of the main topics of illustrations and argument on which you had relied to prove the contrary doctrine, could not be relied upon for that service, so that you must seek illustrations and evidences elsewhere, or give up the doctrine.

In proof that Christians can have nothing to do with organizing local Christian churches, you had dwelt much on the figures used in the New Testament to shadow forth the union of Christians with Christ and each other, such as the vine and the branches—the body, or head, and the members—the building and the stones of which it is composed. These figures used by Christ and his Apostles, you had thought conclusive in favor of your views. You argued, that since it would be absurd to say that the branch had any thing to do with forming the organization that connected it with the vine, that the stones assisted in organizing the building, or that the motion of the legs in walking was the act of organizing the body, so it would be equally absurd, and subversive of the truth taught us by these figures, to say that Christians have any thing to do with organizing Churches of Christ, for the church was Christ's body.

In reply to this argument, I suggested that these figures could not have been intended to apply to the particulars to which you had applied them. They admirably illustrated what was intended to be illustrated by them, namely, the close connection of Christians with Christ and each other, their mutual dependence on each other and especially on him—and their subordination and subjection to him. But they could not have been intended to teach, as your argument supposed, that Christians were as passive as the inanimate objects of nature to which, in those other particulars, they were compared; they could not mean that Christians had no more volition or activity in becoming united to Christ and to one another, in the church (visible or invisible) "than branches have in becoming connected with the vine, or the stones with the building, or the human limbs with the body and the head." In other words, these figures could not prove that Christians have nothing to do with organizing Christian churches, and therefore, (I added) "the parallel supposed by brother Smith does not hold good, and his argument from those figures, falls to the ground."

And have you shown, or attempted to show that it does not? I do not perceive that you have. But you have said—"Nevertheless, to infer from it (i.e. the Christian's activity in regeneration) that he has an agency in organizing churches, seems anything rather than sound logic."

Whether that logic be sound or unsound, is a matter I can well afford to waive, or to submit to the reader. I have already told why I think the Christian's activity in regeneration proves his activity in organizing churches.

It is manifest that all this argument goes on the assumption that local churches are churches in the same sense with the Etyastical body of Christ, the church universal. By declining that view, brother Smith has knocked out the "stopping place" of all his arguments drawn from these figures. Another consideration is equally fatal to his case of them. Literally considered, passivity pertains as much to the vine as to the branches—in the building as to the stones—as to the body as to the members. The vine does not organize either itself or the branches—the building does not organize the stones. The head does not organize itself, nor the body, nor the legs, or other members. It would be just as logical, therefore, to infer from this passivity in the figures, that Christ, the true vine and head, has nothing to do with organizing churches, as it is to infer from the same passivity, that the branches and the members can have nothing to do in the same work.

as, if, (as you hold) Christian churches are constituted simply by men's becoming Christians. If the logic you have described should prove to be unsound, I think I could show who furnished the unsound link that went into it. But whether sound or unsound, can you show me, brother Smith, where the logic was unsound that resulted in the conclusion "that your argument from these figures falls to the ground?" Do not forget the point of my logic—its conclusion. Address yourself to that, if convenient, and do not think my logic confuted by merely saying, "it seems any thing but sound."

THE ANALOGIES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT WITH CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS.

I pass to another point of your argument. From some cause, you do not choose to dwell long on your favorite illustration, which I had attempted to show, fell to the ground. You seem to prefer another illustration drawn, not from the figures employed in the New Testament, but from the analogies supposed to be found in the Federal Constitution, and the case of the emigrant who comes to reside under it. These are your words:

"The Federal Constitution is the organic law—is the political organization of this nation. The election of officers under the Constitution—the assembling of people for such election—the legislative and judicial proceedings; these all flow from, but constitute no part of, that organization. A foreigner reaches America. He is not passive but active in his emigration. By that emigration he becomes a subject, but in no degree, and in no sense, an author of our national political organization. A man is 'born again.' He thereby becomes a subject, but not a creator, of the kingdom of Jesus Christ—a subject, but not an author of the heavenly organization. His part is but to act under, and to act out the laws of that kingdom, and that organization. When the Christians who compose a local church (and by a local church, I mean nothing more nor less than the Christians of a given community) when they provide themselves with the preached gospel, and assemble stately for public worship, and celebrate the ordinances, and mutually subject themselves to each other's supervision and discipline, they are obeying laws which they have had no share in enacting, they are carrying out an organization, of which their Saviour is the exclusive author."

Now I admit that there are some points of resemblance between a civil government and the government of churches, and will not object to a proper use of just analogies to illustrate the latter for names. But I will not agree (nor will you) that all that is true of the one, must be held binding in the other. If, for example, I should insist, that because the Federal Constitution was framed by the people, the organic law of the churches must also be framed by the people, or first have their assent, before it could be binding, you would justly object to this conclusion, that the analogy did not hold good. In this particular, that Christ is the sole legislator of the churches, both in respect to organic and statute law.—And so I may find other particulars in which the cases are not parallel. I may find cases too, in which I may take the liberty to correct, if needful, your statements of the facts of civil government. With these proper reservations, I join issue with you, on the parallel you have put forth, and we shall see whose theories the analogy it suggests, will support, yours or mine.

I agree with you in the fact that "the Federal Constitution is the organic law of this nation." But I do not agree with you that it is "the political organization of this nation."

Organic law is one thing. Organization under that law is another. Our national government was not organized, when its organic law, the Federal Constitution was framed. No. Nor when it was ratified by two-thirds of the states or adopted by the people. After all that had been done, no man on earth could tell whether or no the government of the United States would ever be organized under that organic law. A domestic insurrection, a foreign conquest, a successful usurpation, or a general change in the minds of the people, might have forever prevented any such organization from taking place.

The Savior teaches us, (Matt. 20: 25) that analogies drawn from the civil governments of "the princes of the Gentiles," and precedents founded upon their usage, are not to be considered of very high authority, or demonstrative argument, in matters pertaining to the order of Christian churches.

An instructive hint, in this direction, is afforded by recent events in Rhode Island. The lawful government of the majority, to be sure, in that case, was substantially organized by the election of officers under the constitution, before the petty minority of aristocrats, aided by money and presidential intimidation, succeeded in erecting a military despotism, on the ruins of the government. But long after the constitution was adopted,

But the national government was organized, (and it was done *not by the people*), when, for the first time, under their organic law, the Federal Constitution, they assembled, in accordance with its provisions, elected their officers, and inducted them into office. Any correct history of our government will relate the creation of its organic law, the constitution, first, in point of chronology, as well as in the order of nature, and then, the regular organization of the government, under that constitution, and by the powers above described, afterwards.

For the correctness of this statement, I rather fear, I will appeal to any sound constitutional lawyer in the public. Our lexicographers, even, can tell us such.

"Organization.—The act of distributing into suitable divisions, and appointing the proper officers, as an army or government."—*Noah Webster*.

Organic law provides for organization, and directs the form and process of it. But it is the people organized, who obey the law, and thus organize.

So in the churches. Christ is the sole law-giver. He enacts, and promulgates the organic law of church organization; they assemble—they "distribute" their work into "suitable divisions," according to the varied qualifications of the members. In doing this, they appoint their officers—in a word—they *organize*, under the divine law of organization. Whose views of church organization are illustrated by the organization of the Federal Government, brother Smith, yours?—or mine?

You seem to confound the *instituting* of Christian churches, (the enactment of their organic and statute laws) with the act of *organizing* Christian churches under those laws; just as you in a confounded the Federal Constitution, the organic law of our Federal Government, with the *organizing* of the government under that law. Having said that a foreigner who reaches America, is "in no sense, an author of our national political organization," you draw the parallel, and say that when a man is "born again—he thereby becomes a subject, but not a creator of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, a subject but not an author of the heavenly organization." And you think it needful to insist further that "his part is but to act under and to set out, the laws of that kingdom and that organization." And yet again, you are careful to repeat that Christians, in the discharge of their Church duties "are obeying laws which they had no share in enacting—they are carrying out an organization of which their Saviour is the exclusive author."

From the connection of this and similar language you have elsewhere used, I am led to conclude that you think the active energy of Christians in organizing Christian churches, is *unimproved* by you; when you have established the point, (which we both hold in common) that Christians, in their church duties, have nothing to do, but to act out and to act under the laws of Jesus Christ—laws which "they had no share in enacting," that the Christian is neither the "Creator," nor the "Author," nor (I will add,) the "Institutor" of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, nor of the local churches he has directed to be planted throughout the earth, some of which churches Paul planted, and Apollos watered, while God who gave the organic law of their organization, gave also their increase.

The framing of the organic law—the act of instituting the local churches, is indeed the sole prerogative of Jesus Christ; but the planting and the organizing of such local churches, are acts which, from their own nature, and from the necessities of the case, require the voluntary, and active co-operation and agency of human beings. Without such active co-operation and agency, the work is impossible—it cannot be done—the supposition is an absurdity—an inconceivable operation, or which no clear and distinct conceptions can be formed or have ever yet been expressed. Point out to me, if you can, a single existing instance—or describe to me, if you are able, a single possible case, in which a local Christian Church has actually been organized, or could possibly exist and be organized, without any active co-operation, or agency of human beings, up to the time when the organization of the said Church is, or could be completed. There can be no such local Church, (officers or no officers) without such active co-operation; there can not even be a single member of such Church, (by your own definition of a Church) without

such active co-operation. How then, can such Church be organized? Can anything be organized that does not even exist? You see I am giving you, for the solution of this problem, the benefit of your own definitions, both, of a local Church, and of Church organization.

To return. As we both agree that Church organization should be local, and not national, suppose we extend your parable a little, so as to make the cases as nearly parallel as we can. The Federal Government is quite too extended to be a proper type, in some particular, of the local assembly, or church. What organization can we find, in political life, most nearly corresponding in its genius, nature, object, scope, and extent to the local democratic Christian congregation, or Church?

The townships doubtless, of our northern, middle, and north-west States, furnish the best analogies we can find, and as good as we can reasonably expect or desire. It is no uninteresting fact, by the bye, that there were thousands of townships, the very home and workshop, and primary school of our illustrious political activists, *even their origin* to the local, and comparatively independent Churches of the New England puritans—Accustomed as they were, to do up their Church business in such democratic assemblies, it occurred to them that their municipal and political concerns could be best managed in a similar way. Their Churches, while the new country was sparsely populated, covered over about the same extent of territory with their townships. The Church meeting and the town meeting were held in the same house, and were composed, chiefly, of the same persons. They came together for different sorts of business, at the different meetings. In other respects they were much the same. And when, at length the increasing population required the subdivision of the townships into Church parishes, for weekly worship, the townships, assembling but twice a year, remained, in many cases, the same as before, though sometimes they were, likewise divided into two or more townships. From New England, the township was introduced into the other free states.

The townships are organized under the authority of the states. The law of their organization comes first—their actual organization comes afterwards. The law of their organization proceeds from the State legislature—their organization is the work of the people themselves, acting under, and in accordance with those state laws.

The instituting of townships, the providing for their organization, and defining their rights and duties is one thing; this is the work of the state government. The actual organizing of townships by the first election of town officers—the subsequent elections and various proceedings of the township, under the state laws, is another;—And this is the work of the "freemen"—the "citizens"—the persons of whom the township is composed.

The statute, or the charter of incorporation. If you please, does not *organize* the township, no, nor the village, nor the city. But each is organized when the citizens, or the chartered persons, come forward together, for the first time, under the charter or statute, and elect and install their officers in accordance with the provisions of the charter or statute.

A new township is not of necessity, organized, when its boundary lines are run, under the authority of the state, or by the County Surveyor. It is not, of necessity, organized, when "fifty confessedly" native born American "men and women" (or fifty such families) "emigrate to the center of an uninhabited township." They may be most estimable citizens. They may discharge many of their duties to the state—they may enjoy many precious blessings under its sheltering wing. They may sustain important relations to the Federal Government itself, and be eligible to the most honored seats in the nation; they may actually attain to those high stations (just as many a true Christian may rise to the heights of paradise, without ever having entered the pale of a local organized church.) But a township they cannot constitute nor become, nor avail themselves of any of the peculiar benefits, nor discharge the specific duties appertaining to such townships, until, in conformity with, and under the state laws for that purpose, they organize themselves into a township, by placing the proper town officers in their official seats.

A similar case, in respect to counties, exists, if I mistake not, in the merely nominal county of Hamilton, in our own state. If I am rightly informed, the county laws were run by the proper authorities, and the organizing of such a county provided for, or authorized by the state, many years ago. But the last I heard of the matter, the county, though containing many inhabitants, was not organized; the meeting of which—that the people had never acted under their law of organization, in electing their county officers, for the transaction of county business.

In all these particulars there is, I apprehend, a close resemblance between the organization of townships and local churches of Christ, on the New Testament model. Christ is the supreme law-giver and institutor of such churches. They are to be organized and governed daily in accordance with his directions. But they cannot be organized without the active agency of their members, in obeying the laws of church organization. Men may be Christians, and not belong to the local churches, just as they may be American citizens, without living in organized townships, or rapping the benches or discharging the duties growing out of such organization.—Churches are not organized any more than are townships, by the mere fact that a number of persons, duly qualified and authorized, may, *required*, to organize themselves, live in the neighborhood of each other; so long as they neglect to assemble together and organize, by the election of proper officers. The local Church should keep a list of its members, as the township should keep a list of its legally qualified voters. The local church, in its first meeting of the brotherhood, must judge whether the applicant for admission, possesses the scriptural qualifications, according to Christ's laws, essential to a church member, just as the town meeting must judge whether the applicant for admission to the elective franchise, is qualified, according to the state laws, for the exercise of such franchise. The local churches should reject unworthy members, according to Christ's directions, as the towns should prevent access to the polls, from those who are not legally qualified. In its action, in these particulars, the local church is liable to err, and so is the township. Unworthy members may "creep into" the churches, as improper persons may participate in the elective franchise. The churches that knowingly retain improper members, expose themselves to the displeasure of their law-giver—and so the townships that should knowingly admit illegal voters, would transgress the laws of the state. The churches are not authorized by Christ, to consider persons good Christians, and proper persons to vote in church officers, and as yet to direct church activities, however great their errors and blameworthy their practices. The townships are not authorized to consider persons good citizens and proper depositories of the franchise, whose moral or other qualifications do not correspond with the statutes duly made and provided for their direction. The churches are subverted and ruined when, by their lax discipline, they permit unworthy members to remain in, and control them. The state is overturned when the franchise is yielded by conspirators, by the secret or the designing. There would never have been any such thing in the world as the modern American township, if the New Testament had not furnished our fathers, in many important respects, how to organize local Christian Churches.

I am now ready, brother Smith, for an introduction to your foreign emigrant, just arrived in our country. Bring him forward, and place him under our national and state governments, not forgetting the townships, that correspond most closely to the local churches, and notice the facts that would be witnessed.

"A foreigner reaches America." His arrival you compare to the "new birth" of the Christian. Very well. Carry out the comparison.

The Christian, you say, is a member of the local church in whose territorial limits he resides, simply because he is a Christian. But how is it with your foreign emigrant? Is he a legal voter in the township he comes into, simply because he has arrived in America? By no means. So far from this, he is not even a citizen of the United States, nor eligible to a post under the Federal Government, until he conforms, by a prescribed process, to our Naturalization laws, in which he signifies his assent to, and approbation of, our political organization. And after all this, he does not become a voter in the town meeting until his qualifications are examined and approved by that meeting. As a lover of our free institutions, he may have come to this country at a great pecuniary sacrifice, and under our government he may enjoy, to a great extent, the benefits it is calculated to confer. But if he would participate in its political activities, he must take the position appropriate to such responsibilities.

Suppose a ship's company of such emigrants to occur—

"It will be remembered that I draw no argument in favor of my own views of church organization, from the fact of this resemblance. I use it merely for illustration, and particularly to show brother Smith that the analogies of civil government are more in accordance with my theory than with his.

They failed in not fully apprehending their duty to receive all who give scriptural evidence of being Christians, and also in laying an unnecessary stress upon qualifications of church membership, not insisted on, in the Bible. And thus led them, likewise, to admit members, on their conformity in these minor particulars, while destitute of the higher evidences on which the Bible lays the highest stress. In a word, they failed to proceed, according to the state-book of church organization.

the question of organizing under it hung in public suspense, both among its friends and its enemies; and vigorous efforts were made, both to secure and to prevent it.

The government of any associated body of men is organized, when, for the first time, under its organic law, the officers are chosen and inducted into office. Being thus organized, the organization remains under the other officers that may successively be elected and inducted. The subsequent elections, &c. to be sure, form no part of the act of organizing.

Christ is not merely the "Author," but "Finisher of our faith," as well as our Churches. Does it follow that we can have no voluntary active agency in our own faith?

py a previously unorganized township—do they therefore constitute an organized township, before they do anything to organize themselves? Certainly not. If they go into a township already organized, they need not organize it over again, and cannot, but they must actively conform themselves to the organization already existing, otherwise they cannot become members of it. New converts to Christ, in the same way, may either organize themselves into a new church, under the divine law of church organization, or they may voluntarily connect themselves to one already existing. One or the other they must do, or else content themselves to forego the activities and the benefits of an outward, visible, local church organization. There can be no organization of any body of men on earth without their organization.

You speak of your supposed foreign emigrant as becoming a "subject" of our national political organization. If this is all, you claim for your new convert, when you compare to the emigrant, you claim not enough for him. The foreigner reaching our shores becomes subject to our government, I admit, on his first arrival among us. And all nations of the earth, though dashed in pieces by him, as the potter's vessel, are the subjects of Jesus Christ, who is King of kings, and Lord of lords. But the Christian is more than a mere subject, he is a fellow citizen with the saints, and if he would fully enjoy the benefits and wield the powers of citizenship, he must, like the foreign emigrant, conform himself actively to the laws of the citizen's local and via his organization.

I do not insist that the parallel can, in every particular, hold good. I admit that the Christian, in consequence of his regeneration becomes a member of "Christ's mystical body, the Church." Spiritual and Universal—though the foreigner arriving among us does not come a citizen, even of the general government of this country, in mere consequence of that arrival. So that your chosen similitude, should it be fully applied to illustrate the subject, would militate even farther against your views than I hold to be correct. Suffice it to say (what your candor will compel you to concede) that these analogies of civil government, while altogether adverse to your theories of church government, correspond, except in a few particulars, with mine; while these exceptions respect points in which we are mutually agreed.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

The next topic of your letter which I shall notice, is one, upon the discussion of which I cannot properly enter, without some previous statements of principles which I think of vital importance to be kept distinctly in view, in order to any just conceptions of church organization, or any solution of the problem to which, more particularly, I now refer. And in these principles I am sure you will agree with me, so that we shall have a common ground to stand upon, in the prosecution of our discussion.

We cannot too frequently remind each other that the religion of Christ is emphatically the religion of individual responsibility, and inalienable human rights; that upon these indisstructible rights, the whole framework of moral law and human accountability is erected. Just in proportion to the degree in which we can persuade men to cultivate a solemn and abiding sense of their individuality of existence, just in that proportion can we fix upon their minds just impressions of the weighty responsibilities pressing upon them. Church arrangements, designed, as they are, to teach and to exemplify this religion, must by no means trespass upon inalienable human rights—must not merge the individual in the body corporate—nor raze down the man, in order to make him a church member. To guard against this, it must be remembered that the church, like the Sabbath, was made for the man, and not the man for the church; that (in the truthful language of the church of Peterboro) "Christianity forbids our seeking the good, even of a universe at the expense of the least right of the least being in it"—that "the greatest good of the greatest number" cannot be a safe maxim, unless understood as harmonizing with "the greatest good of the whole number"—that the good of the church, or all the good to be promoted by church institutions, cannot warrant the least infraction by the church, of the original rights of the humblest of its members; that, as an entering civil society, men do not (according to the absurd theory exploded by Jefferson) give up a portion of their original rights for the better security of the rest, so neither, on entering the organized Christian church, do they give up any portion of their original rights, for the better exercise of the rest, or their better religious edification or culture.

You will wonder why I should linger to urge upon your

attention these great truths, in which, I rejoice to know, you are so firmly established, and are so earnestly seeking to exemplify and promulgate. It is for this very reason, brother Smith, that I am bold to ask of you a steady eye on these elementary truths, while I proceed to some practical applications of them, in the controversy between us. You! Strange as it will seem to you, who doubtless consider your own theories of church organization to be far more open, more free, more expansive, more liberal, more pre-eminently respectful of inalienable human rights, than the theories of William Goodell, who, in your view, still lingers, doubtless, upon the low dunes which separate a free Christianity from a narrow and bigoted sectarianism—I find myself obliged, nevertheless, to beseech, nay, to demand of you, brother Smith, that you fasten an unblinking eye upon man's inalienable rights, and hold yourself ready to surrender any and every portion of your cherished theories of church organization that cannot be made to harmonize with them.

What are some of those dearest rights—rights identified with man's highest destinies, his most sacred duties, his most holy aspirations? What are they—if they are not, his right to place himself where he can learn most, of God and his holy commandments—where he can do most for his fellow men, for the virtuous, the ignorant, the stupid, the degraded, the perishing—where he can drink in, not refreshingly, the breezes of the land of Bruloh, where he can bask himself most uninterceptedly, in the rays of the Sun of Righteousness? Who shall judge for him, and instead of him, in these particulars? Shall the local church within whose "territorial limits" his poverty and his necessities may enchain him? Shall he not be "suffered" by the expositors of church order, to go five miles, or even eight—the distance of Emmaus from the temple at Jerusalem—to catch some brighter glimpses of his Savior—to gain some better instruction in the things of the kingdom—to assist a feebler band of disciples in their infant endeavors—to call a neglected neighborhood of lost sinners to repentance? By what authority shall the word of God be bound—or the children of God compounded, like so many stry cattle, within the "territorial limits" of the parishes they happen to be born in, or branded with the Cain-mark of "heretic" or "sectarian" (burnt into their foreheads, in the name of church unity) if caught at the distance of five miles southward, or ten miles eastward, of their habitations, at what they believe to be purer wells of salvation?

The man, before he became a Christian, had a right, because it was his duty, to seek religious instruction, where, according to his own honest judgment, he could best find it—whether six feet or six leagues from his own family threshold. The man becomes a Christian: Has his Christianity crippled his humanity? Has the liberty of the gospel fettered him? If not, he has the same rights now that he had before. He becomes a church member. You say he becomes a church member the moment he becomes a Christian, and if say it is his duty and right to become a church member. In either case, does his church membership impair or suspend his inalienable human rights? Not upon my theory most assuredly. How is it upon yours, brother Smith? We shall see presently. But I must first ask you one or two more questions:

What do you hold your own rights to be, in this matter? Suppose you lived in the heart of the village of Peterboro, where you formerly did, and suppose you judged that instead of worshipping in the village, you could render your Sav or better service, by going every Sabbath day, with your Christian family, into a desolate neighborhood, about half way to Morrisville, and worshipping with the people there, in a district school house, and instrumentally, gathering perhaps, a little church there, and having your local church relations with them? You know where I mean, brother Smith, and your excellent wife and daughter know, and others know, what kind of service might be done (has been in part, done there. Would you not have an inalienable right to do that work? Who, or what principle of church organization should restrain you? You may say, the church of Peterboro, in such a case, would readily give its consent. Very likely it would, and to the manifest overthrow of its theory, that all "the Christians in Peterboro and its vicinity, do, simply because they are Christians—do, of more divine organization, all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding, constitute the church of Peterboro!" But what if the church of Peterboro, adhering strictly to its theory, should not assent; and accordingly maintain that, because you would not fill your heaven-appointed place, is no reason why they should consent to your leaving it. What would you then do, brother Smith? and what would you think of it? In whom lies the right of deciding the case? Is it in the individual or in

the church? And would you be *nachismatic* if you would follow your own judgment instead of theirs?

One more question I must propound to you. From what portion of the New Testament do you learn that when Peter and James resided at Jerusalem, they were not "suffered" by the then prevalent views of church organization and church order, to worship and preach with the disciples at Bethany or at Bethpage, rather than with those at Jerusalem, if they judged the work of their Master would be best fulfilled by so doing? Or how do you ascertain that the liberty of Peter and of James, in this particular, was not the common liberty likewise, of the humblest at Dorcas or Rhoda in the primitive Church? I mean to bring every question in debate between us, to the rigid touchstone of *New Testament facts and admonitions*, before I have done with the discussion, brother Smith. I give you the citation now, that you may not be taken at unawares. I will now introduce an extract from your letter:

"Oblous to you as to the doctrine, and leading as it does, in your eyes, to property itself, I nevertheless rejoice in the doctrine that those Christians of a given locality, who are not willing to be so regarded, are nevertheless to be regarded as members of the one church of that locality—be that locality the village of Peterboro or a whole sparsely populated township. To regard them as such is to accord with truth. Not to regard them as such is to fall in with their false principles, their sectarianism and schism. Because they will not fill their heaven-appointed place, is no reason why we should consent to their leaving it. I know, my brother, that you hate sectarianism, and are fighting valiantly against it. Nevertheless, I do not hesitate to say, that if the doctrine in question be surrendered, neither you nor any other person can make effective opposition to sectarianism. Surrender that doctrine, and the Christian of Peterboro will be suffered to go five miles to the Church of Morrisville, because that church is more Arminian than the Church of Peterboro, or ten miles to the Church of Cazenovia, because that church is more Calvinistic, or eleven miles to the Church of Chittenango, because in some other and perhaps very unimportant respect, that church suits him better. Surrender that doctrine, and you have granted to sectarianism every measure of indulgence which it may choose to claim."

I am glad you have so fully explained the workings in this direction, of your theory of Church organization. It will save me a world of labor in showing to most men, (who are slow to read future-history in the present speculations that are pre-ordinating it) what the workings of that theory must inevitably be, and how closely its results must, in future, resemble the well known products of the self-same speculation in past ages. It will spare me too, I trust, the imputation of practicing unreasonableness upon you, when I call your attention to those results, and tell you why I think they must continue to take place. Quite remarkable is it that the very explicit avowals of this extract should come in the same letter, and in such close contact with your complaints at my apprehensions of results similar to those you have here presented to me, with your mark of decided approval.—You satirize my needless fears of such little "acorns." And then you triumphantly introduce to me, and profuse, too, with significant allusions to my dread of popery, a specimen of the "oaks" themselves, more than half grown.

The question between us is not whether it would be wise and judicious for the Christian of Peterboro to worship at Morrisville, at Cazenovia, or at Chittenango, for such cases as you specify. It is not whether or an enlarged and expansive view of Christian doctrine and of human imperfection would not incline him to a different decision.—It is not whether a right view of the case would not suggest to him the duty of remaining where his own clearer views of divine truth might render him more useful to his brethren.—It is not whether there would not be danger of fostering an exclusive, self-complacent spirit, a spirit tending towards sectarian divisions in the course you have condemned.—It is not whether the gathering of Churches on the true principles of Christian unity would not, as a matter of fact, lend Christians to worship together, irrespective of the theological differences you have specified.—It is not whether the manifold inconveniences, and wasteful expenditures resulting from the present sectarian arrangements, which send Christians far away from their homes, to worship with their sects, would not melt away and disappear, on the introduction of the true principles and usages of Church organization and order. On these points there would probably be, in a majority of the cases that occur, no essential difference between us. These cases might be comparatively "unimportant" in my view, as well as in yours. But who has commissioned us to judge of their importance for others?

"I do not consider that the difference between Calvinists and Arminians, as commonly explained, (though by no means unimportant in its place,) should interpose a bar to Church fellowship, because I think Christians may and do entertain both those sets of views. But my estimate of this difference is on no true basis, my brother. If we divide either Calvinism or Arminianism so essentially subversive of the gospel that those who embrace it are not Christians, he has no right to hold Church relations with

† Vide 13th resolution, as published in the Christian Investigator for March.

The question is, whether a Christian at Peterboro should "be suffered" to "have his local Church relations with the Christians at Morrisville," or at Cazenovia, or at Chittenango, rather than at Peterboro, for the sake of what he considers better religious instruction—better means of spiritual improvement—better education—better facilities for growth in grace—better help in preparing himself for useful activity in the Lord's vineyard? The question is, whether the true principles of local Church organization, as taught and exemplified in the New Testament, interpose a veto to a Christian's using his own best judgment, (whether well-informed or ill-informed) and honoring his own conscientious convictions in this matter? The question is, whether his original and inalienable human rights are modified, impaired, held in abeyance, crippled, or taken away, in this important particular, by the divinely appointed economy of the local Christian Church? The question is, whether the individual Christian holds the inalienable, indefensible, God-given right, to decide such a question for himself, or whether the local Church, whose "territorial limits" he inhabits, may decide the question for him—may say to him, that all "the Christians in Peterboro and vicinity do, simply because they are Christians—do, of mere divine organization, all human arrangements in the contrary notwithstanding, constitute the Church of Peterboro"—may therefore say to him, that he cannot "be suffered" "to have his Church relations" with the Christians at Morrisville, or Chittenango, or Cazenovia—may say to him, that it regards him, "a member of the one Church of that locality," though he "is not willing to be thus regarded"—that it cannot "consent to his leaving it"—that to do so would be to "fall in with his false principles—his sectarianism, and SCHISM!" The question is, whether the integrity of true Christian Church unity is to be preserved only by a rigid adherence to the principle of involuntary Church membership in Churches assembled on the principle of territorial jurisdiction? The question is, whether the sin of SECTARIANISM or SCHISM is to be defined as consisting in the refusal to submit to the claims of those principles? Whether it is *sectarian* and *schismatic* for Christians to have their local Church relations where they think they can be best instructed, most edified, most improved, most useful, best qualified to do good on the earth, and ripened for the blessedness of heaven?

This is the question. You have taken your side, I have taken mine; and the opposite one. Here we join issue. I affirm that your theory of Church organization as expounded and applied by yourself to the point now under consideration, is as *unwise, original and inalienable human rights*—is subversive of the rights of conscience, and the fundamental principles of religious freedom. I am far enough from believing that you intend any violation of religious liberty, but I do say, that the result to which, by your own showing, your theory reaches, is a result, in matter of fact, violative of such liberty. Take away a man's right to worship where, and under what religious teaching he thinks proper, and you take away his right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. And were the benefit to the Church or world, of the prevalence of your theories of Church organization, ten-fold greater than even you have imagined them to be, you have no right to seek that "greatest good of the greatest number," "at the expense of the least right of the least being in the universe."

It will not avail for you to set forth the superior spiritual benefits which the individual concerned might secure, by conforming to your views, and to mine, in such cases. All you might say on that point might be true, and you have a right to convince him of it if you can.—But of that matter he must be his own judge. You must not seek the benefit of his soul by a denial of his right to decide. Neither must the Church. And no theory of Church organization can be trust-worthy that could sustain a Church in that course.

Nor do I forget (what will, no doubt, be alleged) that this denial on the part of the Church, of a man's right to seek religious instruction where he thinks best, is a denial enforced by no physical penalties, and sus-

them. Every man must judge for himself in such matters. I have heard such Antinomian fatalism, such subversions of the law through faith, set forth under the name of Calvinism, I have heard such flat denials of man's inherent sinfulness, of justification by faith, and of regenerating grace, set forth under the name of Arminianism, that I would no longer support the preaching of such Calvinism or such Arminianism, than I would support and promulgate any other form of a false gospel. And I could say the same of many other sorts of preaching that go under the name of gospel preaching in this country. A pro-slavery gospel—a gospel in which no final distinction in a future state, between the righteous and the wicked—a gospel without an atoning Sacrifice and an omnipotent Saviour, would come under this description. No reproaches of "sectarianism" should drive us into a fraternity with such religious teachers.

tained by no power of the civil arm. All this I understand—and understand too, that into the elements of a strictly spiritual control, whether legitimate or despotic, the ingredient of physical force, or of civil jurisdiction, does not enter, of necessity, as an ingredient at all. The spiritual despotism of the Roman Pontiff was not more real after his connection with the temporal power, than before—is not more real in Italy now, than it is in N. Orleans, N. York, and Montreal. A denial of fundamental human rights is not less truly a denial of them, when enforced by the penalty of church excommunication, and founded on supposed but mistaken principles of Church organization, than when enforced by the bayonet, and founded on considerations of state policy. Men's rights are never more injuriously invaded, than when invaded on assumptions that make the Divine Author of Church organization responsible for the invasion, and make use of the veneration and even the conscientiousness of the man himself, as instruments to deter him from the exercise of his dearest rights.

I marvel the more, at this position you have assumed, from the juxtaposition in which it stands to a remarkable concession which, in the same letter you have made. The Christians at Siloam may determine whether "there should be the Church of Siloam" (the absolute, divine organization of the Church of Siloam, independently of human arrangements notwithstanding.) They may have their "local Church relations" at Morrisville, at Munnsville, or at Peterboro, if "it would be more convenient!"

And so then, the Christians at Siloam, for the sake of CONVENIENCE, may worship at Munnsville, at Morrisville, or at Peterboro, at their discretion! For the sake of these human arrangements the absolute, and irrevocable "divine organization" of the Church of Siloam shall obsequiously stand aside! Not so, if instead of their personal convenience, they are seeking (at no small sacrifice of such convenience, it may be,) the fires of an holier altar—and brighter revelations of the divine glory from clearer expositions of God's word! For the sake of a more commodious and comfortable place of worship, they may desert the "territorial limits" of the divinely organized Church of Siloam, and go to Peterboro without encountering the charge of schism.—But alas! for their false principles and sectarianism, if a portion of them shall do this same thing, uttered by the purer Christian society at Peterboro, the juster views and better order of the Church assembled in that house of prayer! For the sake of a smoother road to Morrisville than to Peterboro or to Munnsville, they may "have their relations with the Christians of Morrisville," without schism. Not so, if the object of their preference were clearer directions in the road to heaven! For this would be the sin of *sectarianism*! "one of the most marked children of its father, the devil!" Much do I fear, brother Smith, that such definitions of sectarianism will do little towards bringing sectarianism into disrepute with the pious!

And I marvel too, that it never occurred to you, that this application of your theory of Church organization (a sufficiently legitimate application, I admit) would cause your Christian Union Churches to symbolize quite remarkably with some of the most objectionable traits, and justly obnoxious features to be found in the polity and usages of Churches of sectarianism, now in process of falling into decrepitude. I scarcely know of a feature of that polity more extensively odious, or more plainly subversive of fundamental human rights, than that which holds the individual member in unwilling bonds of duration to a local church, after he shall have distinctly signified his wish to have his connection dissolved, and on the ground that his spiritual improvement or usefulness, in his own judgment, could be best promoted by a connection elsewhere. To hold their members in this involuntary bondage, the Church covenant is often so expressed as to make the member, on his reception, promise solemnly before God, angels, and men that he will continue to worship with that particular Church, so long as the providence of God shall continue him in this place, ("territorial limits") or until his connection with it shall be "regularly dissolved"—that is, until the Church shall see fit to release him! How many an abolitionist, at this moment, is supporting some one of the thousand "bulwarks of American slavery," because he dreads the odium, (perhaps because he suppositionally fears the guilt) of "breaking his covenant obligations," by surrendering the ties of his *own* Munnsville oath to the sovereign local Church! If there

I cannot much wonder, brother Smith, that our eccentric friend, N. P. Rogers (in his *Harold of Freedom*, April 2d) should so quaintly say of you, "he is in the mud along with them." (i. e. with the sectarians) that he thinks you will ultimately "come up, high and dry, on his no church organization ground." (Dry enough, to be sure.) Let me suggest that one grand secret of your going into the mud-shallows of sectarianism, [if it be so] is

are any flagrant abuses or time-erected usurpations in the present churches calling loudly for the introduction of a more free polity, this most certainly, is to be reckoned among them. And yet the system, at the present time, and in this country, is not carried so far, by the sects, as to claim all the Christians of a given locality, as members of one particular, local Church, whether they are willing or not. The free consent of the individual is to be obtained, in the first place, however rigorously he may be bound afterwards. Not so with your system, brother Smith, which claims for the local Church, all that are born on its plantation, and allows them no year's release, without "quitting the soil." Some approximation to this stringent system once obtained in the territorial parish of New England, and all at once to gather other churches within the enclosure were held to be invasions of its rights! Hence came the control of the parish pastor over his "territorial members," and to this day, the Congregational and Presbyterian clergy have not done upping such claims. The Church of England still parcel out the entire area of the country into territorial parishes, on the same principle, and all who presume to worship, except with the one divinely organized church of that locality are held to be "schismatics and seceders," and treated accordingly.

How marvelous, if a similar attitude and almost identical language should now be assumed by the Union Churches of Central and Western New York! To claim like these, a free and well instructed Christian community, at this late date, will be slow, (it may be hoped) to submit. The effort, in the name of Christian unity, was once unsuccessfully, though desperately and perseveringly made, by the so called "liberal Christianity" of Massachusetts some few years since, with the popular press, the literary influence, the moral interest, the political power, and the old saint law of territorial church and parish, on its side! The right (ecclesiastical and civil) to gather another church within the "territorial limits" of the regularly constituted church, was earnestly contested, in the pulpit and the forum. For a time the question hung in suspense whether the sons of the pilgrims should be "suffered" to worship, out of the parish church! The loud and confident boast of "liberal Christianity" for a long time was, that "the rising tide of popular indignation against the sectarian bigots and innovations, would not permit it." And at the mysterious burning of the obnoxious Hanover Street Church, (long before the burning of Pennsylvania Hall) the course taunts of the rattlement, along with the significant shrugs and interchanged glances of acquiescence, from "gentlemen of property and standing," with their little fingers under their "broadsheet" mantles, while the flames went up toward heaven, and while the ruins were smoldering, the next day, told plainly enough how faithfully, in their view, the prediction was fulfilling. But be it from up to insinuation that the dignified conservatism of Boston had any more sympathy with this secession, than that of Philadelphia has since had, with a similar one. I have sketched a picture that my own eyes saw, and the correctness of which, hundreds of living witnesses can attest. And all I have since passed through, in the anti-slavery department of the same struggle, has not effaced the remembrance from my mind that the first encounter of a free Christianity with despotism, in my own country, (and one in which I have been permitted to participate) was a struggle against the spurious Catholicism of latitudinarianism, so fitting at theological distinctions, demanding Christian unity irrespective of religious principles, intrenching itself in the false theory of an *inextinguishable local and territorial church membership*, denying the right of dissent, enforcing conformity in the name of union, and forbidding free social worship, on penalty of the stigma of "BIGOTRY!" "SECTARIANISM!"

And what marvel! Has it not been, against what she calls "sectarianism" and "schism" that Rome has always lighted her fires? And has it not been against your trying to cast along very nearly to that same dry sand bank, of Friend Rogers. Mud flats and sand reefs commonly touch each other. Better haul off your noble ship, from both, and stand square out, into the wide sea room and deep waters of a free theory, where individuality neither founders in mud, nor bogs up on sand bars.

It is but simple justice to remark here, that this legislative notion of church and parish, so convenient an ally to the "liberal Christianity" of this later period, was conceived in the first place by the rigid puritan orthodoxy of old Massachusetts, and was part and parcel of the polity that banished Roger Williams and persecuted the Quakers.—But whether in the hands of a rigid orthodoxy, or of a semi-skeptical liberalism, the principle was one and the same, and could not fail to come in harsh conflict with inalienable human rights. It was the principle that local church relations must be controlled, not by the intelligent and conscientious discretion of the individual man, but by the convenience and territorial indivisibility of the church!

Brother Smith will allow me to express some feeling on such a subject. And if he wishes to know more of this early conflict, and of the efforts to reach religious liberty in New Eng-

her "sectaries" that the church of England, from the days of Queen Elizabeth down to the times of Queen Victoria has joined her finger of derision and mocked her attitude of approval? And all upon the self-same principle of *voluntary and territorial church membership*? Am I to be laughed out of my "alarm" at the epidemic reappearance of that gory principle, clothed with the blood of the martyrs? Am I to be quieted because it arises from the dust of ages, Paganism like, and puts on all its blind, its youthful, its second century attractions?—Am I to be satisfied because my truly excellent and deservedly honored and influential friend, standing as it were among the Cyrans and Cyrenas and Corymbosists of the present age, assures me, in the fulness of his great and honest heart, that—"admission (to me) as to that doctrine, and holding, as it does, in (my) eyes, to popery itself, (the) government, rejoices in that doctrine?" Is his very amiable and to a widely extended confidence in human integrity, to pass with me, instead of palpable fact, and demonstrative logic? Is it to prevail with me in doctrine of philosophical truth, and prophetic warning, and historical attestation, and personal experience? Does it bind me to forget that the Gerrit Smiths of the first three centuries of the Christian era, as confidently rejected in that same principle as the Gerrit Smiths of the present time? Must I shut my eyes to the fact that because they did, the civilized world, for centuries, has sat in darkness, and humanity has wept tears of blood.

Or are we now to have done with this monstrous but perpetual identification of catholicism with dominion? of *sectarianism* with the exercise of human rights? For how many centuries longer, shall the friends of freedom, and of individuality of conscience be compelled to define, as so long they have defined, the phrase "rights of conscience" to mean the *privilege of sectarianism*?—Or how much longer shall the very name of *Christian union* continue the watchword of prescriptive influence to truth and duty, the dread and terror of the conscientious and the timid?—Shall men never learn that the *sectarianism* that is to be avoided, lies far less in the unfettered exercise of free thought, free inquiry, free speech, and (as the result of the whole) free worship, spontaneous, mutual, religious association, (habits indeed to abuse) than in the false theories of church organization and Christian unity that would forbid them?

If our nineteenth century reformation cannot find out some better solution of these problems than preceding ages have done—why?—The thing that hath been, is the thing that shall be, and our boasted reformation elaborates "nothing new under the sun"—restores only in a spurious order or Ponce de Leon's. The history of our *Christendom*, as we complacently call it, may as well be re-written, at once, in the form of a prophecy, and be stereotyped for all coming generations. Two grains of our grand sixteen-century cycle will only have to be acted over again, till it reaches the same point, in readiness to start afresh! To secure this, our Cyrenians and Cyrenas, our Gerrit Smiths and the other "Christian fathers" of our now passing "second century" or incubation age, have only to magnify the exclusive *divine organization* of the church, so much as problem-humans arrangements may call it, question—organized as demanding, by divine authority, the support of all Christians within their "territorial limits" and branding all away sheep with the crying sin of schism. The dreaded evils of *sectarianism*, in no other way to be guarded against, will settle the principle that Christians "cannot take care of themselves," and must not be "suffered" to stroll away "five or ten miles" from their "center." For one century, this lesson may perhaps, suffice. A coming century may bring the discovery, that the Christians who cannot safely be "suffered" to select their own places of worship, in search of the purest or clearest teaching, fear it should involve them in the guilt of *sectarianism*, must not be "suffered" to choose their own teachers—or to say whether "Paul, Apollas, or Cephas" should instruct them, lest they should form parties under those leaders, contrary to a positive prohibition. The right way, to reveal and expound the Scriptures for themselves, (a right by no means more sacred and inviolable than the right to select the teacher and the place of worship) would be to lead Christians into conflicting views and parties, as well as the right to select teachers and places of wor-

ship. And of the death-grasp of the territorial church membership theory, I will refer him to our mutual friend, Wm. L. Chaplin, (for no man living knows more of that contest, if his memory will permit him to relate the story.) The circumstance of an attempted legal enforcement of that theory, backed up by popular prescription, was, but an incident of that can recover. Its position of power lay in the theory itself, as opposed to individual opinion.

And we know that it has been to guard *Christian unity* against *sectarianism*, that the teaching of the Scriptures has been so extensively proscribed. All restrictions of the rights of conscience, and all religious persecutions have had for their object, the preservation of religious unity against *schism*, and the end has been thought to justify the means. If the right of free worship (in this location, or with this teacher, as preferred to that) may be authoritatively restricted, in the name of church order, to preserve Christian or church unity, why may not any other religious right be restricted and for the same reason?

Much as in their proper places, I value correct church organization, "strict church discipline," and church order (and in some directions, I certainly make much more of them than you appear to do) I have never supposed that they could either better or secure Christian union, though unscriptural perversion of them and *substitution* for them can scarcely fail to violate Christian unity in some form, as I am instance of this I find in the present case. Christian unity is violated in the churches, whenever individual rights are denied, and there could be little unity between two neighboring churches, one of which should deny the rights of its members to pass freely from the one to the other, while its neighbor should practically recognize and honor those rights, by receiving to its bosom the members not "suffered" to make the exchange. Disciplinary church action may mar, though it can neither create nor enforce Christian union.

To Christian unity we may apply what the poet has written of mercy—

"The quality of (union) is not strained,
"It comes as the gentle dews of heaven."

Laws of church organization, grounded on the assumed rights of the churches to retain their territorial extension, unimpeded, and not "suffered" to be disturbed by Christian enterprise or Christian migration,—amount precisely to the end that the best sort of *Christian union* is made of. The manufacture of the fabric has been sufficiently extensive already—the marks of the civilized world have been glided with it for centuries, but the quality of the article has always been matter of dissatisfaction, to all concerned. In "the wear" of it—even with its fabrications and vendors, the rents and tatters have been most unbecomingly

A veritable, truthful reality, and no sham—a living violence against no mere fabric, shall true Christian unity be found to be, when we can once get distinct sight of it, and lay our hands that hold it. Paul, who never directed the map of his missionary labors, with the links of the survivor's chain in his hands, in quest of the definition, had some common sense glimpses at it, nevertheless.

"Now I beseech you, brethren, (said he) by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together, in the same mind, and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. i. 10.

What a world of biblical study and metaphysical investigation might have been saved, if Paul had only thought to admonish his brethren to be united in the same "territorial limits" whether "speaking the same thing," and whether of the "same mind and judgment" or no!—Or had he exhorted them, as some do, to be united in "force," or united in "gospel holiness," without "speaking the same thing" concerning the divine object of the Christian's love—concerning the nature, fruits and evidences of that holiness!

But Paul's language reveals, to us, what a real Christian union is—and what it must be, in order to be lasting any one at all. What can a union be, among rational beings, but a coincidence in sentiment, in principle,—of affections growing out of such sentiment and principle—of common objects, and common endeavors, and common ends?

Afore, vastly more, and not less than at present, must be made of theological inquiry, and of doctrinal knowledge, before any great progress will be made in the enterprise of a schismatical Christian union. By this, I do not mean that there can be no such union, between those who differ in minor details, when they are agreed in fundamental, and thus enabled to agree what things shall be accounted incidental. Church arrangements violate Christian union, and erect *sectarianism* in its stead, whenever they require any thing but Scrip-

"From some incidents in D'Aubigne's History of the Protestant Reformation, I gather, that the little in Switzerland, under the reign of Romanism, held the right of electing their pastors, though I do not remember any recognition of their right to read and expound the Scriptures. The right of selecting teachers cannot be fully enjoyed, without the right of selecting a place of worship; and it seems that the use of the Scriptures was then thought most honorable to Church unity. Shall we invade rights recognized under Romanism?"

tural evidences of Christian character as tests of church membership. They do this whenever, by the erection of church authorities not measured nor exemplified in the New Testament, they make it necessary for Christians to come under that yoke of bondage, or any out of the church.

SECTARIANISM AND ASSOCIATIONS OF CHURCHES.

And this last remark introduced the discussion of another topic, in which, I perceive, we are not yet fully agreed. In your letter I find the paragraph that follows:

With the severity of your language against the association of churches, with each other, I have no quarrel. I think such associations wrong and dangerous; but to speak of it as very highly and gloriously criminal, I cannot. Every encouragement to the entire independence of a local church is unscriptural and unsafe; but an association of churches with each other, such as ecclesiastical, however to be apprehended, is certainly, not of necessity, a crime.

With the severity of the language which denounces *sectarianism*, "one of the most marked of the fruits of its father, the devil," I suppose you have a considerable degree of sympathy, brother Smith? And you will not probably meet that my language against ecclesiastical associations of churches was severer than that for *gains*. If then, an investigation of the matter should make it appear that such associations of churches as I speak of involve the very essence of *sectarianism*, your sympathies would not need to be withheld from the language I used.

What if it should turn out that having exhausted the severity of your language against the thing in which *sectarianism*, in reality, does not consist, you have reserved your forbearance and leniency for the very pernicious and execrable of that abominable thing?

The 14th Resolution of the Church of Peterboro had said—"There are occasions which justify the assembling of Christians together from all distant parts of the world, to discuss and decide on questions of religious interest; nevertheless, for a local church to refuse to come into an association of churches, is a wise precaution for preserving its independence and purity."—As this power to "decide," &c., was mentioned in connection with "a local church" and as the authoritative decision recorded in the 15th chapter of Acts, was referred to, (as is frequently done) for such a precedent, I supposed it was meant to concede that councils of the present day, might authoritatively decide for the churches, and this would be a subversion of their independence, in my view. It was not a recognition of churches, erecting in reality, (whether consciously or otherwise) such a jurisdiction over the churches, but giving the permanence and officiality of a civil court to the deciding body, instead of the temporary existence and promiscuous elements of the popular convention or occasional council—against this, it was, that I directed my severe language. You admit that "every encroachment on the entire independence of a local church is unscriptural and sinful." Is not this such encroachment? If not, can you specify the thing that is, or deprecate the thing that would be such encroachment? Or can you define wherein local church independence consists? Or why and wherein Presbyterians, Episcopals, and Romanists do not possess it? Presbyterians claim to have local church independence as really as consecrated Congregationalists. Episcopals claim to have as much of it as the Presbyterians. And the Romanists of Switzerland, in Zwingli's time, appear to have had more of it than some of our American Episcopals, particularly the Methodists, who cannot elect their own preachers.

Your observation or reading may have acquainted you with associated churches that are not *sectarian*. But mine have not. Your powers of reflection and analysis may have enabled you to conceive of such churches, to describe and to define them. Mine do not. If you can help me in these particulars, I shall be obliged to you: I should also like to be put on the track of finding associated churches that have retained local independence.

You agree with me that Christ has authorized no ecclesiastical discipline or government but that of local churches. The government of associated or consecrated churches, which Christ never provided for, establishes another government over the local churches, which, by your theory, are not only duly instituted but divinely organized. Then Christ's organization is subjoined to unauthorized "human arrangements!"—Have you found any thing in "scriptures" that marked child of its father, the devil? "hot excommunicated against God, more than this?"

And where, I beseech you, shall *sectarianism* be found, if not in arrangements, which of necessity shut all those Christians out of any church, who will not come under ecclesiastical authorities which Christ never instituted nor authorized, which are therefore usurpa-

tant, in which Christians are not at liberty to and mix "enough to be," both "unscriptural and sinful?"

Some have claimed on behalf of those who institute associations, that they have the original and primary right of instituting such voluntary religious associations, as they please, as well as of worshipping where they please, and that therefore, associations of churches are no usurpations, my answer is this: What, ever religious association men may have an original and inherent right to institute, Jesus Christ himself, the great head of the Christian church, holds the exclusive right to institute and direct the order of his church. That right he has exercised, that institution he has created and established, then directions he has given to his people, or any body of men have any right to add to or subtract from—its constitution or alter its institutions. Whatever religious associations men may institute, as their own discretion, they have no right to call them Christian churches, nor to mix them on to Christian churches, nor connect them with, or elevate them over such churches, in such a manner that Christ's church cannot get into Christ's churches without coming into or under their institutions. To do this is an invasion of Christ's rights and not an exercise of their own. I am an invasion of the rights of Christ's disciples, each of whom has an indefeasible right to come into Christ's churches without coming into any other institution along with it—has a right to enter Christ's free church by Christ's free bridge, without paying toll at any of the gates which others have unlawfully erected over their pathway: without paying homage to any other authority than that of Jesus Christ. If sectarianism is not inherent in such practice, in vain may we search for its existence or its definition.

Whatever impairs or modifies local church independence, subverts it. And whatever does this, subverts likewise the foundation of Christian union, because Christian unity and local church independence are founded upon one and the same basis. Like the Sansone twins, they live only when connected together. Like Prometheus's electricity and lightning, one definition will suffice for them both.

What is the definition of Christian union if it be not the mutual agreement, the mutual love, the equal brotherhood, the common and equal rights and privileges of all Christians, their mutual dependence upon Christ, their common subjection to him, their unity with him, and with each other—their equal share in the privileges, responsibilities and duties of the church? Can there be any other Christian union than this?

And what is the definition of local church independence (travels within itself) if it be not the self same thing? Who does not know that it implies the equal rights of all Christians in the church? And who can fail to see that such equal rights exclude all Christians to a place in the church? How then can Christian union and local church independence be separated, the one from the other?

They cannot. Establish a sect, and local church independence is lost in the associations of the churches (in some form) or the associations over them, by means of which the sect manages its affairs. This history of the so-called Congregational and Baptist sects furnish illustration of this truth. Their sectarian bias dominates their independence. Establish associations of the churches as associations over them and the association constitutes, defects, call it by whatever name you please, or by no name. No such thing as an association of churches can take place, without something, expressed, or implied, as the basis of that association, something that distinguishes the associated churches from the other churches around them. The more party and trifling that thing may be the more nearly approximating to a non entity, the more marked is the sectarianism of making it the basis of a distinct ecclesiastical organization. Could it even be proved that the association was founded on no peculiarity at all, and the sect therefore founded on nothing, except the love of ruling over the churches, (in other words the love of sect making and sect ruling,) the wantonness of the sectarian would be but the more apparent.

Whatever severity of language, therefore, may be due to sectarianism, is due likewise to all that association of churches from which sectarianism, as neither separated nor distinguished.—But my space is filled, and I must close, by subscribing myself, as ever—

Your aff. Christian friend and brother,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

* It is not easy to be precise in the theory of a sectarian church that should be locally independent—though I doubt whether history furnishes the instance, except where the sect was so small as to work all together. A second congregation, and "association" in some form, must be resorted to, as a bond of the sect. But I can conceive of no association of churches without sectarianism of some kind.

For the Christian Investigator.

SECOND LETTER FROM GEORGE SMITH.

Peterboro, May 25, 1843.

Brother Goodell—I have just received the May number of the Christian Investigator.

Notwithstanding you have already given to the Church of Peterboro and to myself a far larger share in your paper than their measure of importance entitles them to, I must crave the addition of a few explanatory lines.

Were I to visit the neighborhood in which you live, and go from house to house inquiring, whether you are a drunkard, you would justly say, that I was guilty of charging you with being a drunkard. And you would not allow, that I had relieved myself by showing, that, at some of the houses, I followed up my inquiry with the remark, that I hope you are not a drunkard; or, that, at others of them, I followed it up with the remark, that I believe you are not a drunkard. [1] Now, I am aware, that, in some instances, you accompanied your questions about the Church of Peterboro and myself, in the March No. of the Investigator, with the expression of your hope and in other instances, with the expression of your belief, that we are not as bad as your questions imply. But because there are instances, in which you did not so qualify and did, in no wise, qualify, such questions, [2] I thought it right to say, that you charged upon us the implication of the questions. Since, however, you have informed the public, that you did not mean to bring charges against us, I wish all that part of our controversy to pass into oblivion.

One, who should read your letter to me and not mine to you, would think, that I am unwilling, through fear, haughtiness, a cherished sense of infallibility, or something else, to have the positions taken by myself and the Church of Peterboro discussed. He would think, that my complaint of your departure from your characteristic wisdom and charity, was because you had presumed to discuss these positions. Whereas, should he turn to my letter, he would see, that this complaint is grounded solely on your ascription to us of positions, which we do not take, and which we have given you no reason to believe that we take. Our positions are public. We invite the most searching examination of them. But, for the positions, which men fancy we take—such, for instance, as our "seceding" into the church all sorts of people, and judging of Christian character without reference to doctrines and practices—we feel no responsibility [3] and, when a man of the justly large influence of William Goodell attempts to substitute such positions for our own, it is our duty to resist him.

You suppose, that I regard you as a sectarian or a heretic. Suffice it for me to reply, that I do not and never did. You say much of my severity upon you: and you go so far, as to hint a comparison between this severity and the calling of you "a hundred devils." [4] Pardon me for saying that, they, who read the letter, in which you see this severity, will not think that the text bears out the comments. You must have put on your most magnifying glasses when you read that text. [5]

Editor's Note.—[1] Not a parallel case, brother Smith. The Christian Investigator tells the same story, at all the times it visits.

[2] Another mistake, my good brother. The last paragraph of my March review, the cumulating up and concluding of the whole matter, was exclusively and expressly pointed in such a manner as to cover all the "mistaken views" I had described, and to repeat my fears that I might have failed, rightly to understand the Peterboro document.—not particular parts of it. And besides, if a more particular instance of general application be made of that last paragraph, its location connects it directly with that same "seceding into the church all sorts of people." &c. &c. &c. (without reference to doctrine and practices) of which you are much complaining. Furthermore, I ask Brother Smith to "specify the instances in which I did not so qualify"—in its connection, the questions of which he has complained.

[3] But I was not harbored or intimidated by the fear that you might (or could) possibly, go farther, in such a direction, than to "secede" in "man-stealers, and call them Christian brethren. How could I?

[4] Not exactly so. I was not speaking of the past, but of "our future intercourse"—of my wishes and resolutions in respect to it. My language was hypothetical. "Though (i.e. should or if) Luther call me," &c. &c.

[5] The "text" was that William Goodell had noted in the

And so, Br. Goodell, notwithstanding your admission, that every real Christian is fit for church membership, "you do not deem as fit for church membership any person, who is a real Christian, however great his errors." You say: A man cannot be a Christian, "however great his errors." So say I. But this is not to the point. To speak pertinently, you should say, that a real Christian of errors, however great, is not a Christian: [6] and should you shrink from saying so, you would shrink from uttering an absurdity, more plainly expressed indeed, but nevertheless, the identical absurdity contained in your denial, that any person, who is a real Christian, however great his errors, is fit for Church membership. To say, that a real Christian, however great his errors, is a Christian, is certainly not the same thing, as to say, that a man, however great his errors, may be a Christian. [7] And yet you seem to regard them as the same thing. The errors of a real Christian are qualified, and their extent limited by the fact that he is a Christian. [8]

You quote from a printed circular letter of mine, dated Dec. 4, 1841, the following words:

"You see from what I have just written, why it is, that I cannot go along with abolitionists in their disfellowshipping of all slaveholding professors of religion. I believe, that there are friends of God, who are so benighted, as to consent to stand in the relation of slaveholder, and I must give up my Christian Union principles, ere I can consent to the exclusion of any acknowledged friends of God from Christian and church fellowship."

You then proceed to convey the idea, that I had proudly, relinquished the sentiments contained in this quotation, and that I have now resumed them. But, in our much writing to, and talking with, one another, respecting these sentiments, did I ever signify, that I had relinquished them? Never. You had no right then to believe, or even to suspect, that I had relinquished them. But, that there may be no further misapprehension in your mind on this point, I now say, that I have never relinquished, nor ever thought of relinquishing, these sentiments—that I have never modified them in the slightest degree—and that I have not the least doubt of their truthfulness.

To show the absurdity of those sentiments, you say, "Your Circular of Dec. 4, 1841, involves the principle of continued church relations with slaveholders!" I admit it. To this end, you further say: "The man is so wicked, that you cannot vote for him, but you can nevertheless, co-operate with him as a church member! Here too, it you will but substitute 'pro-slavery' for 'wicked-

character of a 'sectarian bigot' rather than to his own, and that 'sectarianism is one of the most wicked children of its father, the devil.' Of my language, as compared with yours—and of my complaints of severity, as compared with yours, our readers can judge better than we can."

[6] I must "shrink" from saying (very confidently) yea or nay to this sentence, so "plainly expressed" as to the paragraph, as a whole—until I can devote more time to the study of its meaning. At first view, the problem here propounded to me, appears to involve the "identical absurdity" I complained of before, but which, just above, Br. Smith has disclaimed; viz., that a man may be a Christian, however great his errors." Is not, how shall I phrase it, "a real Christian of errors, however great?" It will be time enough to decide whether such a being is fit for a church member, when it can be shown that such a being exists! I have denied that such a being can exist, and Br. Smith responds, "So say I." Would he have recognized the church membership of a non-entity? But I would a second time try to shoulder that load, than to recognize the church membership of a slaveholder.

[7] To my ear, the language employed in the two cases, involves or implies the same idea; at least the distinction is not clearly expressed.

[8] This looks a little like the "possible" explication of the Peterboro creed that I suggested in my March Review, but of which Br. Smith has taken no notice. I then said, "Perhaps the meaning is, that those are to be recognized, whose doctrines and practices, however unscriptural and blameworthy, are not, on the whole, so unscriptural and blameworthy, as to destroy the evidence of their being disciples and friends of Christ." Now if this explication convey Br. Smith's meaning in the Peterboro creed, why did he not say so in his first letter, and end our differences on that point? And, as I called his attention to it again, and to his silence respecting it, in my May number, why does he not allude to it now? This marked silence enables me to claim his present remark as being in accordance with my explication, (still leaving me in doubt of his meaning) but it could turn out that I had "so right even to suspect" any such thing.

ed!" [9.] I will say "Amen." And then, to show the very height of the absurdity of my sentiments, you add: "He cannot help you govern the state, but he can help you build up the cause of religion!" Here too, I subscribe, if not to the words, in which you clothe it, nevertheless to the idea, which was in your mind. And, now, to make your eyes still bigger than these admissions will make them, I frankly declare, that I can conceive it possible, that I should be willing to commune, with a slaveholder, at the Lord's table, on Sunday, and the next day, refuse to vote for him—and refuse to vote for him too, notwithstanding the confessed sufficiency of his talents and general intelligence.

If you will turn to that point in my review of Cassius M. Clay's letter, you will find the doctrine, which has always governed my anti-slavery voting. It is not because he is wicked that I refuse to vote for a pro-slavery man: but because, that, if elected, he will not use his official power for the overthrow of slavery.

I thank you, dear brother, for your labors, (not "seven or eight" but already ten years ago) to convince me that my "Abolition principles and Colonization principles did not agree with each other." You take hope from the change wrought upon me in that case, that I shall yet give up other errors, which grieve you. God grant, that, if they are errors, I may give them up. I would, for your encouragement to persevere in your efforts to dislodge them, remind you, that "change" not "consistency" is my motto; and that whilst I loathe the almost universal pride of consistency, there is nothing more beautiful in my eyes than openness to change.

I am not aware that you have good grounds for supposing, that, in your discussion with the late Luther Myrick, I sympathized with him. As far as I now recollect, I thought he was right in some respects, but that you were right in the main. [10]

I am sorry, that you do not speak out, respecting the supposition, which I employ in the second column of my letter to illustrate our mutual difference about Church Organization.

I close with thanking you for your letter. It abounds in precious instruction to myself and others. Its admonitions to beware of substituting for the simple truth, as it is in Jesus, the wretched current notions included under the taking name of a "Liberal Christianity," are very timely, as well as very valuable. [11.] I hope, that my own heart may profit by these admonitions.

With great regard, your friend and brother,
GERRIT SMITH.

FIFTH LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH.

Just ad of a reply to your Letter, dear brother, at the present time, I can only note down, memorandums, a hint or two, that may serve as a landmark, by means of which to indicate our present relative position, and help our readers, as well as ourselves, to keep in mind distinctly, the GREAT MORAL INTERESTS really involved in our apparently dry, and (as some would think) unimportant if not frivolous discussions about the form and mode of church organization.

[1] Must it be inferred that Gerrit Smith's Union principles have taught him how to make a distinction between being "pro-slavery" and being "wicked?" The "pro-slavery ministers of Madison county" would find great relief in a discovery like that. [2] It comes to my remembrance, now, that Bro. Smith agreed with me, in another discussion I had with the late Luther Myrick, in his Union Herald, on his semi-Episcopal plan of county churches, that should designate preachers for the local congregations. But that was a separate discussion. Bro. Smith can probably tell better than I can, which discussion he had in mind. But the latter is of minor consequence.

[3] But can you picture to yourself, brother Smith, a mere qualification, or lamentable, or mischievous development of that so-called "Liberal Christianity," that is witnessed in the co-existence with which our principal religious sects, "orthodox" as well as "heterodox," encroach into their domains as Christians, the plunderers of the Lord's poor—"extortioners"—"robbers"—substituting by "the highest kind of theft?" Of all the wretched, current notions included under the taking name of "Liberal" Christianity, is there any thing more God-dishonoring—more soul-destroying than this?

W. G.
The fourth letter will probably appear before long. We expect the letters according to the date when written.

How is it, brother Smith? I was wrong it seems, "wholly wrong, inexcusably wrong," in the Review in my March number, in supposing it possible that your theories might lead you to "reap" into your local churches "all sorts of people, and judges of Christian character without reference to doctrines and practices!" And yet, it seems, I had no right to believe, or even to suspect, in my letter to you, in my May number, that your theories would forbid you to "reap" into those same churches a too in habitually practicing "the sum of all villainies," and continually guilty of "the highest kind of theft!" You signed the call of the Syracuse Convention, declaring the time was in to come to "SEPARATE FROM THE FALSELY CALLED Christian churches that would not proclaim the gospel of DELIVERANCE TO THE CAPTIVES," and yet your Christian Union principles forbid you to exclude a man from Christian and church fellowship, merely on account of his *stealing!* Such is the position you hold. Let me now record mine.

When Anti-Slavery societies may embrace slaveholders in their membership, and Temperance Societies may be composed of rum-sellers, then, but not until then, may Christian Churches embrace slave holders. I will add, much yet, that they may then embrace the characters enumerated in 1 Cor. v. 11. "fornicators, covetous, idolaters, ruffians, drunkards, extortioners."

Widely different results, to be reached by two such men as Gerrit Smith and William Goodell, who so commonly draw together in the same team! What is the matter with us, this time? How comes it to pass that, like the team the sailor was attempting to paw with, our "rigging is all awry, the mizzenmast on the starboard side, and all is going to wreck, stern foremost?" Let me tell you why it is, brother Smith. You have harnessed on the wrong gear, this time. You have carried out your principles of Church organization, and I, mine. And that makes all the difference between us. If your theories are correct, there was no occasion for any such ally as the Syracuse Convention, so far as the connection of abolitionists with pro-slavery Churches is concerned; and all secessions on that ground are schismatic.

But your theories of church organization do not stop here. They govern your political, as well as your church action. You do not withhold your vote from Henry Clay, it seems, because he is a wicked oppressor of God's poor, nor because he is a dishonest gambler, nor because he is a murderous duelist, and (if it be so) a lawless debauchee. All this he might be, and yet have your vote, if you could only persuade yourself (as so many of his friends profess to do) "that if elected, he would use his political power for the overthrow of slavery." And your vote for James G. Birney, if I understand you, is not suspended on the question, whether he would prove to be a "just" man, "acting in the fear of God." It rests upon the contingency whether, for any objects, from any motives, or by consequence of any circumstances, you may safely calculate that his vote would be given for the abolition of slavery. And this theory, if you carry it out, (as I trust in God you will not,) would set you upon "calculations of consequences"—estimates of the "greatest amount of good"—"voting for the measure or for the party founded on it, and not for the man"—accepting the "most available, instead of the most worthy candidate"—supporting the nominee of the nominating convention, (if a suitable instrument for accomplishing a just measure,) whatever the defects of his moral character might be—"the least," or perchance the "greatest" of two evils "and dates," if the end could but be gained: forgetful, that when "the wicked bear rule, the people mourn," and that the end sanctifies not the means.

Is this the liberty party to which your explanations, and your disclaimers of "bigotry and narrowness" would assure C. M. Clay? Such I have never supposed it to be. Such, I pray God, it may never become. Such a party I shall never, knowing y, support.

Such a party, however, is the best that my poor powers of analysis would enable me to deduce from the theories of church organization you have branched. You have partly deduced it already. Depend upon it, brother Smith, Christians who cannot learn how to vote Satan and his adherents out of the church, can never learn how, or have courage to vote them out of the state. Sitting as God, in his temple, he cannot fail to be the god of this world, and rule it as hitherto he has done. And how many good measures may be got out of him let the past suffice to indicate! The church laughs at the nations no in fetters, and humanity groans for redemption, all in waiting, for Christians to learn and to restore the holy order of Christ's rule.

The fate of the "Liberty party," and the destiny of this republic, along with the rest, are intertwined with the pending question of church order. We must pursue

our discussion of that question, before we can come at the moral principles by which our political action is to be governed. So it seems.

You're sorry that I "do not speak out, on the supposition you employ in the second column" of your former letter. All in good time, brother Smith. My comments are in manuscript, long since, writing their time at the press. Perhaps they may come on the same sheet with this letter. One thing at a time, and all in their order. My father I need me to hoe the first hill of corn first, and the second next; the first row first, and the second next; and so on, till the whole field was finished: no hill would be "skipped" then—though some think the process "too prolix." Do not fear that I shall fail of due decision and definiteness, when I come to treat of that local, visible ASSEMBLY, (another word for church) consisting of "fifty" veritable, "Christian men and women," whose "roll of names" no mortal man hath ever been able to write down on paper—whose *when* and *whereabouts* are chronology, and geography: both pencilled; and whom neither God nor man, with a human sympathy nor Christian affection, with all the social and the co-operative wrapped up in them, could ever persuade or induce to ASSEMBLE TOGETHER!

A few additional notes I append to your letter.

Very fraternally yours,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

Christian Investigator.

HONOLUE, JULY, 1841.

As the Editor's state of health, for three months past, has not permitted him to travel, attend Conventions, lecture, &c. his receipts, for the Christian Investigator, have, in consequence, considerably diminished, and probably will continue to do so, from that cause, for some time, at least. Those who wish to sustain the paper might as well remit by mail, as to wait for other opportunities. While able to sit and write, I wish to employ my pen, if I can have the means of paying the paper maker and printer.

Friends of the cause, in different localities, might help me much, by soliciting subscriptions and donations to sustain my publication, should they think it desirable to do so.

THE TRACT DISTRIBUTOR, No 2, FOR JUNE, is now ready for those who may order them. It contains two tracts on one sheet, viz.—TRACT No. 2. "Are you a Christian?" (published in the Christian Investigator for June.)—Also Tract No. 3. "The Christian's high Calling."—The two tracts, with a few brief paragraphs, make up 8 pages as in the first number, and at the same price, viz: \$1.00 per hundred. Orders may be addressed to Wm. Goodell, Honolue, Ontario Co. or Erasmus Shepard, printer, Rochester. Tracts delivered for ready cash, only.

THE WASHINGTON REVIEW, By Luther Lee, Syracuse. Issued quarterly. The first number is occupied with a discussion of the connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church with Slavery. The next is to be occupied with a discussion of Church Polity.—The known ability of the Editor is a sufficient guaranty to the interest of the publication. Price 64 cts single, 50 cts per dozen, or \$1.00 per hundred.

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED.

1. FROM WASHINGTON STICKNEY, minister of the gospel.—An Expression of the sentiments and covenant of the new Church in CANASTOTA, Madison County.

2. FROM DAVID PLUMB, minister of the gospel, Utica.—A letter, in defence of the position of the Church of Christ of Utica.

3. FROM GERRIT SMITH: a third letter, dated June 17.

These will, of course, be published as soon as practicable, but our little monthly sheet cannot dispatch documents and discussions like the large weekly papers.

Br. Plumb's letter opens a new view of Church organization. He differs both from Gerrit Smith and from the views we have advanced. This communication, we think, will throw additional light on the pending discussion.

THE CHRISTIAN'S HIGH CALLING.

If you have duly considered, dear reader, what it is to be a Christian, and if you cherish, after a serious self-examination, the sublime hope of the Christian, be persuaded to consider your high calling, and to look distinctly at some of the duties devolving upon you, in the relations you sustain. I shall, of course, take it for granted that you are already at work in our Lord's vineyard, otherwise you could have no well grounded evidence that you belong to the family of Christ. But it is needful for you to "abound more and more, in knowledge, and in all judgment," to abound more and more in every good work—to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of God our Savior.

Without growth in grace you cannot grow in true knowledge, yet increasing knowledge will help you to grow in grace. Growth in knowledge and in grace are both necessary to make you more useful in your Christian labors. And such labors are necessary in order to your real growth in grace and in knowledge. There is no way to learn the will of God but to do the will of God, so far as it is already known; yet the will of God must be ascertained before it can be performed. Your love of God cannot exceed the degree of your knowledge of God. Yet there is no true spirit knowledge of God without a holy love of his character. Love, knowledge, usefulness and blessedness are thus connected together, and cannot be separated. "If any man will do my will," says the Savior, "he shall know of my doctrine." "If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me, in my throne, as I also overcome, and am set down with my Father in his throne."

But in order to grow in grace and in knowledge—to increase in good works and in blessedness—to hear the voice of the Savior, and to overcome—you must study the position in which you are placed—the work Christ has for you to do—the temptations with which you are beset—the difficulties you have to encounter—and the means by which you may be enabled to overcome. In order to be a growing and a useful Christian, in order to make progress in the divine life, in order to do good in the church and in the world, you must learn more and more of the condition of the church and of the world—you must learn what there is to be done in the Lord's vineyard, and what most needs to be done, and the part of the work Christ expects you to perform. If you know little of the condition of the heathen, you will pray little and attempt little for the heathen. If you know little of the condition of the enslaved, you will pray little and do little for the enslaved. If you know little of the condition of the intemperate and the vicious, you will pray little and do little for the intemperate and the vicious. If you know little of the errors and corruptions of the church, you will pray little and do little for the removal of those errors and corruptions. If you know little of the remaining corruptions of your own heart and life, you will pray and labor little for their removal. If you know little of the history of the people of God in past ages, you will know little of the ways in which Satan has hitherto got the advantage of them, and you will watch and pray little to be delivered from similar devices in the present day. If you know little of the history and progress of the church in past ages, you will know little of its condition and prospects at the present time, and be ill prepared to know what influence you ought to exert, or what you ought to do, or to refrain from doing, in order to promote the cause of Jesus Christ in the earth. If you are not acquainted with the peculiar characteristics of the age and the nation you live in, as compared with those of other nations and ages, you cannot properly understand the peculiar work devolving upon Christians in your own country, during your own

life-time; and therefore you cannot fully and properly understand the work Christ has given you to do. The great outlines of that work are, indeed, always the same. But yet every generation of Christians, in every particular country, has its own appropriate and peculiar work, just as every individual Christian has something to do, which no other Christian can do.

If you take it for granted that none but ministers and the chief men of the churches can understand the interests of the churches, or the condition of the age and nation you live in, then you will neglect to make yourself acquainted with such matters. You will either do nothing, voluntarily, with a view to bear directly upon the peculiar interests and condition of the age and nation you live in, or else you will do what you do, at the bidding of others, without any well founded judgment of your own, and not know whether you are helping the cause of Christ, or doing it an injury! Oh, how much does every Christian need to know, and to learn, in order that he may honor his high calling, and do the work Christ has committed to his hands! How short-sighted to think, as so many Christians appear to do, that the great interests of Christ's kingdom are not committed to them, individually, because they are committed to the Church! What is the Church, or what are the churches, but assemblies of Christians? How can a work belong to the Church, and not belong to the individuals of whom the Church is composed? How can the Church understand and perform its duties, if the persons who make up the Church, do not understand and perform them?

You are a Christian! Then you should have a place in some local Church, and having a place there, you should understand that you form a part of the Church—that the responsibilities of the Church rest on you, as really as upon any other member of the Church. Though the Church has its officers, yet those officers are not the Church! They are not exclusively charged with the responsibilities of the Church—Christ does not permit a select few to assume, nor permit the great mass to throw off the responsibilities of the Churches, in this way. The officers of a Church, including its pastor or pastors, are the servants or ministers of the Church, to help do its work, but not to take its work, or the direction of it, out of the hands of the equal brotherhood of Christians.

You are a Christian! Then you are set to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world.—You are one of those to whom Christ has said, "Go teach all nations." Your ability to teach, and to call sinners to repentance, may not be equal to the ability of some others. And hence it may not be your duty, as it is the duty of some, to devote your time exclusively or chiefly to that specific work. But you have the right, and it is your duty, to improve all the time and talents committed to your hands, in the best manner you can, in the service of Christ, and for the souls of men. And a part of that service is your verbal testimony to the truths of religion. The way to improve your gifts, is to employ them. No class of men—no ministers of the gospel—not even the apostles themselves, ever held, or ever will hold, by Christ's leave, the exclusive right and privilege of religious teaching and preaching. "The word of God is not bound." The first disciples "went everywhere preaching the word." Paul told the Hebrew converts in general, that it was high time for them to have become "teachers" of religion. [Heb. 5: 12.] There are no monopolies in Christ's Church—no priestly or clerical caste.—Christians are all a chosen generation—a royal priesthood. They are all equal brethren in Christ. You have no right, then, if you are a Christian, to bury your talent in a napkin—or how down to a caste in the Church—or excuse yourself from a discharge of the duties of an equal Church member—or neglect to qualify yourself

for the discharge of those duties, by growing in grace, and increasing in knowledge and wisdom, every day of your life. You have no right to remain in Churches that are not actively engaged in the cause of Jesus Christ, and his crushed poor! You have no right to remain in Churches where the Man of Sin, in the form of a lordly caste, is enthroned in the place of Jesus Christ. You are commanded to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, and not be entangled in the yoke of bondage.

You are a Christian! Then you have tasted the liberty of the gospel! You have learned that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty!" You are a Christian! Then you are called to a high calling—You are called to a place in the Church militant—You are called to gird on your armor! And, consider! you are called into the army of the nineteenth century!—Into the American division of that army! Have you studied your position? Have you pondered the period of your labor? Have you reconnoitered your battle-field, in the light of the Bible, and in the light of Church History? Do you know your post, and know the specific work that is assigned to you? Have you pondered the prophecy, that "one shall chase a thousand"—that "he that is weak among them shall be as David"—that "the light of the moon shall be as the light of the Sun, and the light of the Sun sevenfold, even the light of seven days,"—that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

Do not think to fight the battles of Christ in any other strength than the strength of Christ; and do not imagine that Christ will strengthen you, for any meager object than that you should fight manfully, his battles—Subdue the Grand Adversary in your own heart, that you may help to subdue his confederated legions in the battle of the great day. And think not to overcome the powers of darkness in your own soul, while you stand aloof from the contests waged by the Redeemer, against all forms of impurity, of oppression, and sin! "He that overcometh," saith the Savior, and "keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, (and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers) even as I have received of my Father."

DONATIONS AND PAYMENTS

For the Christian Investigator, up to July 5, 1841.

Of J. H. Payne, for O. Huchcock, Libertyville, Lake Co. (Ill.) including 2 Sals lectures	1 00	L. H. Hollbrook, for W. P. Huchcock, Centerville, Mich.	1 00
H. Clark, including lectures (by J. H. P.)	25	S. W. Green, Whitesboro, do.	50
A. T. King, Kingsville, Ohio, (by J. H. P.) with lectures	75	Unknown, do.	12
G. Smith, Peterboro	2 00	A. Smith, do.	50
D. Sloc, Agent	5 00	W. H. Chandler, do.	50
C. Arnold, Honesoy	50	Mary Ball, do.	50
W. Stickney, Canastota do. for extra Nov.	1 00	John Mann, do.	50
C. Whiting, Kingston, R. I. (with lectures)	75	Mrs. Paxson, do.	50
E. V. Lee, Stephentown	1 00	A. Hollbrook, do.	1 00
E. Day, Plac.	50	S. Camp, Whitesboro, for J. E. Bebee, Jackson, Mich.	1 00
H. Green, Whitesboro	2 00	H. Elmer, Whitesboro	50
R. Hough, do.	50	F. Wilcox, do.	50
A. Mills, N. Hartford	50	J. T. Quinlan, do.	50
J. Smith, Whitesboro	50	J. Storer, Albany	50
L. Hollbrook, do.	1 00	E. W. Goodwin, Albany	1 00
Sally White, do.	1 00	do. for a collection already acknowledged	1 00
H. Foster, do.	1 00	Dr. S. Spooner, Wampsville	50
W. F. Briggs, do.	1 00	J. L. Marsh, Washington, Ill.	50
J. Prime, do.	13	Gleason Pitts, Honesoye	1 00
J. W. Wilson, Utica	25	W. K. Fishbein, do.	1 00
G. Patton, Whitesboro	50	Den. Beecher, Lyons	2 00
J. Walt, do.	50	S. B. Franklin, Honesoye	1 00
R. Wilcox, do.	50	B. Stewart, do.	50
J. H. Moray, do.	25	Amount,	36 45
J. B. Grinnell, do.	50	Deduct amount received of Church in Whitesboro, by Pres. Green, at Syracuse Convention, acknowledged in January number, but included in above rec'd from Whitesboro	12 00
W. J. Ladd, Newark, N. J.	50		
H. Green, Honesoye	1 00		
S. Lyman, Rose	50		
C. Lyman, Brookport	50		
R. N. Wright, Caylerville	50		
L. R. Brundage, do.	50		
D. Snow Jr., Vitchburg, Mass., by E. W. Goodwin, Albany	2 00		
		Rec'd	\$ 33 15

E. Soper, Printer, 204 State-street, Rochester.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 8.
WHOLE NUMBER, 28.

ONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., AUGUST, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy of his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 00 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
All sent in advance, and free of postage.

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosed for papers.

LETTER FROM DAVID PLUMB.

CHURCH OF CHRIST OF UTICA.

Br. Goodsell,—In the March number of your paper in publishing the views of the Utica church in respect to 'church order,' you took occasion to criticize those views, and labored to show, that they involved the *episcopal* feature of church organization. As in the same paper, you had urged the same objection against the views of the church of Peterboro, I thought I would make a reply to what I deemed an unjust inference on our language, supposing that Bro. Smith could reply, and, in doing so, fully justify both himself and us. But in the May number which contains Bro. Smith's defence, I find that he himself not only thinks it possible that your interpretation of our third position may be correct, (1) but goes further in conceding to your views of independency than the Christian principle or scripture precedent will justify. (2.) when he says, "if there were a number of Christian assemblies in Utica, 'he would have them all ENTIRELY INDEPENDENT of each other.'" (3.) I find, therefore, that I am called upon both to defend the Utica church from the charge of *episcopacy* that you bring against it, and, at the same time, to vindicate its position that there cannot properly be but "one church in one place," though, on account of numbers or other circumstances, there may be "different places of meeting" which, in an "accommodated" use of the word church, may be called churches." When I speak of its "accommodated use" I mean merely its *etymological* use as signifying an assembly, in this case, a Christian assembly. But thus by no means its proper Bible use. When Paul addresses the "church of God at Corinth" he does not mean any particular assembly of the brethren there, of which there might have been a dozen or more, but the *whole body of the faithful* at that place. (4.)

NOTES IN REPLY TO BRO. PLUMB.

[1.] Pretty good evidence that my understanding of the Utica document was not a prejudiced or illiberal one.
[2.] A concession that absolute church independency inconsistent with Bro. Plumb's theory—in other words, in his theory is at least, semi-episcopal. There are, it can be but two essentially distinct theories on the subject, the independent and the Episcopal. The policy of the Quaker, Presbyterian, Methodist Protestant, (now) Wesleyan connections, are only modifications of *episcopacy*; that is, of a general *overacerism* of the local churches, but with awkward attempts at a nominal material independency, or rather "parity," all alike being surrendered independency.
[3.] Bro. Smith will see by this, where, in Bro. Plumb's mind their common theory tends. Bro. Plumb understands its results better than Bro. Smith does, unless I mistake the matter.
[4.] And so the local assemblies (properly speaking, in the Bible use of the term,) are not churches at

The proof that there cannot properly be but one church in one place is derived—

1. From the great principle and law of Christianity that Christians are "ONE." Paul declares in his letter to the Galatians that believers "are all one in Christ Jesus." The Savior, in his memorable prayer, recorded in the 17th of John, prays that His followers "ALL MAY BE ONE." This amounts to a positive law that they should be one. Now this unity was designed by Christ to assume a visible form, for it was designed to convince the world of the divinity of his mission. His words are, "that they all may be one, that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me." Their unity, therefore, must be seen, in order to produce this effect. But its visibility can be manifest in nothing less than *association* and *joint and harmonious action*. (5.) But as this visible intercourse and joint action of believers cannot be universal, (6.) it must manifest itself

all—the word being applicable only to a certain aggregate plurality of such assemblies associated together. No Episcopalian will ask a better definition of a church than this. It would soon be found to follow (whether Bro. Plumb foresees it or not) that some man or body of men, whether called Bishops or otherwise, would be appointed to *oversee* a "dozen or more" congregations. It makes little difference to THE PEOPLE whether this be done by an association, a presbytery, a synod, general assembly, yearly meeting, conference, bishop, cardinal, or pope. The main question is, not by whom this *overacerism* shall be exercised over the local churches, but whether it shall be done at all.

[5.] We here have an almost verbatim repetition of the Romish argument, as urged for the last fifteen centuries, and daily heard, still, the very argument, that week after week, is steadily drawing Protestants, English and American, into the Romish church. If the argument be good for any thing, and for any mode of outward church organization, it is better for the Papist than for any one else, because he, and he only, has the courage and consistency to carry out the principle faithfully, and apply it to that "one" and indivisible Holy Church Universal, to which the memorable prayer of the Savior referred. The only fallacy of the argument and of the theory, however applied, (and whether by St. Chrysostom, Leo X, or Bro. Plumb,) lies precisely here: It assumes what is untrue: viz: the identity of the visible and the invisible church, and applies to the outward organization of the former, what Christ and the apostles said only of the latter, of the church which they did not intend to have visibly organized at all. If the assumption were a truth, an outward, visible organization of the church universal would be obligatory, of course, unless to avoid that conclusion, we adopt, as Mr. Garrison is understood to have done, the theory, that outward visible organization and officers are not appropriate to the church, or churches at all.

[6.] Indeed! "It cannot be universal!" Then how can the memorable prayer of the Savior be fulfilled, that his disciples "all may be one," if, as Bro. Plumb's argument hath it, that prayer amounts to a positive law, that they should be one—that this unity "was designed by Christ to assume a visible form," and that this "visibility can be manifest in nothing less than *association*, and *joint and harmonious action*" "in ALL MATTERS touching the VITAL INTERESTS OF THE church!" Instead of an argument, as he intended, for the one church of Utica or of Corinth, (with a dozen or more worshipping assemblies which are not, in the proper Bible sense, churches,) Bro. Plumb had manifestly framed an argument for the unity in visible form, for association and joint harmonious action, in ALL MATTERS, &c., &c., of all the disciples of Christ, the Church Catholic Universal. And a stronger or more compact argument to that point, the *articles* of the Romish church, for the last fifteen centuries, may be challenged to produce.—Yet now, Bro. Plumb has discovered that "this visible intercourse and joint action of believers cannot be universal." Why, then, Bro. Plumb, you should have discovered that your whole argument from the prayer of the

among those whose local proximity will render it practicable. (7.) And there is no village, town, or city on the earth, in which the Christians of such place are not sufficiently contiguous for visible fellowship and joint action in all matters touching the vital interests of the church. If divisions into churches "entirely independent of each other" take place, therefore, beyond what the law of proximity requires, it must be a manifest violation of Christian unity and involve the essential features of sectarianism. (8.) The Christians of New-York or London, can act as one body as well as can the

Savior, &c., &c., falls to the ground. And by what rule of logic shall an argument which proves (if it proves anything) the necessity and obligation of an outward visible organization, for joint and harmonious action, for all the Christians on earth, for whom Christ prayed, and which proves nothing else, be applied to prove the obligation of thus organizing together all the Christians of one particular city, however few or many? If the argument (which says nothing of a city) be a sound argument, then the Christians of Corinth or of Utica, like those of a single congregation, are "only churches in an accommodated sense"—not in the proper, Bible use of the word, which should be applied only to all the Christians on earth. And by what hint of authority from the prayer of the Savior, or from any of the parallel expressions of his apostles, concerning the unity of Christians, does it appear that such unity requires the outward, visible association of all the Christians of Utica or of Corinth, any more than it requires the association of all the Christians in Macedonia or Oneida county, of Asia Minor or of England, or of the state of New York? If the argument is good for the one, why not for the other?

And how does it appear that the joint action of Christians cannot be universal? The Romish Church has made some considerably close approximations towards a successful experiment. Some local developments of sectarianism have indeed crippled her a little, but if the theory be correct, the experiment should not, on the score of impracticability, be relinquished. And if the Romish Church has disgraced the principle, or in any other way made shipwreck in her endeavors, the circumstance furnishes no good reason why better Christians should not take up the principle, and do it better justice, as some have, indeed, proposed to do.

[7.] And who shall judge of this practicability and of this proximity upon which it is suspended? Bro. Plumb supposes there is not a city on earth, too populous to be united in one church organization. And I suppose that all the Christians in the State of New Jersey (all the population, if Christians) could more conveniently and intelligently discharge the duties growing out of their membership in one church, than could the Christians, or the population of London. Some might extend this remark to the state of Massachusetts, or of New York? But who shall decide? Or by what authority—or by what rule? Some may decide one way, and some another. All is vague and indefinite. No man can tell whether his own decision, or that of the majority is the correct one: yet a mistake may involve the sin of schism!

[8.] And so there cannot be two local churches entirely independent of each other in any village, town, or city on the earth, without "the essential features of sectarianism!" A fair inference, I admit, from the doctrine of indivisible and divinely constituted church organization of all the Christians in one place. What will Bro. Smith say to it? In opposition to Bro. Plumb's doctrine, I affirm that there cannot be two or more distinct Christian assemblies in one city, so associated as not to be entirely independent of each other, without the essential features of sectarianism. For, in all organized, associated action of a plurality of local Christian assemblies or churches, the very definition and essence of sectarian arrangements are embodied. Bro. Plumb himself, in resolution 5, of the Utica church, goes even further than this, affirming, that "Every departure from the strict independency of the local church is an approximation to Popery." But perhaps he calls the city church, with its dozen or more separate congregations, a local church. If so, he might as well call a county, or state, or national church, a local church.

Methodists (9,) of those places, and that, too, without being governed by a "diocesan Episcopacy" but governing themselves. That this may be true, that it was done in the apostolic age, I shall presently show.

2. The New Testament furnishes no precedent for more than one church in one place. (10.) In referring to particular districts of country the scriptures use the word church in the plural form. Hence we read, "Then had the churches rest through all Judea." "Paul went through Syria confirming the churches." "The churches of Asia salute you." "The grace bestowed on the churches of Macedonia." &c. But in speaking of a single city the plural is no where used. The uniform language of the New Testament in such cases is, "The church at Jerusalem," "The church of Antioch," "The church of God at Corinth," &c. [11.] Now, although in several places spoken of in the New Testament, I have no doubt believers were so numerous as to find it convenient to have several "places of meeting" [12.] yet they all constituted but one church. If we may rely upon the testimony of the word of God. This was the case, not on account of the paucity of numbers, for we find the number of believers in Jerusalem at one time to be not less than five thousand. (see Acts 4: 4.) [13.] And after this it is

[9.] The Methodists! Singular church independency, to be sure. The Church of Rome is quite "independent," enough in that sense.

[10.] This is true, because it "furnishes no (instance of) more than one" Christian assembly (only another word for church) "in the same place."

[11.] In other words, the New Testament never speaks of more than one Christian assembly in one city. Such testimony should satisfy us of the fact, that there was only one such assembly in any city.

[12.] This is conjectured, and lacks proof. Dozens of detached portions of the same church might occasionally meet in small rooms for prayer, and yet come together weekly, in the assembly. Those at Jerusalem are recorded to have met, sometimes, in the temple.

[13.] The connexion does not warrant us to say, that this mention of five thousand believers was made in respect to Jerusalem only. And other parts of the history render it next to certain, that this could not have been the case. Just before the day of Pentecost, the number of names "numbered" in the Jerusalem church, is particularly stated at one hundred and twenty. At the Pentecost only three thousand were converted in all, and the converts were chiefly, it would seem, "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Crete and Arabians," speaking a variety of languages, and residing in various and extensive countries, assembled in vast numbers, at the great annual festival. A very liberal estimate of the resident city converts, in proportion to the others, (if we may judge from the modern proportion of city converts to any good cause, at great national conventions,) would give, say, one sixth part, or five hundred, to the Jerusalem church; and the real number was probably less. But put down (contrary to the express statement) the whole three thousand to the Jerusalem church, and, adding this to the previous one hundred and twenty, you have only three thousand one hundred and twenty, instead of five thousand. (The probability is, that the resident converts were less than three hundred.) But it was apparently before the close of the same protracted meeting, with most of the strangers still in the city, or certainly very soon afterwards, that we have this estimate of the number of "believers" (nothing said of their residing or being in Jerusalem) at five thousand.—It seems manifest, that the entire census of believers, every where, including the previously converted hearers of Jesus in Judea, Galilee, &c., must have been intended. And, a long time afterwards, at a most interesting meeting of the Jerusalem church, and in company with a considerable number of brethren from Antioch, there seems to have been no difficulty for "the church," "all the multitude" to come together, and "give audience" to what was said on that occasion, and for "the whole church" to act together, and decide a most intricate theological question. Learned and candid Episcopalians have often conceded, (John Wesley among the rest,) that the primitive churches, during the apostolic age, were such only as were "gathered together" in one place, as was the

said that "the number of the disciples MULTIPLIED in Jerusalem GREATLY" (Acts 6: 7.) Yet these believers were called "the church at Jerusalem," and it is affirmed of them that they "WERE TOGETHER," with ONE ACCORD. [14.] If there was no necessity for the five thousand believers and upwards in Jerusalem dividing into a dozen or twenty "entirely independent" churches, then where can any such necessity exist?

You ask, "shall we call the church of Christ at Utica the local church when it shall have become subdivided, at some future day, into a dozen, or an hundred 'places of meeting,' if the reformed religion prevails there, and the city becomes sufficiently populous?" I answer, YES. [15.] Then, say you, will not the "original mother church," the now "church of Christ of Utica," still "remain, with its pastor and deacons, or other officers, OVER the different places of meeting?" I answer, NO; for the "church of Christ of Utica" then will not be the little assembly now worshipping on Charlotte street, but will be composed of the "hundred" assemblies of which you speak, and the Charlotte street meeting will be but one of them. It will be as true then as now, as expressed in our first position, that "the church of Christ of any place consists of all the Christians in that place." [16.] Then you ask again, "Will not these hundred meetings be considered as churches not only in an 'accommodated' but also in a 'subordinate sense?' Certainly, subordinate in the same sense that the individual member is subordinate to the whole church [17.] he possessing, at the same time, equal powers with every other member. [18.]

church of Corinth. (1 Cor. 5: 4.) The claim is, that they became too numerous afterwards, to meet in one place, and therefore had to be governed by an Episcopacy.

[14.] Proof positive, that the conjectured necessity of "several places of meeting," is groundless—that the number in Jerusalem was less than five thousand, or that they had a large place of meeting "in the temple," or peradventure, in the open air. "With one accord, in ONE place," (not "several places.") Acts 2: 1.—"Daily, with one accord, in the temple, (not "several places.") Acts 2: 46. This was after the conversion of the three thousand. "They went to their own company," who "lifted up their voice to God, with one accord"—(in unison.) Acts 4: 24. And the place (not "several places") was shaken, where they were assembled together." verse 31. This was after the mention of five thousand believers in all. And again, after that, (Acts 5: 12.) "they were all with one accord, in the porch of the temple." Perhaps every member was not present at these daily church meetings.

[15.] Then the phrase "local church," loses its distinctive meaning, and a "local church independency," means the independency of the diocese!

[16.] Well then, the question (the very question I first intended,) remains to be answered. Is the "Church of Christ of Utica," consisting of these numerous congregations, to have its Bishop and deacons? If so, then there is an Episcopacy proper, in due form; a diocesan bishop over a plurality of worshipping congregations, (commonly called the honorable name of "local churches," whether independent or no.) But if not, then "the Church of Utica, the Church of Corinth, and indeed every church that Dr. Plumb believes to be a church," in the proper Bible use of the word, should be without any bishop at all! Dr. Plumb will probably admit, that "the New Testament furnishes no precedent" for such an omission. He will have to settle that matter; and if "the church of Utica," as he defines it, has its bishop, shall the several congregations (component parts of the church) have their pastors or bishops also? If so, they will be pastors under a diocesan bishop. If not, by what scriptural rule shall the business of the separate congregations be conducted, and by what officers, if by any? Something of "New Testament precedent" may be wanting again, here.

[17.] Another full denial of the independency of the single congregation, (commonly called the "local church,") that shall come into the arrangement.

[18.] And every separate Methodist society, or Presbyterian church, or Episcopal parish, has as much independency as every other society, church, or parish; that is to say, no independence at all.

But it still may be asked how a hundred assemblies may act as one church? I ask, how did the church at Jerusalem with five, or it may be ten thousand members, act "together" [19.] and "with one accord?" On the question of circumcision, noticed in the 15th of Acts, we find that the "apostles, and elders, and whole church [20] acted." I see not why one hundred thousand might not act together on any vital question, as well as five or ten thousand. The question might be submitted simultaneously or successively to the different assemblies and thus the voice of the whole brotherhood be obtained as easily as if there were but five hundred believers in the place, all meeting in one assembly. [21.] All this surely could be done without a "system of diocesan Episcopacy, or semi-Episcopal Presbyterianism" which you affirm would be the "inevitable result." [22.] The principle, of one church in a place, carried out you say, in your review of the Peterboro creed, from which the last two quotations have been taken, would require that "all the Christians of the United States should constitute the church of the United States." [23.] They would, but not in the

[19.] I answer, that the churches that acted together, (br. Plumb may conjecture their numbers as he pleases,) were "with one accord, IN ONE PLACE," Acts 2: 1. And they were explicitly directed to transact their business, when "GATHERED together," 1 Cor. 5: 4—Can bro. Plumb find a "New Testament precedent," for transacting church business in any other way?

[20.] Yes. And "all the multitude" ("the church") "kept audience to Barnabas and Paul," &c., when the case was under discussion. Of course they were "gathered together" "in one place," according to apostolic direction, and "New Testament precedent," Acts 15: 12.

[21.] The "New Testament precedent" for this, bro. Plumb, if you please? Besides, by the same mode of reasoning, all the congregations in the State of New York, or of the United States, might "act simultaneously," and the "proximity" principle evaporate. More than all this; suppose one congregation decides one way, another, another; the congregation is not considered a church in the proper, Bible sense, and its decision must be set aside for that of the majority of the churches—the diocese! The last vestige of local church independency thus disappears.

[22.] The thing described by bro. Plumb, is Episcopacy itself, so far at least, as the separate congregations and the lay brotherhood are concerned. For this consists in the subjection of the worshipping congregation to a higher or larger body, a plurality of congregations, a diocese. The diocesan bishop is but an incident of such subjection. And even that incident would follow. Somebody must superintend, must oversee this process of submitting questions to the separate congregations, receiving their returns, and declaring the issue. And this declaration is authoritative over all the congregations in the diocese. Otherwise there will be no "association, no joint and harmonious action" in the church. In case of a tie in the votes of the separate congregations, this "joint and harmonious action" of the diocese, will require that this somebody give his casting vote. Call him by what name you please, or by no name, he exercises quite as much power over the separate congregations and their preachers, as does the "speaker of the House" over that body. He is, *de facto*, a diocesan bishop, though with less power, perhaps, at first, than all such bishops, in the course of a few generations, never fail to accumulate. And this power must either be "delegated" or usurped.

[23.] The liberty of individual Christians, of the worshipping congregations, and their preachers, would be as much infringed by the diocesan church of Utica or of New York as it would be by "the church of the United States." Nay, it would be more so, for this obvious reason. A widely extended ecclesiastical connexion, as Bro. Plumb understands, is less conveniently, in other words, less efficiently managed than a smaller one.—That is to say, the single congregations are left more to themselves, and are subject to less rigid supervision and less thorough control. For this reason the high church party in England, are, at this moment, engaged in a fierce struggle for a subdivision of the dioceses of the church of England. The Presbyterian "church of the U. States" would be next to powerless and nominal, without its Synods and Presbyteries. What could the Methodist Episcopal "church of the U. States" do with the Methodist "societies" or congregations, with-

same sense that all the Christians in Utica constitute the church of Utica; because they are not sufficiently contiguous to act in democratic joint concert; [24.] and I do not propose, nor does our one church principle require, what you infer from the premises, "a conclave of cardinals" or a "diocesan Episcopal" authority to administer the affairs of the church. [25.] If the Christians of a province were to attempt to act as a single church, they must resort to delegated representation, which would involve such a departure from the democratic independence of the local church as would be "an approximation to popery." But in every village, town, and city, democratic action of the whole body may be had, as has already been shown. [26.] and, therefore, your charge of "Episcopacy" falls to the ground. At any rate, until you can show, from the New Testament, more than one, strictly independent church in a place, or that the circumstances of Christians have, since, so changed as to render such an arrangement necessary, your views must be considered UNSCRIPTURAL and SCHISMATIC. [27.]

out its smaller conferences, districts, presiding elders, quarterly meetings, &c., &c. The papacy itself would be powerless, without its minister subdivisions of the church universal.

[21.] Why could not all the churches in the U. States vote on a given question, as well as all the churches in London? It might take a longer time, and afford fewer chances for arbitrary control—a less convenient field for Episcopal supervision—and so much the better.

[22.] An Arch Episcopate or Cardinalship is only an incident to be sure, scarcely worth debating about. But in fact, there with the papacy on top of the whole of them, have grown out of the feeling that some protection was needed, from the rigor of diocesan control, particularly in the cities. This single argument as we know, has always reconciled Paris and Madrid, and other great cities, to the authority of the papacy. Roman Catholics in New York City have argued, in my hearing, that the paternal protection of the pope, was sometimes necessary to shield both people and priests from the otherwise intolerable arrogance of an unreasonable bishop. Such appeals from Catholics in this country to Rome, are not uncommon, and sometimes bring a timely redress of grievances. Were I under the jurisdiction of a city diocese, in any city of my acquaintance, and could not escape from its control, I should be strongly tempted to vote for a court of appeal somewhere. And the farther off the better. Japan would be even better, for an American, than Rome. "A diocesan authority, to administer the affairs of the church" that is subdivided into several separate congregations devoid of proper church authority, is indispensable, of course, if "the affairs of the church" are to be "administered" at all.

[23.] All Episcopacies in America, including the Methodist and the Romish, have been defended on the score of their "democratic" tendencies and bearing. One of the most eloquent appeals of this sort, I ever heard, was from a Romanist, and I most candidly confess that I think he succeeded in showing, that in some important particulars, the Romish polity, in America, unconnected as it here is, with the civil power, was less rigorous and overbearing than that of the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational sects, of this country. The "democracy" that can vote, or nullify, or reverse the decisions of a worshipping Christian assembly, so far as that assembly itself is concerned, denying to such an assembly the full power and authority of an independent church of Christ, in "the Bible use" of the term—reserving that name and that authority solely for a diocese of associated churches, I need not largely discuss. Whatever affinity it may have with the democracies of "the Gentiles" it is not stamped with the features of liberty and equality, of moral responsibility and simple allegiance to Jesus Christ, by which his churches should be distinguished.

[27.] The old Episcopal argument against Congregational church independence is here faithfully repeated, not omitting the customary anathemas of contumacious dissenters, (mildly expressed to be sure) for the "sin of schism" and backed up, as usual, with the high church claim of "jura divino, (authority divine!)" All I have ever intimated of the strong tendencies towards Episcopacy and Romanism, of certain loose and vague notions of "Christian Union" prevailing in Central New York, and incidentally in the late "Union Herald" are here fully realized, and my repeated remonstrances against them are justified.

In conclusion, I would say, it appeared to me, that in your review of both the Peterboro creed and the sentiments of the church of Christ of Utica, you took the worst view you could of the two documents, instead of putting that liberal construction upon the language which in all Christian candor you was bound to do. But this, I trust, resulted, not from a want of disposition to be fair, but from an honest zeal, to guard against what you feared might lead to an infringement of local church independence. Yours fraternally,

DAVID PLUMB.

UTICA, June 12, 1844.

As to the demand that I shall "show from the New Testament more than one strictly independent church in a place," &c.,—it will be in season to urge this demand when there shall be occasion for it;—which will not be until it shall first have been "shown from the New Testament," that there were, in apostolic times, churches "in the Bible use" of that term, churches having bishops and deacons, "visibly associated for joint and harmonious action" that were not statally "gathered together"—"in one place" for the worship of God, and the transaction of church business; and "strictly independent" of any other body of men. Whoever can do this, will have achieved what none of the learned bishops of the church of England, a thousand times challenged to the trial, have never found it convenient to attempt, though filling volumes with the traditions of "the Fathers" and "precedents" drawn from the so called "primitive" in distinction from the apostolic period of the church, in order to make out the antiquity of church authority over a plurality of separate congregations.—My excellent brother Plumb, whose ardent desire for the correct apprehension and speedy restoration of Christian liberty and union, connected with scriptural church order, I have never, for a moment doubted, will pardon my frankness when I tell him that I suspect he has hardly been long enough out of the Methodist Episcopal church to be certain of having divested himself wholly of the Episcopal conception of a church, or to understand distinctly what the Congregational church independence implies and requires.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

GERRIT SMITH'S THIRD LETTER.

For the Christian Investigator.

PETERBORO, June 17, 1844.

William Goodell:

My Dear Brother,—I have read the last number of the Christian Investigator. Never was there a better or more timely one than the tract in it entitled: "Are you a Christian?" Would that every family in the land had a copy of it! I suppose, that it is, or soon will be, printed in a pamphlet form. Please send me as many copies of it, as the enclosed five dollars will purchase.

And now to your letter in this Number. My chief complaint of you was, that you substituted your own, or other men's fancies, for the real positions of the "Church of Peterboro." In this letter, you complain of me for saying, that certain views of yours lead to "sectarianism" and "schism" (1.) Now, had I charged you with believing in this tendency, I should, indeed, have been uncharitable. (2.) But it was only my own belief, which I expressed; and I neither thought, nor intimated, that yours coincided with it. (3.) I cheerfully admit, that you hate "sectarianism" and "schism," as much as I do. Nevertheless, both you and I may cherish views tending to this very thing, which we so much hate.

NOTES IN REPLY.

[1.] Not precisely so, brother Smith. I did not complain of you. I only remarked that you had said so, and for the purpose of saying explicitly, in that connection, that I "should do no such thing" as to complain of you, for the honest expression of your opinions in such cases. Read it again, and see, if you please.

[2.] And, in my March Review, I was very careful to say, from beginning to end, that I did not charge brother Smith with believing in those tendencies of his theory, that I thought would be found to result from it, if I understood it aright.

[3.] Just so in my March Review, only with this difference: I was careful to add, that I was not certain of understanding correctly your meaning.

I will only add on this point, and then dismiss it, as I hope forever, that, if, through carelessness or prejudice, you have misapprehended and misstated some of the positions of the Church of Peterboro, yours is an offence so much higher than that, which any wrong reasonings of mine on your admitted positions constitute, that you should not have compared the one with the other. (4.)

I need not follow you through your long letter; it will suffice, if I give my view of the difference between a local church and the church of the whole earth, or the church of a nation, or state, or county. Thousands and ten thousands of persons may entertain the same view. But as I know not that any one does, I own, that it would be but modest in me to have doubts of its correctness;—and, yet, I cannot say that I have such doubts.

1st. The church of the whole earth is, to use your own admission in your own language, "the entire body of true Christians on earth." And, I think, that, after this admission, and in view of the obvious requirements of analogy, (5) you will not deny, that it is strictly proper to speak of the church of a Nation, of a State, of a County—and to speak of each of them, as comprising "the entire body of true Christians" within its respective limits. (6.)

2nd. A local church includes a part of the church of the whole earth, or Nation, or State, or County—viz.: those Christians, who are, or who are in circumstances to be, fellow worshippers.

I have given you, in these few words, my view of the difference between a local and any other church. And, now you will search me with interrogatories for the purpose of proving the unsoundness of this view.

1st. You will ask me, if I believe it right to have office-bearers in a local church. I will answer, that I do.

2nd. You will then ask me, if I do not believe it right to have them in other than local churches. I will answer, that I do not.

3d. You will then ask me, why I do not—saying that I make a local differ from another church, in comprehensiveness only, and only as a part differs from the whole. I will answer, that office-bearing, discipline, the sacraments, &c. &c., are, in their very nature, arrangements for a local

[1.] On this point, our mutual readers must judge. I am not conscious of prejudice. And I have certainly devoted my best powers to the task of understanding brother Smith's theory. Yet, even now, after all brother Smith's earnest and honest disclaimers, when compared with other parts of his letters, I must confess myself almost as much at a loss for the meaning of the creed of the church of Peterboro, as I was at the beginning. If this is my "high offense," it is one that I cannot help committing, until I can, some how, get more light, or better optics.

[5.] "The requirements of analogy!" Brother Smith has strongly, and ever indignantly disclaimed the holding of the idea that the churches local, and the more extensive churches, (the National and Universal,) are churches in the same sense; and the implication that he reasoned from the one to the other. Even now he intimates that it must have been through "prejudice" or "carelessness," that I supposed it possible that the Peterboro creed could have embodied that view. How is it then, that brother Smith brings up again as fresh as ever the analogy, the likeness between the local churches and the church universal? If this analogy has any foundation, then they are churches in the same sense. Admit the propriety of thus reasoning from analogy in this matter, and we admit all that any advocate of an Universal or Catholic church government ever asked, or need ask!

When I admitted the existence of the one invisible and spiritual church universal, I did so in connection with a denial that it was a church in the same sense with smaller bodies of Christians, distinguished by the place they might inhabit. And thus I denied the propriety of running analogies between them, on subjects connected with outward and visible arrangements.

[6.] And the "analogy" requires much more than this. The New Testament however, never speaks of any such national and provincial churches: a pretty strong proof that it does not recognize any such analogy.

church only (7.) Their legitimate end is the benefit of fellow worshippers; the greater purity and profit of such worshippers. In these arrangements, (remember, that I regard them, as no part of the organization of a church,) we see the social duties of fellow worshippers—not the duties of Christians in England toward Christians in America, or of Christians in Ohio toward Christians in Vermont. (8.) I would add, that the Bible does not touch, that the church of the whole earth (a church recognized by the Bible, as you do yourself admit) has, or should have, office-bearers (9,) and that hence it would be doing manifest violence to analogy (10) to suppose, that any other church, not made up of fellow worshippers, should have them. I would also add, that a local church, is, or should be, entirely independent, (11) and that it could not be so, if churches including it had office-bearers.

Now, what think you, Brother Goodell, of my very brief and simple explanations of these matters, (12) about which there has been so many centuries, so much learned and elaborate disagreement! (13) Do you think them quite too brief and

[7.] But what if "analogy" should suggest provisions for church "discipline" in the church of the country, the state, the nation, the whole earth, as well as in the local church?

[8.] "Analogy" appears to be somewhat unceremoniously dismissed, just at this point. But when I understand *analogy*, instead of the New Testament, gets fast hold of the reins, the usurper is not quite so easily displaced. Church history, and br. Plumb's letter prove this.

[9.] True—and this accords with another fact, viz: that "the bible does not teach" us any thing about the "analogy" (in matters pertaining to organization, officers and discipline,) between "the church of the whole earth" and any other churches.

[10.] "Violence to analogy?" "Violence to the bible," you should have said, br. Smith. Violence is done to the Catholic "analogy" whenever the teachings of the bible are introduced in their stead.

[11.] Certainly, the local churches should be independent. But they never were, and never will be, where this doctrine of "analogy" takes the lead. No argument against local church independency was ever framed without recourse to it. No available defense of such church independency was ever made without a repudiation of it. We cannot start the race under the acknowledged authority of "analogy," and then bolt from its course the moment it conducts us away from our favorite notions on the subject of church independency, or any thing else. We must select our guide and follow it.—If an imaginary analogy be our rule of faith and practice, we must follow it, and abide the issue. But if the New Testament be our directory, we should follow that; and not halt between two standards.

[12.] Rather more "brief" than "simple," brother Smith. Before I am aware of it the praise of *simplicity*, I must be able to understand it in its practical operation, and also how its several parts harmonize with each other. I must have the "apparent discrepancies" reconciled, that I have pointed out. I must see the theory that is so simple *carried out*, and not *dodged* every time that it conflicts with the usages that are found to be indispensable, or acknowledged to be scriptural. I must be able to reconcile it with *existing facts*, and with New Testament testimony and precept. Before I can praise its simplicity, I must find at least, two independent thinkers and actors, in different locations, who, starting upon the same "simple" theory, explain it alike, and carry it out into the same results. I must see how brothers Smith and Plumb can contrive to agree, in the workings of the theory.

[13.] The theory that identifies the church invisible and universal with the church visible and organized, and traces analogies between them, (however simple it may seem,) is the very theory that "has been, for so many centuries," the source of "so much learned and elaborate disagreement." Recognizes, Episcopals, and semi-Episcopals of all grades, have all started with this same doctrine of "analogy," and their "learned and elaborate disagreements" have arisen either from their different apprehensions of the "simple" theory itself, or from their different degrees of fidelity, in carrying the principle into practice. In our own day, Mr. Garrison and his friends have given us a new variety of these "disagreements;" br. Smith has preached a second, and br. Plumb a third. How many more shapes the "simple" theory is capable of being bent into, time must determine. In a recent conversation with an intelligent advocate of

simple to be true? (14) Their very brevity and simplicity are arguments with me that they are true. (15.)

the Peterboro creed, we met with another variety of explanation and application, at variance both with br. Plumb and br. Smith!

[11.] No—Nor am I prepared to abandon that, which is moved by existing facts, or by the Bible to be true, because people do not think it sufficiently "simple." We live in a world where there are many things existing in fact, which, to us, appear inconveniently complex. A great deal of patient Bible inquiry and investigation might indeed be spared, if some labor saving machine could be devised, to "simplify" the works of creation and Providence, and make them less "manifest" than God and Nature have made them. No that would rightly understand the things that exist, must take pains to understand them *as they are*, and not as his own notions of "simplicity" would have made them. Were it otherwise, there would be no occasion to "search after wisdom, as after hid treasures." It would be, as error now does, upon the surfaces of all things.

[15.] So reasons the Roman Catholic, when he magnifies this same rule of "unity" on this same subject of church order, and makes the matter *simple* enough, in all conscience, (for all despotisms are proverbially simple) by bringing the practice into unity with the theory. "Unity and simplicity" are ever his watch-words; and these are his arguments to prove that his theory is true!

But the truth is, the rage for *apparent simplicity* has been, and still is, a most prolific source of the greatest, and most complex errors, both, in theology and science. There is a never ceasing restlessness after something "more simple" than the revelations either of nature or scripture. Imputation of living in so complex and paradoxical an universe as one compounded of both matter and spirit, and longing to get rid "of so much elaborate and learned" research as a knowledge of such an universe requires, one sect of philosophers would "simplify" the universe by resolving it all into matter, and making the soul itself to be only a modification of certain particles and gases: hence the theory of *materialism*. Another sect, in search of the same idealized "simplicity," but starting off in a different direction, sets up pure spirit, intellect, intelligence, as the comprehension of the entire universe; and what appears to be matter, is affirmed to be only the peculiar modification, symbol, expression, or form of some invisible spirit: hence the complex systems of *idealism*—*pantheism*—*Spinozism*—which virtually make the Creator and his creation to be one!—No creation but the Creator—and no Creator but the creation; and all this under the name of a transcendent spirituality that cannot brook the complexity or presence of any material substance at all!

Very closely akin to these anxious identifications of matter and spirit, (in fact resulting from them) do I regard the theory, by whomsoever held, and however applied, that identifies the church, spiritual, invisible, and universal, with the church local, visible, and organized, that reasons from the one to the other—that runs analogies between them. The philosophy of *materialism*, by bringing down the church spiritual to the outward arrangements of the church visible, supplies us with the Romish Catholicism. The philosophy of an exclusive *spiritualism*, by attempting to elevate the church visible, to the transcendental glories of the church invisible, supplies us with the new school of no church officers, church discipline, or outward church organization.

Misled by the love of a mistaken simplicity, one class of theologians discard the complex theory of the "three that have reigned in heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and which three are one"—A theory which they cannot reduce to their notions of simplicity, and they think that much "learned and elaborate disagreement" may be avoided by discarding it. Another, not say the same, but are impatient of the complexity, and want of simplicity, observable in the doctrine of two different states of human beings in eternity, and of opposite awards, "according to the (complex) deeds" done here in the body. And so they simplify away the "great gulf" between Divine and Lateral. And in all ages, there have been multitudes of philosophers who would reduce the complex moral world into simplicity, by virtually repudiating the perplexing distinctions between moral good and evil, about which, "for so many centuries," there has been so much "learned and elaborate disagreement." The old search after the philosopher's stone, and the new one after the machine-deity (perpetual motion) that shall cause its own motions, or be self-caused, are only instances and illustrations of the unphilosophical mania after a *simplicity* that truth knows not.

There is another point on which you press me, I spoke of the villagers of Peterboro, and Siloam, and Munnsville, in Madison county. The first is only six miles from the last, and Siloam midway between them. The church in each is a divine organization; and divine though it be, I nevertheless admit, that the members of the Siloam church can, and may, break up that church; and one part of them go to the Peterboro and the other part of them to the Munnsville church. (16) But, that there should be such a power of man over a divine organization is, in your eye, impossible, and the supposition of it utterly absurd. (17) I will, in a few words vindicate this supposition, and illustrate the possibility of this power: (18) and then I will close my letter, which, brief as it is, I really have not time to make longer. Twenty persons dwell under the same roof, and dwell together. They constitute a family; and a family is a divine organization. The heaven-appointed duties, of their heaven-appointed relations rest upon them. Notwithstanding, however, the divinity of the family constitution, it is referred of God to their own judgment and discretion whether they shall continue to abide in one family, or divide. They divide into several families. The divine family organization, nevertheless, follows and attaches to the several divisions. In the course of time, they judge it best to reunite; and then again, these several divinely organized families constitute, as before, one divinely organized family. Similar to this is the God-given liberty of the members of the Churches of Peterboro, Siloam and Munnsville. (19.) What I have said

[16.] What can this mean, if it does not mean an admission that the creed of the church of Peterboro was incorrect, when in such strong and pointed language, it *denied* that any "human arrangements" whatever, could prevent all the Christians in Peterboro from constituting "the church of Peterboro," which "is a divine organization." WAS a church, "ALL HUMAN ARRANGEMENTS to the CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING?" That there WERE members who did not CONSENT to be members? If br. Smith's admission does not admit that this was an error, what DOES it admit?

[17.] How is this? I thought it was br. Smith's theory, and not mine, that made it impossible and absurd to suppose that man could have anything to do with organizing, or with breaking up a church that was a *divine organization*? Those who heard us debate at Syracuse—those who read the Peterboro creed, the March Review, &c. &c., will have understood, if I mistake not, that I have maintained, while br. Smith has *denied* the possibility and the congruity of a simultaneous and co-operative unity of a *divine AND a human* agency in the organizing and breaking up of divinely constituted Christian churches. But now, br. Smith speaks as though "such a power of man over a divine organization" was an impossibility and an absurdity in my eyes—not in *his* eyes!

Very likely br. Smith may have his eye upon what I said in my June number; for it was to *this* that he was replying. But what did I say *there*, about the impossibility and the absurdity of human activity in organizing or breaking up of churches of Christ? Simply this: that it would be an impossibility, and an absurdity upon the principle of br. Smith, and the Peterboro creed—a contradiction of their statements in direct terms.—And who, I desire to know, can fail to see that?

[18.] And if successful, br. Smith, you will *illustrate* the truthfulness of my argument, to the same point, in the Christian Investigator of April, 1847—then verbally repeated in the Syracuse convention—and yet again in my March Review; in all of which, I maintained the possibility of such power, in opposition to the prevalent tone of the late "Union Herald"—the well known maxims of leading "Unionists" in central New York, the Peterboro creed, and the Syracuse speeches of Gerdt Smith.

[19.] Very well said, br. Smith. And a letter illustration of the correctness of my theory, in opposition to that expressed in the language of the Peterboro creed, and in the arguments of br. Smith, could not easily be penned. The church and the family are *not* *divine organizations*. Yet learn to let us have to do with organizing and disbanding them—will, forming them and with "breaking them up." They are *not* of MERE divine organization—"all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding."

does, by no means, imply a sanction of all the shiftings of church relations. (29.) The reasons for many of them are insufficient. If the husband leaves his wife for any other reason than that she is an adulteress; if the daughter quits her parents for no other reason than that she is weary of serving the aged and sick; their separations are unjustifiable. So too, if members of the Church of Salem leave it, not because they have ceased to regard it as a true Church of Christ, but because the Church of Peterboro being more Arminian, is more to their taste, or because they prefer the Church of Munsville, on account of its being more Calvinistic, then are their secessions to be condemned as sectarian and schismatic. Your friend and brother,

GERKIT SMITH.

When the heads of a family mutually select their partners for life, and rear up a family of children—when, as the marriage of a son, or a daughter, the family separates for a season, and then, for convenience, or the better discharge of their duties, or the better enjoyment of the family relation, they come together again, Bro. Smith will not seriously insist, (will he?) that in all this, human beings and “human arrangements” have nothing to do with organizing the family—with disbanding it—and then, reorganizing it again?

If he does deny this, then his “illustration” fails of its object. It does not prove the “power of man over a divine organization.” If he does not deny this, then he cannot deny my doctrine, that human beings are active in the organization of Christian churches.

[20] Certainly not. And all such shiftings I have never sanctioned, though I do not admit that all injudicious and unwise shiftings involve the sin of Schism, any more than I would admit, that all unwise and injudicious subdivisions of families into smaller ones, involve a rebellion against the divine family relation. Bro. Smith will not, probably, claim that this illustration corroborates the divinely appointed jurisdiction of churches over a given territory, any more than it does the “proximity” principle of Bro. Plumb.

WM. GOODELL.

For the Christian Investigator.

EXPRESSION OF SENTIMENTS, & COVENANT OF THE CHURCH AT CANASTOTA, MADISON CO., N. Y.

We, whose names are here enrolled as members of a Christian assembly, or church, adopt, as an expression of our sentiments, the following truths:

There is one Infinite Being, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, infinite in wisdom, justice, and mercy.

We avouch this Infinite One to be our God, our Comforter, Sanctifier, and Redeemer:

We receive His will, expressed in the command on which hang all the law and the prophets, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself,” as our law, paramount to all others, and the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as his inspired word, “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished into all good works.”

We believe that God made man upright, in his own image; but that in consequence of transgression, mankind have altogether become vile, alienated from God by wicked works—that without the grace of God, “there is none that doeth good, no, not one.”

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world to be a propitiation for our sins, and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world. That he took on him the seed of Abraham, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death—even the death of the cross. “He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities.” “The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all”—That he arose from the dead and ascended to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God, where he is exalted to be a Prince and a Savior, and ever liveth to make

intercession for us, “to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sin.”

We believe in the office work of the Holy Spirit, “to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment,” to regenerate and sanctify, through the truth, all that believe in Jesus. “Ye have purified your hearts, by obeying the truth, through the Spirit.”

We believe that the salvation of Jesus, is a salvation from sin. “He shall save his people from their sins,” by a renewal of God’s image, and divine spiritual life in the soul; thus bringing the will of the creature into sweet accord with the will and righteousness of the Creator—rendering a hearty and habitual compliance with all the commands of our Heavenly King, and Redeemer.

We believe that those, and those only, who confess Jesus with the lips, and believe on him with the heart, and take up their cross and follow him, and continue in patient well-doing and perseverance unto the end, will be saved.

We believe that “He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained.”

We believe that a Christian church is an assembly of believers, that love, cherish, and profess the fundamental truths of the gospel, “doing justly, loving mercy and walking humbly with God, visiting the widow and the fatherless in their affliction, and keeping themselves unspotted from the world.”

That all Christians, by virtue of their spiritual relations to Christ, are members of his church—members of his body, and therefore entitled to all the benefits, and privileges of the Christian Church.

We believe that while each child of God is a member of his church, by virtue of his faith in Christ, yet, he has made it the duty of his people to associate together, and unite their strength on principles of a simple, and common faith, for the promotion of the interests of his kingdom in their own localities, that they may bear each others’ burdens, and aid each other, by council, sympathy, and prayer, combining their energies to overcome evil, and to do good.

We believe that all who give evidence of Christian character, furnish the only essential requisite to entitle them to Christian fellowship. That nothing can justify a withdrawal from such of Christian fellowship, but a forfeiture of Christian character—a denial of fundamental Christian truth—or a continued violation of the fundamental principles of Christian morality.

We regard the separation of the friends of the Redeemer into sects, founded on distinctions which may exist without the forfeiture of Christian character, as anti-Christian—as fraught with incalculable mischief to the church, and the world; a prolific source of jealousy, envy, rivalry, spiritual pride, and ambition, as creating, and fostering the worst passions of the human heart, and rending the seamless garment of our Savior.

We believe that Christ, for the promotion of order and purity in his church, has established other rules of discipline. We acknowledge only those of his own establishing, laid down in the 16th chapter of the gospel of Matthew.

We believe in the perfect equality of the brotherhood, as having an equal and mutual right to call and dismiss ministers, to select officers, and to do whatsoever pertains to the duty or privilege of the church of God. We believe that all power is vested in the body itself, assembled in one place. We reject the doctrine that power can be delegated, rightfully, to sessions or presbyteries, to consistories or synods or assemblies, to elders, conferences or bishops. We regard it as subversive of the order and simplicity of Christ’s house, as tending to spiritual corruption and despotism.

We believe in the institution of the Sabbath, but only as a means to a high spiritual end, possessing no inherent efficacy, or holiness; and im-

proved right, and in accordance with its design, when employed in improving man’s spiritual nature, and relieving the wants of needy humanity.

We believe in the ordinance of baptism, and the Lord’s supper; but we regard them only as a means to an end—as shadows to the substance—as having no virtue of themselves; and as to the modes of their administration, we regard them as wholly non-essential.

COVENANT.

Believing the doctrine, that all men by nature, are the children of one common Father, possessing rights inalienable, God-given, and sacred—believing that we should cherish towards all, a brotherly love—believing that both nature and grace call aloud for the enfranchisement of our race—for the heavy burdens which have crushed them to the earth by violence and wrong, to be cast from their necks—believing that our God is a Father to the fatherless, and a refuge to the oppressed, an avenger of the wronged, the widows’ God and the orphans’ friend, and professing, as the children of our spiritual Father, the philanthropy of God, we, therefore, covenant with each other, and with God, in God’s name, and by God’s grace, to consecrate ourselves, and our all, to the elevation of the poor, the deliverance of the oppressed, the defence of the wronged, to the promotion of temperance, Godliness, and peace—to the diffusion of light and holiness—to the restoration of the world to its rightful Sovereign, and to the full enjoyment of those inalienable rights and prerogatives which came from the hand of God in creation, to the enjoyment of which, prophecy points and Providence tends, when Jesus shall have accomplished his mission on earth, and a millennium of righteous and impartial law, and love, shall gild the abodes of men, and fill them with light and liberty and glory.

MINISTERIAL DELINQUENCY AND ITS CAUSES.

N. E. JOHNSON AND THE N. Y. OBSERVER.

The sad fall of Nathaniel E. Johnson, and his deposition from the ministry & excommunication by the Presbytery of Newark, N. J., for “the use of intoxicating drinks,” for drunkenness, licentiousness, and attendance on the theatre, have been the theme of abundant comment in the papers, and have been matter of grief and lamentation to every pious heart to whom the unwelcome story has been carried. Standing as this case does among the large number of similar cases that, within a few years past, have astounded the community, and furnished such incontestible evidence of prevailing iniquity in high places as should cover the churches and ministry in sackcloth, we should not, perhaps, have felt called upon to make it a subject of distinct record or of special comment, in our little monthly sheet, had it not been for the characteristic and very unfair efforts of the editors of the New York Observer to make this case subservient to their own systematic opposition to those ministers and Christians who are obnoxious to them and to the public on the score of their activity and consistency in opposing the very class of vices to which Mr. Johnson fell a victim, and for insisting that the churches and ministry should be purified from such practices, and bear testimony against them! The following are the paragraphs of the Observer to which we allude:

We feel that it is proper for us in recording the deposition of this individual, to refer briefly to some facts in the history of the case that will be of value to those who are accustomed to look seriously into the causes and relations of such deplorable events.

“He has been distinguished for many years as a leader in those measures which we mentioned last week as tending to corrupt the moral sensibilities of those engaged in them. In the pulpit, on the platform and in the press, he has been one of the loudest in their advocacy, while those who have sought more judicious and scriptural means to promote moral reforms, have been denounced as behind the age.”

That Mr. Johnson has been a member of temperance, anti-slavery, and perhaps of moral reform societies, we do not deny. The editors of the *Observer*, too, if we mistake not, have belonged to temperance if not total societies. And they have strongly insisted that their favorite colonization society, was, in fact, "the best anti-slavery society." They have advocated the old gradual Manumission Societies, and also the "Female Benevolent Society" professing to seek, by other methods, the same objects sought by the societies of "moral reform."

And yet they would "denounce" as leading to these same vices to be eradicated, an active advocacy of those other societies that are distinguished chiefly for insisting upon an entire and immediate abandonment of vicious practices, instead of a partial or future abandonment of them! They would have it believed that Mr. Johnson fell into drunkenness because he advocated entire abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, instead of advocating a general abstinence from distilled liquors only! That he fell into licentiousness, because he had believed, that something should be done to prevent young men and women from becoming licentious, and to urge the claims of the seventh commandment, as well as to provide an asylum for degraded females! That he fell into theater-going, because he had associated with those who have been most zealous against theaters! That he was seduced into the brothel, by the Cincinatti doctrine that the great southern brothel of slaveholding ought to be immediately abolished!

How lamentable that there should be a stupidity, (and in the churches too, and in the ministry,) that could be delighted and deluded with such absurdities! And how marvellous that "those who are accustomed to look seriously into the causes and relations of such deplorable events" should never have inquired "seriously" into the tendencies and the propensities of placing and retaining, for years, by clerical acclamation, and without a blush, the notoriously profligate Henry Clay, in the Presidential chair of the Colonization Society! Or are we to infer that in the Colonization Society, licentiousness, and duelling, and theatre going, and slave holding, along with "the use of intoxicating drinks," are not particularly disgraceful; that "a missionary institution for evangelizing Africa" is honored with the incarnation of those vices at its head, while public sentiment expects and requires the prompt excommunication of the abolitionist who shall have been found guilty of similar practices?

And then, what shall we make of the philosophy that decides against the moral tendencies of an institution because some of its members, in manifest violation of its known principles, commit criminal acts? Mr. Johnson was a member of an Anti-Slavery Society. He fell into vice. Therefore "those who are accustomed to look seriously into the causes and relations of such deplorable events" must gravely insinuate the demoralizing tendencies of Anti-Slavery Societies! But Mr. Johnson was also a member of a Presbytery! Shall we therefore infer the demoralizing tendency of Presbyteries? Have the editors of the *N. Y. Observer* measured the length of their weapon? Do they foresee by what hands and against whom it might be wielded? What would they say, if an infidel should point them to the case of a Hymenas, an Alexander, a Judas, and commend them to their own logic? What do they make of the late fall of Bishop Onderdonk! and of the fall of the scores of highly "conservative" clergymen that have fallen, within a few years past?

While we do not claim for any institution, divine or human, or for any department of benevolent or reformatory or Christian enterprise, that the persons belonging to, or enlisted in them, are therefore, or from any cause, free from the assaults of temptation, and the danger of falling into gross transgressions, we feel it incumbent on

us to correct the false impressions the *N. Y. Observer* has made, in respect to the facts of this case.

It is not true that the position of Mr. Johnson, at any time, has been such as the editors of the *Observer* describe it to have been. We have known him from his early youth, and though in common with, perhaps, all who then knew him, we regarded him as a pious young man, of fine genius and high promise, and have since been deeply interested in his course, and regarded him with a favorable, and perhaps, (in our own case,) with a partial eye, in remembrance of his early promise, yet we have no recollection of the time, when he was accounted an effective laborer, much less a "leader"—a "distinguished leader in those measures" against which the *N. Y. Observer* never fails to vent its malignity and spite. An "ultraist" he has never been esteemed. His temperament and policy have always been, on controverted topics, of the moderate and so called "conservative" caste. At a very early period of his ministry and even while finishing his theological studies, he came into intimacy with prominent ministers of that stamp, and decidedly under an influence from them, and from which he is not known to have since escaped. It was soon seen, to the concern of some of his early friends, that the stern and uncompromising theology and ethics, in which he had been first trained, before leaving New England, had suffered a diluting process from this cause. He was much courted, not to say flattered, by his new clerical patrons in the Presbyterian church, and though trained a rigid independant, soon became Presbyterian. The most unhappy change noticed in him was, a partial loss of that marked sobriety, modesty, and humility, bordering on diffidence, that had characterized his collegiate course, and the appearances of an incipient vanity, inflation, effort at display, and anticipation of clerical preferment, in its stead. Thenceforward, he was decidedly, and before long, somewhat unusually, tenacious and conscious, of the dignity of the clerical caste.

He was a member of the notorious Third Presbytery of New York city that deposed the saint McDowall, so much to the gratification of the editors and patrons of the *N. Y. Observer*. He was present at the trial, and though professedly a warm friend McDowall, and freely declaring, in conversation with the friends of that holy man that he considered him innocent and wronged, he scarcely uttered a syllable before the Presbytery in his earnest defence, and on the ground of his innocence and his wrongs. Some verbal and technical objections to the proceedings he indeed made—little, if any thing beside. He took a temporizing course. From such men as Absalom Peters, and Thomas H. Skinner, and Erskine Mason, and Henry G. Ludlow, the wicked persecutors of McDowall, he could not strongly dissent. From men of their standing he could not consent to disavow himself. And he did not. If he voted (and we are not quite certain, now, whether he did) against the deposing of McDowall,* it was on mere technical, frivolous grounds, not on the intrinsic merits of the case. And his influence was with the Presbytery, after the trial. Of the outrageous course and usurpations of the Presbytery on that occasion, the subsequent proceedings of the Synod that afterwards reviewed them, may tell their own story. When such conservatives as Dr. Spring and other men of like stamp and standing, are forced, by a sense of shame, and for the sake of common decency, to bear witness in favor of a despised "ultraist" and "fanatic" like McDowall, and against the high handed misdeeds of his ecclesiastical persecutors, little more needs be said. Of Mr. Johnson's connexion with that affair, and with the "Moral Reform" enterprise, afterwards, it is sufficient to add that the friends of McDowall and his meas-

* Some of the friends of truth in N. Y. city can probably assert this, with more precision, his vote on that occasion.

ures, never relied on him, afterwards, whatever they may have previously done. There was some time when they had confided in Wheatright and Starr, and others whom the *N. Y. Observer* and clerical allies, afterwards seduced from their integrity, along with poor Johnson, and many more.

When Mr. Johnson took charge of the *New York Evangelist*, he did so, at the instance, and under the auspices of "moderate" "conservative" patrons, particularly clergymen, who eagerly seized the opportunity of getting that important journal under their control and lowering down the high moral standard it had previously maintained. Mr. Johnson was relied upon for this service, although the influence of such men as Peter Patton, Skinner, &c., that service was satisfactorily and but too successfully performed. Sermons, and not "the leaders" of the reformatory measures deprecated by the *N. Y. Observer*, were his counsellors and associates.* The paper, to great extent, was shaped to meet the views, and secure the co-operation of such men. With some what of a flourish of trumpets, this change of policy was hinted at, in the early editorials of Mr. Johnson. Under the care of Joshua Leavitt, the paper had become too ultra, too "loose"—too democratic, too much under the influence of the liberty, too little obsequious to the caste. It had advocated the congregational independency of the churches. Under Mr. Johnson it was assiduously brought back to Presbyterianism. The prerogatives of the "Constitutional Assembly" became prominent. This unity, at all events, of the New School Presbyterian church, was the all absorbing object of editorial effort. To secure so indispensable an object, it was essential that the anti-slavery question should not be suffered to divide it. Yet, for this object, along with others, the *N. Y. Evangelist* must continue to be an anti-slavery paper—must have anti-slavery support must keep its hold on the anti-slavery portion of the Presbyterian church. Who could have accomplished these ends, better than Nathaniel E. Johnson? He was an abolitionist to be sure, and none other than an abolitionist could do such a service. He was an abolitionist, but a "constitutional," a "conservative" abolitionist. He was an abolitionist, and so, it was said, were Patton, Ludlow, &c. and even Skinner was almost or quite claimed to be one with them.

The *N. Y. Evangelist*, under Mr. Johnson, was always persuading Presbyterian abolitionists that there were some very special reasons why the last General Assembly could not take decided action against slavery, but the very next Assembly would certainly do the subject full justice. When the time came, and the "volcano was" coolly "capped for three years," Mr. Johnson's *Evangelist* assured us it was about the best thing that could be done, but that every thing would come out right, at next session. As that appointed time drew near, the Editor, urged on by his anti-slavery patrons and correspondents, went so far as to say that some definite anti-slavery action of the General Assembly was to be expected, and was due to the churches. The *N. Y. Observer* took up on the other side, and a fierce contest ensued. The time comes, and the General Assembly follows the advice and fulfils the predictions of the *N. Y. Observer*, instead of those of the *Evangelist*. The *Evangelist* thereupon succumbs, and congratulates the abolitionists on the encouraging progress of the Assembly! At every step, the downward course of the new school Presbyterian church and General Assembly has been endorsed by Mr.

* Though residing in New York city, a number of years, and a prominent clergyman of a popular sect, Mr. Johnson was never placed on the National Anti-Slavery Committee—never elected to an office in the National Society, nor, with all his fine talents, selected by the committee for either editor or agent; a sufficient comment on the story of his being a "distinguished leader" among them. We do not recollect ever to have met him at an Anti-Slavery Convention, or heard him make a speech on Temperance, Abolition, or Moral Reform, though it would be strange if he had not sometimes done so.

tion's N. Y. Evangelist. Abolitionists in the past time, have been propitiated by such an adroitness and application of their principles as would particularly interfere with the unity of slave-owners and abolitionists in the Presbyterian Church. On the Amistad question, and some other points, a bribe fire was occasionally kept.

But the "compensation" scheme of the *then* Doctors was new vain and revived the editor, in accordance with the ethics of the *then* editor, and while a pliant battle was kept up between the two papers, the Evangelist, by little by little, lowered down its tone, until it finally fell, and before Mr. Johnson left it, very nearly the low level of the *Observer*. To the anti-slavery cause it has done more injury, for its past, than the *Observer* could do. For high scores and perhaps hundreds of abolitionists have dropped the paper in disgust, and many more have been dissatisfied, more or less, with its course, yet a much larger number have confessed, as they would not have done in the *Observer*, till they were imperceptibly drawn down some declining slope along with their editor, nearly or quite ceased to be known as abolitionists.

The paper in the country has exercised a more deleterious effective influence against thorough measures for an anti-slavery reformation in the churches, as the N. Y. Evangelist, under the charge of Mr. Johnson. How many thousands of abolitionists have been prejudiced against those measures by the Evangelist! The misrepresentations related in that paper, in respect to the convention at Penn Yan and at Auburn, were among the most hateful and mischievous missiles ever directed against the anti-slavery cause; and only the greatest difficulty, and after a long delay, in connection with the threatened withdrawal of subscribers, was it found practicable to get a few corrections of those misstatements, by a reply, through its columns. At no time, that paper been open to a discussion of the rect of anti-slavery church reform; while the act of making the slave question a test in the churches, has always been treated by it as identical with infidelity—hostility to the church and disorganization—and schism!

It has been the course of the man, and the influences under which that course has been shaped, so far as his public life has been concerned. How much of a "distinguished leader" has been in the measures the N. Y. *Observer* recites, the reader can judge. What concern his public and private history may have with each other, we do not pretend to do.

We repeat it, there are no outward associations that can secure men from sin. We have no disposition to use the arguments of the N. Y. *Observer* against itself, for we have no confidence, in the philosophy or candor of such logic. As moral effects have their causes, and the N. Y. *Observer* is intent on tracing them, in this sense, we record these facts for the use of "those who are accustomed to look seriously into the causal relations of such deplorable events." And protest, for ourselves and fellow-laborers, against being silenced and put down; in the first place, because our measures are unpopular with leading religious journalists and clergy of the *Observer*; and then, when they may chance to be placed in the balances and found wanting, to let them gazetted as specimens and illustrations of the tendency of the measures they have opposed, and represented as distinguished leaders in a contest in which they were never engaged.

In the following paragraph of the N. Y. *Observer*, which stands in close connection with the preceding extract, the reader will find a more reliable and trustworthy account, of "the causes and effects of such deplorable events." And it fully shows, both the statements and the logic, to the

propagation of which the editors had just before lent themselves, for such unworthy ends:

"He is a noble advocate to the point where he fell into profligate vice, so gradual has been his entrance through the various stages of his apostasy. Indulging in the perusal of beautiful books, neglecting the private duties of a Christian, giving scope to an erratic fancy, dallying with temptation, making occasional and afterwards free use of intoxicating drinks, visiting places of amusement where Christians should never be found, and afterwards haunts where the foulest vice and the deepest shame seek a hiding place and a home, he has gone down step by step to the very lowest depths of degradation, crushing the heart of his family, blasting the happiness of those who looked up to him as an example and guide, filling the church with amazement and grief, and the world with new occasion for reproach and scorn."

And so it has to be chronicled, even by the N. Y. *Observer* itself, after all, that the fall of Mr. Johnson was owing to his practical adoption of that same policy of *gradualism* that the N. Y. *Observer* has so long commended the Presbyterian church for pursuing, in respect to what that church had admitted to be, "the highest kind of theft," and what the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky has declared to be, inseparable from "licentiousness." He fell (so the New York *Observer* assures us) from the practice of "dallying with temptation"—from the "moderate"—the "prudent"—the "judicious"—aye, and perhaps, the supposed "scriptural use" of a little intoxicating liquor for the stomach's sake, in favor of which, the New York *Observer* has so constantly lent its support, and has therefore become accounted as "behind the age!"

What becomes of the truthless pretence, then, that we must search for the "causes and relations of such deplorable events," in the "loud advocacy" of "measures" obnoxious to the *Observer* and its patrons, on the ground of their "ultra" and "radical denunciation" of all "compromise" with transgression—their testimony against "dallying with temptation," against the "occasional use" of the tempter, against a "gradual" instead of an "immediate" abandonment of bad habits?

Let those who would not "go down, step by step, to the very lowest depths of degradation," read and ponder! And let them never forget, that whatever may be the position, the connexions, the training, the advantages, the privileges, the professions, the theoretical principles, the outward activities and the usefulness of men, there is nothing short of the omnipotent energies of the Holy Spirit, through the grace of God in Christ Jesus, producing holy watchfulness, humility, and converse with God, that can secure even the most eminent saints on earth, from relapsing into rebellion and sin. Until this truth can be seen, felt, and practically acted upon, we shall expect abundance of ministerial defections; nor can it be supposed, that, in the absence of this, any class or description of ministers will not furnish its quota of the delinquents.

Since writing the above, we have received the New York Advocate of Moral Reform, containing a long and excellent article on the same subject. It gives some additional quotations from the New York *Observer*, in which the Editors explicitly specify "the ultraisms of some of the modern moral reform movements," as having a natural tendency to such defections! In reply to their further affirmation, that Mr. Johnson was a leader, for many years, in the moral reform movements; and that his "efforts in the cause, exerted a baneful and corrupting influence on his mind; and marked his course with moral bankruptcy and ruin," the editors of the Advocate make a number of statements, showing the truthlessness of the charge. The following are among the facts they have adduced:

"Mr. Johnson pursued his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Cox of Brooklyn, a gentleman, as all know, not distinguished for ultraisms, and never once charged with being guilty of friendship to the cause of moral purity."

"It is not known, that for many years past, he has personally lifted a finger to sustain efforts being made in this city, any more than have the editors of the New York *Observer* the advocates. Guided by public sentiment, he has occasionally admitted articles into his paper, favoring our petitions for righteous laws, as 'to have they to theirs.' We remember in one instance, his inserting an article on the subject, as editorial, but it was not his own, as a good lawyer in this city can testify."

"An officer of a church in Brooklyn, called on him, with his lady, about four years since, to request him to give an address at the annual meeting of the Brooklyn Auxiliary. He decidedly refused, and indicated, in plain terms, his opposition to the cause. He has repeatedly refused to publish well written articles on the subject, presented by his personal friends, and not a member of the Ladies' Society, in this city, has, for years, received from him an iota of personal countenance or encouragement."

If the editors and admirers of the New York *Observer* will have it, that SUCH "efforts," by Mr. Johnson, "in the cause" of "Moral Reform," "exerted a baneful and corrupting influence on his mind, and marked his course with moral bankruptcy and ruin," let them be duly admonished by the reflection. But the best reflection for each and all, is this, "LET HIM THAT THINKETH HE STANDETH, TAKE HEED LEST HE FALL."

We copy the following from the "Disciple." With some of the views promulgated in that paper, as we understand them, we cannot agree; but this article meets, so fully, our own views, on the subject it presents, that we cannot do better than transfer it to our columns:

TRUE AND FALSE REFORM.

Whoever reads D'Aubigne's unequalled History of the Reformation three hundred years ago, with his eyes at the same time open to the Present, must see the identity of the false Church, under all its forms and names, and in all its periods. In that picture of the Romish Church in Luther's times, are drawn the features of the apostate Protestant Church of this day. And as that history of the past and view of the present, shows the identity of the corrupt Church, so does it also show the identity of true Reform in that time and in this—in all times. Then the essential characteristic of the false Church, involving all its falsities, consisted, as it ever has consisted, in the putting of itself in the stead of Christ—in putting the commandments of men in the place of the commandments of God. True Reform then consisted, as it now consists, and ever consists, in breaking away from this usurpation of men in their own outward institutions, and coming to God—in taking Christ, directly, without an interposing human medium, for salvation, with the Scriptures as the Rule for belief and practice. "Salvation by Faith—the Scriptures the Rule," were the two simple sentiments, or the two-fold and indivisible sentiment, by which all the pretensions and demands of Rome were denied and set at defiance. These were the watch-words of that great Reform, in the faithful utterance of which, by Luther and his companions, they shook and mutilated the Papal throne and broke the Papal yoke from the neck of half the world. This is the doctrine with which the Son of God himself confronted the same essential corruption and usurpation, in Pharisaism. It is the same by which the apostles assailed Judaism and Idolatry. It is the doctrine which is at this day the only true reform from the multiplied corruptions of the false Church in its two—and divisions of Papal and Protestant, and its subdivisions of numerous sects. SALVATION BY FAITH—THE SCRIPTURES THE RULE, is the standing doctrine for Reform in all times and for all corruptions.

But there is a false Reform as well as a false Church. It is that in which the Church is opposed and assailed in other grounds than salvation by faith and the Scriptures the standard—in which the usurpations of false Religion are rejected for the assumptions of false Philosophy—in

which the commands of men in their Church capacity, are rejected for the opinions and dogmas of men in the capacity of philosophers, expounders of Reason and oracles of God—in which discrimination is not made between true religion and the false, and Christianity itself is confounded with Anti-Christ and is made equally an object of enmity and attack—in which doctrines obtained from Revelation are not acknowledged to have that origin, but by perversion are even turned to weapons of opposition against it, being claimed by men as their own discoveries, and promulgated, if they may be said to be really promulgated at all in such circumstances, on their own authority. Of course we do not call this Reformation, even false Reform, in the sense of a change from bad to good in any degree, absolute or comparative. It is merely a change from one wrong to another wrong, rather, from certain forms of badness to other forms of the same essential badness. False Religion and false Philosophy are the same in substance and spirit—identical—essential Infidelity and Atheism. Both are the pride, darkness and delusion of the unregenerate human heart, usurping the place of God, and contending against each other for the throne of the universe, disputing titles to the homage of mankind. The claims of the Pope, of the unregenerate Protestant, of the nominal Theist and Atheist are all the same essentially. Each demands the reverence and subjection of mankind to himself as god of the word—nor will one be more scrupulous in measures for attaining what his heart aspires to, although the hypocrisy, dishonesty and cruelty of each exercises itself in ways very different from that of the others.

The true Reform has lived through varied circumstances and apparent vicissitudes of activity, prosperity, and depression, since the days of Abel. Its great crisis was in the advent of its Author and the power and effect that followed through a century or two succeeding. The great crisis since that greater one, was that in which Luther had so prominent an agency. The false Reform we suppose to have existed in various manifestations since the day of Cain. Its prominent and most horrid development, is that in connection with the French Revolution, if it be not more proper to denominate that development the Revolution itself. It commenced by the agencies of those termed philosophers, in indiscriminate attacks against the false Church and Christianity itself. It resulted in a national abjuration of Christianity and the Bible, the denial of the existence of God, the adoration of Reason personated in a dancing-girl and prostitute formally installed as the Goddess of Reason by the National Convention with similar installations throughout the nation, the abolition of the marriage vow, the declaration of death to be an eternal sleep, and in the establishment of a heathen ritual—all in connection with unbounded licentiousness and perfidy, with acts of tyranny and scenes of blood-shed, which made the whole well worthy to be designated as "the Reign of Terror." And all this in the name of Liberty, Equality, Virtue, and Morality!

The following description of the French Philosophers, by Macaulay, viewed with the results of their principles in the revolution, shows what natural philanthropy amounts to when undirected and unsanctified by the precepts and spirit of the Gospel—what hatred to a false religion and a tyrannical government produces or tends to, when accompanied by a hatred to true religion and to the freedom which Christ bestows. We quote it as an earnest warning to our philanthropic friends, to hold fast to Christ and the Scriptures, and to the liberty wherewith only Christ maketh free, while they war against Anti-Christ and his perversions of the Bible, and against slavery and all oppressions. Unless they do, they will certainly make shipwreck of their cause and of themselves. "Let him that readeth, understand!"—

"Had the sect which was rising at Paris been a sect of mere seceders, it is very improbable that it would have lost traces of its existence in the institutions and manners of Europe. Men of great energy and high ability, as Lord Bacon justly observes—has never distinguished the price of the world. It furnishes no motive for action. It inspires not enthusiasm. It has no misanthropies, no cruelties, no martyrs. If the Patriarch of the Holy Philosophical [Voltaire] had contented himself, making jokes about Saul's wives and David's wives, and with ridiculing the poetry of Lucretius in the same narrow spirit in which he ridiculed that of Shakespeare, the Church would have had little fear. But it is due to him and to his coadjutors to say, that the real secret of their strength lay in the truth which was mingled with their errors, and in the generous enthusiasm which was hidden under their stupidity. They were men who with all their faults, moral and intellectual, sincerely and earnestly desired the improvement of the condition of the human race—whose blood boiled at the sight of cruelty and injustice—who made manifold war, with every faculty they possessed, on what they considered as abuses—and who on many signal occasions placed themselves gallantly between the powerful and the oppressed. While they assailed Christianity with a rancor and an unflinching disregard for men who call themselves philosophers, they yet had, in far greater measure than their opponents, that charity towards men of all classes and races which Christianity enjoins. Religious persecution, judicial torture, arbitrary imprisonment, the unnecessary multiplication of capital punishments, the delay and chicanery of tribunals, the exactions of farmers of the revenue, slavery, the slave trade, were the constant subjects of their lively satire and eloquent disquisitions. When an innocent man was broken on the wheel at Toulouse—when a youth, guilty only of an indiscretion, was burning at Abbeville—when a brave officer, borne down by public injustice, was dragged, with a gag in his mouth, to die on the Place de Grève, a voice instantly went forth from the bosom of Lake Lemman, [Voltaire's retirement.] which made itself heard from Moscow to Cadix, and which sentenced the unjust judges to the contempt and detestation of Europe. The really efficient weapons with which the philosophers assailed the evangelical faith were borrowed from the evangelical morality. The ethical and dogmatical parts of the gospel were unhappily turned against each other. On the one side was a Church boasting of the purity of a doctrine derived from the Apostles, but disgraced by the massacre of St. Bartholomew, by the murder of the heretic kings, by the war of the Centuries, by the destruction of Port Royal. On the other side was a sect laughing at the Scriptures, shouting out the tongue at the sacraments, but ready to encounter principalities and powers in the cause of justice, mercy and toleration."

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, AUGUST, 1844.

BRO. PLUMB'S LETTER—Furnishes a curious and instructive commentary on my discussion with Bro. SMITH. These two brethren start upon the same theory of church order. I object to it, among other things, that it subverts congregational church independency, paving the way for a virtual Episcopacy in its stead. My Review does not come from the press before Bro. Plumb pushes his theory to that result! I notice the fact, and Bro. Smith looks at, and says, in effect, Bro. Plumb mistakes the theory. It does not lead to such a result. Local churches when multiplied by subdivision, must each be entirely independent of each other. I tell Bro. Smith that this concession in favor of congregational church independency involves, if carried out, an abandonment of his theory. Bro. Plumb confirms this, by dissenting from Bro. Smith's admission to the entire independence of each separate congregation, and though he disclaims the name of Episcopacy, describes, approvingly the thing, yielding the common Episcopal argument in its favor, and against congregational independency. I have then Bro. Plumb's testimony that my conceptions of the tendencies of the theory, in its bearing upon congregational independency, are more correct than those of Bro. Smith. And I have Bro. Smith's concession that the result to which Bro. Plumb drives the theory, is an undesirable one, to which he cannot consent. If Bro.

Plumb understands the theory correctly, the "little acorns" produce very readily, the "tall oaks" that Bro. Smith was so merry about. And if Bro. Smith's view of Bro. Plumb's oak be a correct one, it was not quite so ludicrous a task, after all, to attempt rooting out the "acorns."

TO OUR READERS.

As soon as we can properly dispose of the discussions on church order which existing circumstances seem to require, we hope to devote a larger portion of our little sheet to the more agreeable work of exhibiting such gospel truths as have, for their direct object, the promotion of a deeper spirituality and more unreserved consecration in individual Christians. Without lively and polished stones, the orderly form and just proportions of the building, even if they could thus be restored, would be of little or no value. We would not have our brethren forget this great truth; nor forget it ourselves. At the same time we know that there is humble ditching as well as stately sowing and triumphant reaping, to be performed, in the Lord's vineyard, and we do not mean to shrink from what seems our allotted task, because it is accounted a subordinate drudgery. Although the building cannot be erected, or would be worthless, without living stones, there may be rubbish to be cleared away before there can be any room to lay the stones, however lively and polished, in a clean and firm place, where they can either be preserved from surrounding filth, or secured, for a single day, in the position they ought to occupy. The greater part of all the labor of the last fifty years, for a spiritual regeneration of the church, and for the conversion of sinners, has been lost for want of attention to these common sense thoughts. The Holy Spirit will not dwell in the midst of rottenness and confusion. If the people of God would have his presence, they must put the house of God in order, for his coming. How frequently do existing disorders and tolerated abuses exclude or grieve away the Spirit of God! And how often, even after an outpouring of the Spirit, has been witnessed, do we see the expected fruits stunted, if not blasted, by the atmosphere they are placed in. The new converts and the revived Christians remain or are put into the ecclesiastical nets which Satan has been weaving, on purpose to ensnare them. The result is, that within a few years, and commonly in a few months or even weeks no one would suspect that there had been a revival.

DONATIONS AND PAYMENTS

For the Christian Investigator, up to Aug. 1844.

W. Waggoner, Lebanon,	\$0 50	M. Peckham, Madison,	0 50
E. Campbell, do.	0 50	A. B. Coe, do.	0 50
J. H. Payne, Half-Day,	0 50	S. G. Cleveland, do.	0 50
Ill., back No's sent as ordered,	1 00	J. Manchester, do.	0 50
E. Buckley, N. Haver,	0 50	C. St. Hawley, Hamilton,	0 50
Conn.,	0 50	D. B. Shapley, do.	0 25
J. J. Tucker, Buell,	0 50	W. Houghton, do.	0 25
R. Chapin, Havana,	1 00	Dea. A. Sandford, do.	0 25
J. S. McKenzie, Phelps,	0 25	L. C. Chappell, do.	0 50
E. Pace, do.	0 25	U. Z. Garrett, Plymouth,	0 25
S. P. Breck, do.	0 25	D. McConick, Schuylers,	0 50
D. B. Breck, do.	0 25	Lake,	0 50
J. D. Rogers, Palmyra,	0 25	P. A. Hopkins, Trenton,	2 00
J. C. Pettit, do.	0 25	S. Brownell, Madison,	1 00
El. D. Harrington, do.	0 25	M. R. Burnham, do.	0 50
D. T. Bratell, do.	0 25	E. Burnham, do.	0 50
C. Probert, do.	0 25	U. B. Sile, agent, included in the above \$3 00,	
J. Darr, do.	0 25	also \$3 00 in addition,	2 00
L. J. Hicks, Watworth,	0 50	W. L. Chaplin, Utica,	2 50
H. G. Mason, do.	0 50	G. Taylor, Honeoye,	1 00
J. A. Lums, Port Gibson,	0 50	A. Kingsbury for L. Ledyard,	50
L. Spencer, Orleans,	0 50		
Faila,	0 25		25 18
A. Percival, Vernon Center,	0 50	Product com. of agents,	5 23
J. Parker, Westmoreland,	0 50		
W. Benedict, Whiteboro,	0 50	Nett amount,	\$19 00
F. Lawson, do.	0 50		

Connection.—Nett amount received last month \$24 45, instead of \$33 95, as printed.

To Agents.—Agents are again reminded of the importance of stating in their letters (1st) at what times new subscribers are to commence receiving papers from the publisher, that is, whether any back numbers are to be sent them:—Also, (2d) Whether or no the agent has supplied them with any back numbers, and if so, how far back.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 9.
WHOLE NUMBER, 29.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., SEPTEMBER, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL ix., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, \$2.00, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 Cts. | Sixty papers, \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers for 3 00
Cash always in advance, and free of postage.

Post Matters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

The following letter was written at the time of its date, but its publication has been delayed to make room for the other side of the question.

FOURTH LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH. NEW TESTAMENT FACTS.

HONEOYE, May 17, 1844.

My Dear Brother—I think you will agree with me, that no theory of local church organization can be trustworthy, that conflicts with the facts of such a local church organization as existed in the time of Christ and his apostles, and received their sanction, according to the testimony of the New Testament. You will not say, as some have said, that those facts do not furnish the proper model for Christians, in our times; that we are neither bound by apostolic precept, testimony, or example, in this matter, but are privileged to walk in a purer light than beamed upon their path, and to disincumber ourselves of the institutions and usages adapted only to the infancy of the religion we profess.

NEW TESTAMENT FACTS, &c. I. ERRORS IN DOCTRINE.

Bear with me then, for a short time, while, (along, perhaps, with some other questions and remarks) I bring to this test of New Testament facts, some of the points plainly involved in the theory of local church organization which you appear to have imbibed.

It is not true, that by the first churches, persons were considered as "fit for church membership," or as being, by any possibility, "real Christians," "however great their errors." This sentiment I understand to be expressed in your letter of March 23, wherein you say:

"And do you not deem as fit for Church membership, any person who is a real Christian, however great his errors? Certainly you do."

But what saith the Scripture?

"If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." 2 John 10: 11. "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than ye have received; let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 8, 9. "He that is of God, heareth God's words. Ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God." John's Gospel, 8: 47. [This is said by Christ himself.]

The church in Pergamos is censured by Christ, for retaining in church membership and fellowship, those who "hold the doctrine by Balaam," and the "doctrine of the Nicolaites." Rev. 2: 14, 15. "The church of Thyatira is censured, for suffering a false prophetess to teach and seduce

the members of the church. ib. verse 20. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches."

Hymeneus and Alexander were delivered unto satan, [i. e. excommunicated from the church] "that they might learn not to blaspheme." 1 Tim. 1: 20. What their blasphemy was, we may gather from 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18, where it appears that Hymeneus and Philetus, concerning the truth, had erred, saying, [as some do now] that "the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." Remarkably spiritual these men doubtless considered themselves; so much so, that a literal resurrection of the body, yet to come, was not their taste, and so they made the resurrection a spiritual one, that had already taken place! And for this peculiar and unscriptural error they were voted out of the church. So it would seem. It was Paul's vote at all events. So much for the theory by the side of the fact.

2. THE ASSEMBLY NEVER ASSEMBLED.

I do not recollect any instance in which a local church is called, in the New Testament, a church, i. e. an assembly, which never assembled. But perhaps there may have been such a case. If there was, brother Smith can probably point it out. I will admit that an assembly may be a Christian assembly, and fail of doing some of the things that the first Christian assemblies did—some of the things they ought to do—some of the things enumerated by brother Smith, Christians there might be, without a Christian assembly. But it is not quite clear to my mind, that the scriptures, or that strict propriety of speech, permit us to speak of a local Christian assembly, that could never be induced to assemble, and were not willing to be regarded an assembly. Nor do I believe that men can be members, either of the spiritual church universal, or of the local, visible church, without their consent, though they may be members of the one, without being members of the other. God does not force men into church membership, [either spiritual or visible—universal or local] against their wills. His people are willing in the day of his power. They may be unwilling through their errors and imperfections, to enjoy all the privileges that they ought to enjoy. But they can enjoy no higher or other privileges than they have a heart to enjoy. The privileges of local, visible church membership, [the having of their local church relations, as bro. Smith calls it, with the Christians of Munsville, Siloam, or Peterboro] is a privilege by no means forming an exception to this rule. What the Christian is, he is willing to be. The fact is utterly subversive of the reason, that "fifty confessedly Christian men and women" can constitute the Christian church of the locality they inhabit, while unwilling to be, or to be called such a church.

3. INVOLUNTARY CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

This theory, so plainly taught in the creed of the church of Peterboro, is therefore without any foundation in New Testament facts. I shall feel warranted in saying this, until it can be made to appear that there were members of the church of Jerusalem, or of the church of Antioch, or the church of Corinth, or of the church in Philadelphia, or of some other New Testament church, who were members, and held by the church to be such, even in the case of those who did not consent to [their] thus recognizing them; or until it can be proved that persons who should thus have withheld their consent, would thus have been recognized. And where are the facts?

4. NO CHURCH MEMBERS BUT TRUE CHRISTIANS.

"My theories are such," says Gerrit Smith, "that none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church."

This is brother Smith's theory. Now for the New Testament facts:

None but Christians were members of the "mystical body," the church spiritual and universal; this I admit. But brother Smith has strongly protested that he is wronged, and made to suffer unreasonableness, when he is understood as holding this mystical church and the local church at Peterboro, to be churches in the same sense, or that the principles of church organization appropriate to the one, should be applied to the other.

We are speaking of the local churches now; churches in the sense, and on the principle that requires the election of elders, and the maintenance of strict church discipline. The question respecting them, is not whether those who were not Christians had a right to be in such churches, nor whether they were knowingly permitted by the brotherhood, and with the approbation of Christ and his apostles to be and remain in such churches, after their destitution of Christian character had been made manifest. I admit, nay, rather, I earnestly insist [for this is essential to my theory] that none but Christians have a right to be in the local churches, and that the brotherhood have no scripture warrant to retain any persons in the churches, who do not continue to give scriptural evidence, by their doctrines and practices, that they are Christians; and therefore it is, that I am obliged to dissent from some of the statements of brother Smith, who says that men cannot be voted into the church or voted out of it by the members; who says, likewise, that Christians are bound to recognize as members of the church, those whom he describes as affording satisfactory evidence that they are disciples and friends of Christ, yet in their doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blameworthy, he it to whatever extent it may.

But the question simply is, whether ungodly and wicked persons—deceivers and being deceived, did not, as a matter of fact, sometimes "be in the church"—the local, organized church, in the times of Christ and the apostles. Brother Smith says they cannot, by any possibility, be in the church, on his theory. How does this theory correspond with New Testament facts? Were such persons never found in the local churches, in those times?

The question, I suppose will be settled, if I can adduce an instance of an officer, a bishop, in the visible church, who turned out after all to have been a thief—all the while, a wicked and a bad man. For in those times, no man could be a bishop over a church, who had not a standing as a member, in the church of which he was a bishop. The case of Judas is exactly in point. He forfeited his bishopric, and with it his membership in the church, on the discovery of his wicked character. Christ knew him all the while, to be sure, and knew that he was not a member of his mystical body, the church spiritual, yet he did not intend that his own omniscience should be a substitute for mutual watch-care, and strict church discipline in the local churches then, any more than he intends the same thing now. And so he let Judas remain in the church visible, and remain a church officer too, and go in and out among them as one of them, so long as the evidence of his Christian character could not be successfully impeached by his fellow-members.

*That Mr. Smith's views may not be mistaken, the reader should refer to his letter in our July number, which contains some explanations on this point. This letter was written before that was received.

A full account of the proceedings of the Jerusalem church in this case, may be found in Acts 1: 15-26. In the minutes of this church meeting, it is distinctly stated, that the roll of church members at Jerusalem, at that time, contained about a hundred and twenty names, and that Judas was numbered with them. [The roll of this church, by the bye, brother Smith, appears to have been kept on earth, does it not?] And tho' the sudden suicide of Judas prevented a formal act of excommunication, yet the same principle was involved in the declaration, that he "fell" from the position he had occupied, by his transgression, which (and not his death merely) rendered the appointment of his successor appropriate to the occasion.

Another instance of a wicked person in a New Testament church—the church at Corinth, is recorded in 1 Cor. 5—so wicked, that he was guilty of incest and would not repent of it—and evidence that he was not a member of the "mystical body, the church" spiritual, and therefore the admonition of Paul was, that he should be voted out of the church local and visible, by the members, when gathered together in church meeting—that he should be excommunicated—delivered unto Satan—classified with wicked men, as the last and only remaining means of bringing him to repentance, by leading him to reflect upon his great wickedness.

That this wicked person was held to be a member of the Corinthian church, and having a place in it, (not merely coming into the meetings of the church on his own responsibility, without involving the church in the responsibility of his membership) is evident from the admonition, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." The same thing is further evident from the reasons given for the excommunication. (1.) Because he was called a brother, i. e. recognized as a church member, so that his character, if he were retained, could not but be attributed to the church.—(2.) Because, in that case his wicked character would, in fact, pollute the church, on the principle that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump—that the character of even one corrupt member of the body would become, if he were knowingly retained in church membership, the character of the whole. (3.) Because while it pertained to God alone, to judge them that are without the church; it pertained to the church likewise, to judge them that are within.

All this logic of Paul would have been sadly out of place if he had not considered (and known that those to whom he was writing considered) that wicked person to be in the church as a member of the same. And his charge against them—"It is commonly reported that there is fornication among you," would have been a false charge if the guilty person had not been regarded, on all hands, as a member of the church.

Look at another instance: In what ancient community was it, brother Smith, that "they had all things common, neither said any of them that ought of the things that he possessed was his own, neither was there any among them that lacked—and distribution was made to every man according as he had need?"

Was it not in the Jerusalem church, and while Peter was one of their number, that these arrangements obtained? Would you not readily say so, to any person by whom the question should be asked? And would you not expect of any intelligent and simple minded Sabbath school scholar or teacher, that he would answer the question in the same manner?

And if asked whether this arrangement of con-

tribution and of distribution extended to any besides the multitude of them that believed—the mutually recognized members of the Jerusalem church, would not the natural and the reasonable answer be, No?

Well, "A certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife," came professedly into this arrangement, somewhat grudgingly, it would seem, from their attachment to wealth, yet evidently compelled to take some action in the case, from their strong desire to maintain the appearance of co-operation with their associates, and to retain the continued good opinion of the community to which they belonged. What community could that have been, brother Smith, if not the Jerusalem church—the multitude of them that believed? in that city? If they had not been recognized members of that church, how easily their avaricious dispositions would have persuaded them that no such remarkable contributions were to be expected of them? Had any except recognized disciples come into the arrangement, at all? Why, then, should they?

And besides, had they not been recognized members of the Jerusalem church, how could they have expected to reap, from their duplicity, the unfair advantage they are believed to have sought—the advantage of receiving a full share of the distributions from the estates of those who gave up all their possessions, while they reserved, secretly, a part of their own? The church certainly did not distribute to the community at large, and why should it distribute to them, if they were not in the church?

More than all this: If they were not in the church, and had no reason to expect any of the distribution in return, it seems incredible that those shrewd and cunning sharpers should have laid any of their money at all at the feet of the apostles! Such a transaction, upon such a supposition, could not have taken place.

It is most manifest from every part of the story, that Ananias and Sapphira were recognized members of the Jerusalem church. Great fear came especially upon all the church, when two of their number were struck dead for their deception: and "of the rest, durst no man join himself to them" deceptively, as these persons had done, so that the fearful warning, for a long time afterwards, deterred such characters from joining the church. The community, as well as the church, must have understood them to have been members. Yet assuredly they were not real Christians. But according to your theories, brother Smith, "none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church." Put that theory, if you please, by the side of the New Testament fact, and say which shall stand.

"Simon himself believed also, and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip."—Where did he thus continue, if not in the church? Or why was he baptized, if he were not recognized as a brother? But after all, it appeared that his heart was not right in the sight of God: He was still "in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity." Acts 8: 8-24.

"Demas hath forsaken me," says Paul, "having loved this present world"—"Alexander the copper-smith, did me much evil, the Lord reward him according to his works, of whom be thou ware, also, for he hath greatly withstood our words." 2 Tim. 4: 10-14, 15. "Hymeneus and Philetus." 2 Tim. 2: 17, 18. Hymeneus and Alexander." 1 Tim. 1: 20. Were not these men in the church? Did Paul complain that men out of the church had forsaken him?—Did Timothy need to be cautioned against confiding in such? Or were false teachers out of the church visited with apostolic excommunication from the church, "that they might learn not to blaspheme?"

Whatever may be thought of these, the beloved disciple, who was all charity and meekness, describes the character of one "full of malicious

words," who was not only in the church, but so prominent and influential a member, that he could succeed in wrongfully casting true brethren out of the church. 3 John, 9: 10.

Christ's directions for "church discipline" in the 18th chapter of Matthew take for granted the "possibility" that there may "be in the church" a recognized "brother," who, after all the proper measures taken to reclaim him from his wrong practices, will need to be excluded as "a heathen man and a publican." And the churches are assured that their proceedings in such cases, shall be ratified in heaven.

At a certain time, "many of [Christ's] disciples"—the members of his own visible family (and brother Smith knows that a family of disciples are a church) "went back, and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away?" And in the same connection he added, "Have I not chose you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." John 6: 66-71. Will brother Smith say that such a devil "could not by any possibility be in the church?"

And how could Paul say to "the elders of the church at Miletus," "I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also, of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them?" Acts. 20: 29, 30. Does this look as though Paul knew that "none but Christians could, by any possibility, be in the church?" Were not "the elders of the church" (who were thus addressed) "in the church?"

And who were they whom the church at Rome was to "mark and avoid" (to consider as heathen men and publicans) on account of their causing divisions in the churches contrary to the doctrine they had learned? Men whose "fair speeches deceived the hearts of the simple?" Was it only from men out of the churches that these disorganizing influences were to be apprehended?

And what meaneth this admonition to "the church of God which is at Corinth?" "For, first of all, when ye are come together in the church, I hear that there are divisions among you, and I partly believe it. For there must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." 1 Cor. 11: 19. It seems from this, that not all who come together "in the church" were "approved" of God—so that he saw it to be necessary that divisions or heresies should exist, in order that those who were approved "in the church" should be "made manifest"—should be distinguished among the brotherhood as they were distinguished by himself. How could this be if "none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church?"

To the same "church of God at Corinth" it was also written, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead?"

"Be not deceived! Evil communications corrupt good manners. Awake to righteousness and sin not; for some [i. e. "among you"] have not the knowledge of God. I speak this to your shame;" i. e. to the shame of the "church of God at Corinth." 1 Cor. 15: 12, 34. Now if Paul had learned that "none but Christians could, by any possibility, be in the church" "of God in Corinth"—had known that those "deceivers and self-deceived" at Corinth who "had not the knowledge of God," and whose "evil communications corrupted good manners," were not "among them," he might have been less "severe" in his "extended animadversions." He would have understood that it was not at all "to the shame" of the church of Corinth that they had been "imposed upon" by wicked men coming into their conference and prayer meetings.

† The word "roll" or "list" is not used, I admit; but the statement amounts to the same thing. No one can doubt that the names were written down, in order to be counted, or that some similar method was employed. How else could it be told who were "numbered with" them, and who were not? And in writing to the churches, the apostles thought it practicable to "greet the friends by name."

who did not belong to their number, and over whom they held no control! It must have been from his ignorance of the modern theories of church organization, methinks, that Paul, on this occasion, should have appeared so little in keeping with himself, and acted so much more in the character of a sectarian bigot than in his own!

But who were the "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ" even as "satan himself is transformed into an angel of light?" 2 Cor. 11: 13. Examine the context. Notice how these deceivers sought to supplant the true apostles, to bring them into contempt, to be regarded as apostles in their stead. And mark the solicitude and anxiety of Paul, lest they should succeed in beguiling even "the church of God at Corinth!" Then any whether this danger was to be apprehended from persons never-recognized as members of the church!—And notice how, in the 26th verse of the same chapter, Paul speaks of having been "in perils among false brethren." Who could these have been but recognized members of the church; yet ready, Judas like, to betray him into the hands of his open persecutors who sought his life?

How came it to pass, on your theories of church organization, brother Smith, that in writing "to the church of God at Corinth," Paul could have feared lest, when he should visit them, he should not find them such as he would—lest he should find some of them to be incorrigible transgressors, and "beware many which had sinned already, and had not repented of the uncleanness, fornication and lasciviousness that they had committed?" 2 Cor. 12: 20, 21. And how could he have supposed it possible that there might be "reprobates" in the same church to which he was writing? [Ib. 13: 5.]

And what shall we say of the "false brethren unawares brought in, who (says Paul) came in privily to spy our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage?" Gal. 2: 4. They "came in" it is said; and they came "unawares." What came they into, if not into the church? And to whom was it "unawares?" If not to the brotherhood? How is this if, "none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church?" And why did Paul, in this same letter to "the churches of Galatia" so unaccountably say to them, "I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed labor on you in vain?"—And again, "I stand in doubt of you?" Gal. 4: 11—20. Why could he not have comfortably assured himself that "none but Christians, could by any possibility, be in" those churches?

Who were they that preached Christ, not of good will, nor sincerely, nor of love; but of contention, supposing to add affliction to Paul's bonds? [Phil. 1: 15, 16.] Who could these have been but Judaizing or other false teachers (as Scott supposes) who were recognized teachers in the churches, taking this method to mingle their errors with the Christian doctrine, and thus supplant Paul and draw off a party by themselves? Who but such could have expected to afflict Paul by preaching Jesus Christ? Or what but their position in the churches could have enabled them even to make the attempt? Was it not of such characters, and holding such a position, that Paul again speaks in the same letter, when he says, (chap. 3: 2.) "Beware of dogs, beware of evil workers, beware of the concision!"

How could Paul, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, command "the church of the Thessalonians" to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly—to "note that man that should not obey the word by that epistle—to 'have no company with him that he may be ashamed?' How could he add, "we hear that there are some which walk disorderly among you?" 2 Thess. 2: 6, 11, 14. Who were they that had "the form of godliness, but denied the power"—that "crept into houses"—"led captive silly women"—"men of corrupt minds—reprobate concerning the faith"

—"resisting the truth as Jannes and Jambres" (in a similar manner,) withstood Moses? And how, or why were the faithful to "turn away from them?" 2 Tim. 3: 5—8. Had they the form of godliness without a standing in the visible church? What but such a position could enable them to do what they are represented as doing? Or who were their victims, or from what houses but those in the fold which these wolves in sheep's clothing had entered? Who were the "unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things they ought not for filthy lucre's sake?" Titus 1: 10, 11. Was it in or out of the visible churches that the "blameless" and "faithful bishop," the very reverse of such characters would be called to confront, to "exhort and to convince the gainsayers" of that description? What communities did these money-loving teachers expect to fleece, but the churches planted by the apostles? How could they do this, or expect to do it, without being even recognized as church members or Christian teachers by these churches? If no "heretic," "subverted" and "self-condemned" can "possibly be in the churches," why should the churches be directed "after the first and second admonition" to "reject"—to exclude them? Titus 3: 10, 11.

Then think of the "once enlightened"—"partakers of the Holy Ghost"—yet fallen, and "impossible to be renewed again to repentance."—Where were the originals of this picture most commonly to be found, if not in the visible churches? [Heb. 6: 4—6.] To whom, if not to the members of those churches, was this solemn warning addressed? Or why, in addressing "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling," (Ib. 3: 1,) did the same inspired writer exhort them to look "diligently, lest any man fall of the grace of God—lest any root of bitterness springing up, trouble you, and thereby many be defiled—lest there should be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who, for one morsel of meat sold his birthright," and "found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Chap. 12: 15—17. Does this look like there being no possibility or danger of there being one such profane person in a church? Or why did James, in exhorting his "brethren" "scattered abroad," imagine it possible that some "vain man" among them might need to be admonished that "faith without works is dead?"—James 2: 20.

Who were the "false prophets" and "false teachers" predicted by Peter, "denying the Lord that bought them and bringing upon themselves swift destruction?" "Through covetousness, with feigned words, making merchandise" of the brethren—"wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest" "turning from the holy commandment delivered unto them"—like "the dog turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire?" (2 Peter 2: 1, 3, and 17—22.) And who were he similar—nay—the identical characters, described by Jude, (when writing to "them that are sanctified") as "spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast themselves with you, feeding themselves without fear—clouds without water, carried about of winds, trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; aging waves of thorns, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness, forever." Who, I ask, were these men, thus described? What was their relation to the visible churches of their times? And what had "them that are sanctified" in those churches to do with them? Hear the testimony

* Whether we adopt the theory of Calvin, that apostates never were real Christians, or that of Wesley, that having been once real Christians, they had fallen from grace, it will equally remain true that large numbers of such apostates were once in the visible church. The theory of Wesley would lead us to say that it was in the church, and while in it, that they became wicked men which only makes the case a stronger one.

of Jude. Having declared it needful for him to exhort them to "contend earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints," he gives as his reason for so doing. "For there are certain men crept in, unawares," &c., "turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Most manifestly, these men had "crept into" the local churches, "unawares" to the mass of the brotherhood, who needed therefore to be admonished of their danger, exhorted to "contend" for the faith thus assailed in their very bosom—to be put on their guard against these false brethren who had "crept in"—by a graphic description of their distinguishing characteristics. And finally "the sanctified, and preserved in Jesus Christ" (verse 1) to whom Jude was writing, were admonished to keep themselves (from similar pollutions) in the love of God, and to do what they could, for the rescue of the deluded: "of some have compassion, making a difference, and others, save with fear, pulling them out of the fire." The ring leaders of the apostasy would "separate themselves," from the faithful, (being "censured, not having the Spirit." This they would do, either by breaking off into a heretical sect, by themselves, or by making it necessary that they should be excised: neither of which could have taken place, had they never been "in the church." But among those who had been deluded by them, there might be some who ought not to be hastily cut off, as incorrigible. By a cautious discrimination, and by prompt and judicious action, they might be snatched from the burning, and preserved to the church.

The beloved disciple has a testimony to the same point. "They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." [1 John 2: 19.] Their going out of the visible church without any just cause, made it manifest that they were not spiritual, living members, while visibly or outwardly in it. "They were not all of us" says John, even while they were in the same church or local assembly with us. But the modern theory, opposition to the ancient fact, assures us that not not one can be with us, in the assembly or church, unless he is of us, in Spirit.

And what was to be the position, in respect to the visible churches, of that "man of sin" that was to be "revealed—the son of perdition?" He who "opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped?" Where was it, that, even in Paul's day, "the mystery of iniquity [did] already work?" Where, but in the outwardly organized or visible churches? Where, but "in the temple of God" did he "sit, as God, showing himself, that he is God?" Where else but in the churches visible could such a work of apostasy and perversion be performed? 2 Thess. 2: 3, 10.]

The history accords with the prediction. The introduction of wicked men into the local or visible churches or assemblies, is sufficient to account for the great anti-Christian apostasy, and nothing else can account for it, or make the story an intelligible one.

Christ himself, in his messages by John to the seven churches in Asia, complains that there were wicked men in some of those churches, and severely reprobates the churches for permitting them to remain there. The church of Pergamos fell under this censure, (Rev. 2: 14—16,) and was charged to repent, lest the Savior should come quickly, and fight against her with the sword of his mouth. The church at Thyatira was charged with retaining a Jezebel in her communion, and after a solemn threatening, the Savior adds, "all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the hearts and the reins." Ib. 20—23. The church of Sardis, it seems, had but "a few names" left on her roll, which had

not defiled their garments' and who should walk with their Lord in white, for they were worthy.

The fact, then, is well attested, that the local churches, in New Testament times, contained persons who were not Christians. If this were not so, what mean these solemn warnings and predictions concerning the seven churches in Asia, that Christ himself would fight against them—that he would "remove their candlestick out of its place"—that he would "come upon them as a thief, and they should not know what hour he would come upon them"—that he would "spue them out of his mouth?"

On the theory that "none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church, what possibility was there that any of these solemn threatnings could ever be executed? Or that there could ever, "by any possibility," be an occasion for it? "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches!"

5. NO VOTING INTO THE CHURCH OR VOTING OUT OF IT, BY THE MEMBERS.

This is another of brother Smith's theories that does not correspond with the facts of the local New Testament churches, as we have already seen. If local, visible church membership, and membership in the one mystic body of Christ or church spiritual, were one and the same thing, (both being churches in the same sense) then this theory would be true. And it would be not simply improper, but impossible for any man or body of men, to cast a person out of the local church.

But the facts were not so. Diotrephes did, as a matter of fact, cast the brethren out of the church. St. John tells us expressly, 3 John 9: 10. "The consideration that even brethren (true Christians) were cast out—and cast out maliciously and wrongfully, only makes the case a stronger one, and conclusively proves that the thing can be done, and consequently, that the theory which denies the possibility of any such transaction, and says "we can neither vote into the church, nor vote out of it," is a theory that does not correspond with the facts.

When Paul was come to Jerusalem, he craved to join himself to the disciples, but they were all afraid of him and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of the Lord Jesus. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem." Acts 9: 26-28.

Here we have the following particulars: 1st. The intention and effort on the part of Paul, to become a member of the Christian assembly or church at Jerusalem. 2d. The refusal of the brotherhood of that church to receive him. 3d. The ground of their refusal—their want of evidence that he was indeed a disciple. 4th. The exhibition of satisfactory evidence in his favor. 5th. The consequent fact of his reception and co-operation with them.

And in these facts the following principles are plainly involved: 1st. The right of Paul to apply to the Jerusalem church for admission. 2d. The right of that church to decide whether they would receive him or not, under the divine rule of receiving all who gave evidence of being Christians, and rejecting those by whom the evidence was not exhibited. 3d. The concurrent action of the applicant and of the church were both necessary to his becoming a member. He could not be a member without his own consent, nor without theirs. A contrary principle would involve a violation of human rights. The duty of the church to receive all who give evidence of Christian character, does not take away its right to deliberate and to decide. The duty presupposes the right. Responsibilities grow out of rights, and cannot be excused or destroyed them.

In the 18th chapter of Matthew, Christ lays down the rules of procedure, according to which the delinquent or incorrigible member of a church may be excluded, and thenceforward accounted "a heathen man and a publican." And he declares that just and proper action under those rules, shall be ratified in heaven; that where only two or three are gathered together, (assembled as a church) in his name, his own authority and presence are with them.

Hymeneus and Alexander, as noticed in another connection, were thus excluded from the church. The churches at Pergamos and Thyatira were censured for the neglect of this duty. So was the church at Corinth, until the duty was performed; and then the good effects were recorded and the church commended for its fidelity,

and congratulated with its successful exercise of church discipline. See 2 Cor. 2: 1-11.

Take away the right and duty of voting incorrigible offenders out of the church, and what, deserving the name of atter church discipline, can remain? Nay, what right can any church members have to decide from an incurably corrupt church—to "come out of her, lest they partake of her sins and receive of her plagues?" If a majority of faithful men cannot excommunicate a minority of apostates, how shall a minority of the faithful excommunicate a majority of the faithless, or escape from their thralldom?

Imagine, for one moment, that Paul had held this new doctrine concerning church organization, when he wrote his first letter to the Corinthians, and how would the case of the incestuous person have been treated by him then?

Instead of telling the church of God at Corinth that common report (to which he evidently gave credit) had charged upon it a case of fornication unknown even among the heathen—instead of asking them because, so far from being grieved and seeking that the author of such an abomination might be excluded from among them, they had treated the imputation lightly and contemptuously—instead of telling them distinctly that his own judgment concerning the matter was made up and settled—that he thought it incumbent on the church assembled together, and by the common suffrage of the brotherhood, to give up the offender to the fraternity of the adversary, and thenceforward to keep no company with him, to put him away from their assembly—to do this because the brother was accounted a brother in the church—to do it, because being one of their number, his transgression became theirs, and they wereavened by his corruption—to make a marked difference between their treatment of a transgressor within the church, and a transgressor without, whom God alone judged—and finally by all means, to "put away from among themselves that wicked person."

Instead of all this, I say, Paul's consistent adherence to any such theory of church organization as the one now under review, would have given us, if I understand his matter correctly, a 5th chapter of 1 Cor. in some such shape as the following:

It is commonly reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife! But I am well aware that all such reports must be slanderous, and you do well to give little heed to them, and to treat them with silent contempt. For according to my theories of church organization, none but Christians can, by any possibility, be in the church. It is true that the church of Corinth "is liable to impositions. Wicked men, deceivers and self-deceived, may presume to take part in her conferences and prayer meetings, and to sit at the table which she spreads with the symbols of her Savior's body and blood. I know of no unfailing process for their exclusion from such occasions—Holy living on the part of those who recognize themselves to be members of the church of Corinth "is, under God, my only reliance for exemption from these evils. If they live as children of the light, the children of darkness will in very rare instances be inclined to mingle with them, for darkness has as little communion with light, as light has with it." I trust, therefore, that the church of God which is at Corinth, will be guilty of no such sectarian folly, such want of Christian charity and wisdom, as to gather themselves together, for the purpose of putting away from among themselves, that wicked person. For if he be a wicked person and not a Christian, he can, by no possibility, be in the church, and cannot need to be put away from it. Besides, the church of God at Corinth, can neither vote into the church, nor out of it." And in supposing, as some do, that the church of God, at Corinth keeps a roll of its members, and knows who they are that are subject to its strict church discipline, they are in error. There is such a roll, but it is kept in heaven. The name of every Christian within its territorial limits is upon it. He who looks upon the heart, not he whose view is limited to the outward appearance, is alone capable of determining whose names are written upon it." You cannot know the tree by its fruits, nor tell certainly that that person that hath so done this deed, is not a Christian. How then can you put him away from among you? Do you not recognize as fit for church membership, any person who is a real Christian, however great his errors? Certainly you do." And you are bound to recognize as a member, every person within your territorial limits, who affords satisfactory evidence that he is a disciple and friend of Christ, and bound to do this even in the case of those who, in their doctrines or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blame-worthy, be it to whatever extent it may."

What do you think, brother Smith, would have been the effects of such a letter from Paul to the church of God at Corinth—Would they have been such as we find described in 2 Cor. 2: 1-11? Is it likely that by the process the person guilty of incest, would have been led to repentance?

Do not understand me to intimate that your language which I have put, by supposition, (as an epistle of Paul, could have been used by you on such an occasion as the one to which it has now been applied. But unless it can be shown (as I think it cannot) that such an application of your theory, if it be correct in itself, would be either inappropriate or misplaced, I shall think it neither unfair nor unkind to show in this manner, that the principle you have adopted is unsound.

Nor will you understand me as doubting the mutual repellant of light and darkness, of holiness and sin, when I remind you, in view of the history of man and the church, that sin is never more truly itself, than when successfully seeking to entrench itself in the institutions adapted and designed for its overthrow.

Holy living, properly defined, comprehends in its wide scope, without a question, all that Christians can do for the purity and preservation of the church. It is such holy living includes, let me remind you, (and hence it can never supersede) a scrupulous and watchful observance of all the directions of Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles for the maintenance of holy order, righteous government, discriminating culture, and strict and vigorous discipline, in Christ's house. Let us beware how we withhold those precious instructions with the ecclesiastical teachings we so much need to learn.

Holy living, that is to say, holy obedience, the result of wakeful attention to God's commandments, would have prevented the first apostasy of the race—would have prevented the early defection of the primitive churches. And it would have done this, because in its full development and proper application, among other things, it would have taught our first parents to vote Satan out of paradise, and the first Christians to vote him out of the churches. Unless we can do this, let us never think we can vote him out of our own hearts, or preserve ourselves from evil communications, or walk in the light while we tolerate works of darkness; or become as gods while in fraternity with the tempter, and disobeying the plainest divine injunctions.

I might read you over another edition of your theories of church organization, or some portions of them, not as coming by supposition, from the pen of an apostle, who should tell them, while writing to the torrid and intemperance Corinthians, but as coming, with slight modifications, from the conservators of our still more liberal and accommodating American churches. Who does not know that holy living, as they understand it, on the part of the pious portion of the churches, is their never failing panacea for the unredressed disorders of the churches, their cherished substitute for the dreaded duty of voting wicked persons out of them? Who has not heard them teach, that the best method for the reformation of men, guilty of the highest kind of theft, is to permit them to sit down with us, on their own responsibility, forsooth, "at the table spread by the church, with the symbols of her Savior's body and blood,"—to "take a part in her conference and prayer meetings"—aye, and to ascend her pulpit of public instruction, (on precisely the same principle) at their pleasure? And on the same principle, co-operate with us (for why should they not—or how should we exclude them) in the work of tending the gospel to the heathen? Who has not heard, as a defence of this policy, that men of the very worst practices may be Christians—that God only can tell who are or who are not Christians—that the roll of the redeemed is kept only in heaven—that the tares and wheat must grow together in Christian assemblies, as well as in the world—that man must not presume to hurl anathemas against his fellow man, or (as sings the disciple of Dillingbroke) "del damnation round the land;" and thus become denunciatory and anathematizing? Are we not sufficiently familiar with the usages growing out of such theories? What boots it to remark that those usages are, in this case, and most commonly, maintained for the purpose of keeping together a paltry sect, founded on petty abidments and forms, and not for the more noble object of cementing a comprehensive union of all Christians? What wata a Christian union, in which Christianity itself were left undefined?—Or what mighty difference to the cause of gospel purity on the earth, would it make, whether, as in the one case, the wicked persons

"May I be permitted to inquire of brother Smith, whether there be any remarkable resemblances between his language and that of the Doctors of the prominent sects, may not be owing to the remains of his sectarian education," which he has quite unlearned.

ally held in religious fraternity were dignified with the name of church members, or whether (on the principle that God alone can tell who church members are, and there are no standards) that designation were, in every case, withheld from them, as it would be altogether. And how, in the one case, more than in the other, shall the church retain and direct in her the righteous and the wicked, between him that is God and him that sorrows him not? How shall we bring the church and the unclean? You have planned, brother Smith, (and I honor your frankness) that with your views of my theories, you cannot say I can escape from sectarianism. Allow me, in equal frankness, to tell you, that with my views of your theories, I cannot see what you would gain by escape from sectarianism, should you effect it, since the worst results of that form of disorder, the mingling of the righteous with the wicked, would be retained in the churches.

THE ROLL OF CHURCH MEMBERS TO BE KEPT ON EARTH.

This feature of your theory has been pretty considerably discussed, as it is involved in the preceding particulars. Persons may be "real Christians" "however great errors"—if Christians may constitute a Christian body while refusing to assemble, and unwilling to be in an assembly—if persons may be church members at their own consent—if "none but Christians can, as a possibility be in the church"—if there can be no one in the church or out of it by the members, then, I think, you are correct enough in saying that such a church can keep no roll of its members. And she can also on occasion or also for any such roll.

As to the other hand, if we admit the principle that a church on earth, is not competent to keep a roll of its members, it will follow that it is not competent to keep members into the church or out of it—is not competent to put away from among themselves wicked persons—not competent to decide that such persons shall be held as "heathen men and publicans"—is not competent to exclude those who bring another gospel—indeed that persons are not Christians on account of greatest errors and most blameworthy practices—nor try those who say they are apostles and are not, as Paul them liars"—[Rev. 2: 2—] nor to cease from seeing the Jezebels that call themselves prophetesses, and seek to seduce the servants of the Lord—[Rev. 18: 2—] nor competent in any intelligible sense, to "recognize members" one class of persons to the exclusion of others—nor to "disfellowship" some in distinction from others—not competent to "maintain strict church discipline," nor to say who are the subjects of such discipline—not competent to any whether it has any materiality, in those words, who her as a church, it has its existence. I have no objection to contend that persons may not be members of such a church, as well without knowing it as with—as well within pretending that they are not members, as while "recognizing themselves as members of the church. The apparent discrepancies" of which I complained, do not prevent the symmetry that connects the absence of an earthly roll of church members, with many other prominent features of the theory.

Do I mistake in the statements I have just made?—I suppose I should ask you, brother Smith, whether those who professing "professors of religion," (as I suppose they will say,) "Squire H. and P. D.—if still residing within the territorial limits of the church of Peterboro," remember of that Church? How could you tell me, if the roll can be kept only in heaven? And how could we "strict church discipline" (in accordance with your known abhorrence of a pro-slavery religion) be made manifest, in your church action towards such men, if you do not tell who your church members are?

Let me vary the supposition somewhat. Should I ask you whether our excellent and mutual friend O. S., "within the territorial limits" of your church, is a member of the same? how could you answer me in the affirmative (in case he worships and co-operates with you) so long as you cannot know what names are on the roll of the church? Would not affirmative answers to a name-

I perceive, by the bye, brother Smith, that notwithstanding your self-acknowledged ignorance you thought I understood you in recognizing "all the professors of religion" in Peterboro to be members of your church, you nevertheless still speak of those "who recognize themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro," as being the persons whose holy is "to be under God (your) discipline for exemption from the evils" to be apprehended by intruders. And your creed was adopted, and your elders were chosen by those who recognized themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro. None appear to have been excluded, and I cannot see that your theory would permit any exclusion. And you please to tell me the distinction between "professors of religion" and those who "recognize themselves to be members of the church" in your sense of church membership?

her of such questions, supply me with your list of the members of the Peterboro church?

But you could not give any such affirmative answer. And should I ask my friend O. S. whether Gerrit Smith and the members of his family were members of the church of Peterboro, he, on the same theory, could supply me with no answer. How then can it be known whether any man, woman, or child, is a member? Or whether there be any church of Peterboro at all?

But Paul seemed to have had no misgivings whether there were a "church of God at Corinth." Nor did he seem to doubt whether "that wicked person" whom he describes, were (very unworthily and improperly to be sure) permitted to hold a place "within" rather than "without" its enclosure. Do you think him indebted to a phony divine inspiration for that knowledge?—And was it from that source that he continued to know was a "wicked person" "within" the "church of God at Corinth?"

But there are some things about this matter of the roll in connection with the church of Peterboro, that I cannot yet fully understand. Near the close of the meeting, the request was made, that all who, in view of the doctrine and "signs of the cross," have themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro should give their names to the secretary of the meeting. In accordance with this request, a number of persons gave their names." So says the record.

What was this record but a roll of the church members? It was a roll of those who "believed themselves to be church members." So the record itself states—And brother Smith's letter afterwards speaks of those who "recognize themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro" as constituting in his view, "under God" all the available power of the church. Let me here add a few queries and remarks.

1. Do those who "believed" and who "recognized themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro" believe likewise that the secretary of the meeting kept a correct list of the names that were given in?

2. If so, how can they help believing that list to be a correct roll of the church of Peterboro, so far forth as it is made out?

3. Shall I understand that those who "believed" or "recognized themselves to be members of the church of Peterboro" are mutually recognized by each other to be church members or real Christians?

4. How, how can it be otherwise than that the aggregate brotherhood—the church (if entitled that the Secretary of the meeting has kept a correct list of the names given in) do, as a recorded matter of fact (all human theories to the contrary notwithstanding) "recognize" in that list a roll of its church members—so far at least as it is made out? Their theory would indeed lead them to suppose that there may be other names that were not given in. But this would not alter the fact that the church has a roll.

5. The church has at least recorded the name of its elder elect. It would doubtless record the names of its other officers when elected. And all the officers, no doubt are held to be members. This again would be a "roll of members" in part. Shall the officers alone hold the distinction of having their names enrolled? Are they a superior caste?

6. And by whom are the officers elected? Is it not known who have the right of voting for church officers? If not, why may not all persons "within its territorial limits" come in, and elect the "Elders and Deacons" of the "church of Peterboro"? But if it is known who have a right to vote for church officers, then it is known, is it not, who are recognized members of the church of Peterboro? What shall hinder the enrolling of their names? And when enrolled, what shall prevent its being recognized as the roll of the church of Peterboro?

I need not further multiply queries and observations in this direction. Whatever of obscurity there may be in your theories, or of indistinctness in my apprehensions of them, some things respecting them are, by this time sufficiently apparent. The theory that a local church can keep no earthly roll of its members—no matter who into the church or out of it—can authoritatively exclude no one from a participation in its religious activities, its conference and prayer meetings, or from a seat at its table of communion—that none but Christians can, by any possibility be in the church, is a theory not only in harsh conflict with scripture admonitions and New Testament facts, but is likewise a theory that can never be fully acted upon by any organized church or assembly, with its officers and its "strict church discipline." Carry out the principle, and no outward visible organization would remain. No officers could be elected by the church, or if elected, no one could tell whether the officers were themselves church members. In a word, there could be no visible or organized, in distinction from the invisible

church. And the local assembly, if maintained at all (which is doubtful) would either in fact be composed indiscriminately of all who chose to "take part in" them and "sit at the table," or else (if it be contended that some but Christians can form any part of the assembly) the local church or assembly would consist only from the invisible church in the comprehensiveness of its extent, according to brother Smith's Union Catechism of Dec. 1, 1841.

But this would be making the local churches and the Universal church to be identical in their principles of organization—churches in the same "sense"—the very thing that brother Smith's Letter, now before me, has so strongly (and no doubt, honestly) disavowed as I have stated. A fresh illustration of my former remark, that persons of the highest intelligence and integrity will not so frequently subscribe themselves to theories with the utmost tenacity, and refer to them as self-evident axioms, while at the same time (as in this case), in the same theory they will shrink a little with astonishment at the same idea expressed in the form of a logical proposition, and drawn out into its minutest details and results.

Let me cherish the hope that a re-examination of scripture directions, of apostolic example, and of New Testament facts will convince you, my dear brother, to revise and correct your theories of church organization; for I cherish the utmost confidence in your implicit admission to what you regard as the teachings of God in the bible. A mistaken application of those teachings, I am persuaded, has led you to apply, incorrectly, to the local, visible, organized churches, what was intended to be applied only to the one invisible church universal. When you shall have fully corrected this error, as you will when you perceive it, we shall be agreed in this grand enterprise of reformation, as we now are in others. The world knows already, that Gerrit Smith does not cherish that ungodly love of consistency which prevents a different sort of men from correcting their mistakes.

You will agree with me, I doubt not, that the progressive developments of Christianity connected with the onward and upward march of the species, will not be subjected to the limitations imposed upon them by the laws of time and of space, in any such disease of local church organizations and church officers—such abandonment of "strict church discipline," as some among us have anticipated and would realize. Such a movement would be retrograde instead of progressive. The absence of any outward, visible, organized church institutions appears to have been the experiment of the antediluvian age; and the catastrophe of that drama was wound up with the deluge. Then came the family churches of the patriarchs, with the father at the head. Abraham was a patriarch fit in the of the Chaldees, that in his seed the family church might grow up into a nation on one. And when that stage of onward progress had been traversed, and the way paved a wider diffusion and broader expansion of divine influence, "the middle wall of partition was broken down," and arrangements made for organizing the whole world as soon and as rapidly as evangelized, into local independent churches, on the New Testament model. No new dispensation has come, or will come, to remodel or to supersede these. What Letter "for man on the earth" can be devised or conceived? What more can be done in this direction for the Lord's vineyard, than has already been done in it? What need we but an heart to build on the divine model? Other foundation can no man lay than is laid. Other progress can no man make than is made by walking in the path that divine wisdom has marked out for him.

At each step in the progress of church organization, we witness the progressive developments of the social—the expansion of humanity, and of the true religion. From isolated individuality, as with the antediluvian saints, the first transition was into the patriarchal family church—the next, into the church of the house of Jacob, as the stars of heaven for multitude—the next, into the local churches of the New Testament, to be planted over the whole earth wherever two or three can be gathered together in Christ's name, his presence with them "always, even to the end of the world." Then comes the end of outward, visible organizations, and nothing remains but "the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven." What gradation could be more perfect? Would it be mended by a backward flight from the New Testament economy, into the desolate loneliness of antediluvianism? And would this furnish the best—the highest stepping-stone before reaching the heavenly state?

Certainly, my dear brother, you will not think so.—And therefore you will not long suffer yourself to be bewildered in the theories that would lead to it—that are propagated by those who are enamored with such anticipations. With fraternal regard,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

For the Christian Investigator.
FOURTH LETTER OF GERRIT SMITH.
 PETERSBURG, July 21, 1841.

Wm. Ch. dell—My Dear Brother: When I wrote you my letter of 17th last month—a letter which, I presume, will appear in due time, in the Investigator, I made up my mind that no further defence of the positions of the Church of Petersburg was called for, at my hands. Modesty alone should prevent my further occupation of your columns with this subject. But another consideration to prevent it, is that I could not better my argument by multiplying my words. I must be content, therefore, to leave that argument, as it is, under your dissecting knife. No one is more able than yourself to detect its fallacies; and I the more faithfully you expose them, the better I shall be pleased. Much as I love the positions of the church of Petersburg, I shall be glad if they are overthrown; for if they can be overthrown, they are not of God; and what is not of God I have no interest to maintain.

It is, therefore, not to speak of the church of Petersburg, that I have taken up my pen. I have taken it up to ask you whether, in your fifth letter, you have not fallen into the common error of making a man guilty of holding the conclusion which others draw from his premises.

One of my beliefs is, that "there are friends of God (and with me, all the friends of God are, as you know, church members) who are so benighted, as to consent to stand in the relation of slaveholders." Your inference from this belief is, that I would "scoop" into the church all sorts of wicked people. For another of my beliefs, I referred you to my letter to Cassius M. Clay. It is, that when I have learned, that the candidate would wield his official power on the side of slavery, I have, without inquiring into the extent, or even the question, of his wickedness, learned enough to determine me not to vote for him. It is too, that when I have learned so much of the candidate, I need learn nothing more of either his head or his heart, to make it plain that I must not vote for him. It is too, that I may vote for anti-slavery candidates without their being "wicked men." Your inference from this belief (though I think you cannot understand the belief, as I have here represented it) is, that I would vote for gamblers, debauchees, mad-doctors.

Now the truth is, that I would not extend the hand of church fellowship to any persons but such as I think to be Christians; and that I would not vote for any persons, but such as have, in the ordinary meaning of the expression, a fair moral character. But you will justify your inferences by saying, that they are legitimately drawn from my beliefs or premises. It is, perhaps, true, that were I to act consistently with those beliefs or premises, I should act as you suppose. But ought you not, charitably, to hope that I will refuse to act consistently with them?—and that I will by my refusal, show that my heart is better than my head? Ought you not charitably to hope, that whilst you, with your clearer mind, see the logical connection between my theories and those guilty practices, for which you regard me as ripe, I would promptly give up these theories, if my mind were not too cloudy to perceive this connection?

I had no idea, until reading your letter, that you and I differed in this matter of voting; and even now, I can hardly believe that we do. You would not vote for an admitted Christian, if you thought he would refuse the rightful use of his office in behalf of the slave; and I would not. I would vote for an intelligent man, of fair moral character, who would so use his office; and this I would do, even if he were not a Christian. Would not you do likewise?

Pardon me for not seeing the connection which you see, or indeed any other connection, between my theories of church organization, and my belief of the possibility that a man, living in some benighted portion of the earth, or in other unfavorable circumstances, may be a Christian, and yet not know that the relation of a slaveholder is, over and essentially, sinful. However erroneous this belief, that theory nevertheless, may be right—entirely right. You and I do not necessarily differ in our theories of church organization, because a certain man is a Christian in my eyes but not in yours.

A candid man is careful not to prejudice the opinions of his opponent on the point under discussion, by referring to the unsound or unpopular opinions of that opponent on another. Now you are well aware that the great majority of your readers think me wrong in believ-

ing that there are any supposable circumstances in which a man can be a slaveholder, and yet a Christian. You are a candid man; and hence it is not from a want of ability, that you have landed the positions of the church of Petersburg with the oilum, which attaches to my belief of the possibility that a slaveholder may be a Christian. You are a candid man; and hence it was not to prejudice those positions that you have now dug up a delusion, which my hearty repentance of it, nine years ago, consigned to a deep grave—the delusion that the American Colonization Society could be brought to harmonize with the Anti-Slavery Society. It is true that you may give me liberty to make reprisals; but I know not that I should and my errors in all your past life; and if I could, I hope that I should not be willing to make an ungenerous or improper use of them.

Pardon me, too, for not seeing the connection which you see, or indeed any other connection, between my theory of church organization and my voting. This theory is, that every Christian is a member of the local church where he resides. Now, how this theory should, as you say it does "govern my political action," I do not understand.

Such are my doctrines of Christian union, that I concede to you the right of Christian fellowship with all whom you believe to be Christians. Do you not reciprocate this concession? Or is it so, that you will let me have Christian fellowship with such only as you think are Christians? If it be so, as I presume it is not, then I see not but you are as intolerant as the sects.

You see a glaring and gross inconsistency between my belief, that a church which refuses to proclaim anti-slavery truth is not a church of Christ, and my belief that it is possible for a slaveholder to be a Christian. But to this inconsistency I am alone blind. If a church in Ontario or Madison county should refuse to admit, that it is wrong for its members to loiter about grog-shops, it could give me very little evidence that it is a church of Christ. But I might still think it a church of Christ, even though it should believe that one of its members, who is guilty of this very sin, is nevertheless a Christian. More readily could I believe it to be a church of Christ, if the person for whom it has such charity, dwells in a less enlightened community than Ontario or Madison county. Yes, and I could believe it to be a church of Christ, even though it might believe, that in Asia, a real Christian can be found apologizing for infanticide. Yes, and I might believe it to be a church of Christ, even though it should believe, that in Arkansas there is such a strange thing as a man's being a Christian, and yet being ignorant of the sinfulness of holding property in his fellow man.

For my own part, brother Goodell, I am afraid to say, and I am always sorry to hear abolitionists or others say, that no individual at a given place—for instance, of the class of slaveholders, or commissioners, or rum-sellers can by any possibility, be a Christian. There is frequent occasion to recall the remark of the late eminent Doctor Mason, to the young man who justified his wish to marry an ill-tempered girl, on the ground that she was pious, and that the Holy Spirit dwelt in her. "The Holy Spirit," said the Doctor, "can dwell where you and I can't."

With great regard, your friend and brother,

GERRIT SMITH.

Deferring, for the present, an answer to the above, we subjoin an extract from Gerrit Smith's letter to Cassius M. Clay, containing the paragraph connected with this discussion.

"From the doctrine of your letter, that good men can through ignorance, live even in great sin, few abolitionists will be found to dissent. But you will pardon me for not being able to perceive, that either this doctrine or your quotation from Macaulay, which, I cheerfully admit, serves to justify it, has any pertinence whatever on the question before us—has any bearing whatever on the point of voting. I find no fault with you for intimating, that Henry Clay is ignorant of the moral nature of slaveholding. I find no fault with you for numbering him, as you impliedly do, with 'religious, great, good, and patriotic men.'"

But what I cannot for is, that you have no more right to vote for him, under the supposition that he does not know the sinfulness of slavery—no more right to vote for him under the supposition that he is a great and good, than under the supposition that he is a little and bad man—no more right to vote for him under the supposition that he is a Christian, than under the supposition that he is an infidel. And in this connection, I would say, that the leading consideration of the abolitionist in his vote is extensively misapprehended. Tens of thousands of persons suppose, that the abolitionist, in his bigotry and narrowness, votes for his candidate

because he thinks him sinless; and withhold his vote from rival candidates because he thinks them sinful. If they are mistaken. The abolitionist passes by slavery tickets, not because the names on them are names of sinners, but because they are the names of men, who, whether sinners or sinners, will, if elected, refuse to wield their official power for the overthrow of slavery. He prefers the anti-slavery ticket, not because they are the names of sinless men, but because they are the names of men, who, however imperfect their practices and principles, will, if elected, their offices, as far as they constitutionally can, take or the land from the grasp of slavery. In all this abolitionist exhibits good sense. When I am choosing a man to act for me, I must see to it, that I choose one who will act upon, and act out my principles. When I am voting to fill the office which has power to grant or withhold licenses for making drunkards, I am to concern myself, not so much with the general religious character of the candidate, as with the question of their faithfulness to the principle of temperance.

So now, when I am voting to fill the office of president of the United States, it is an insufficient excuse my pro slavery vote, to say, as you virtually say, "The man for whom I am voting, is indeed a slave of slavery; but he does not know slavery to be wrong, and he is, moreover, a 'religious, great, good, and patriotic man.'"

From the Liberty Press.

REPORT

Of the proceedings of the Church Reform Convention held at Whitesboro, July 10th and 11th, 1841.

MR. EDITOR: Perhaps the occasion which drew the friends of Church Reform together at this place, is indicated with sufficient distinctness in the printed call. Yet a brief statement of position of things in that department of Christian enterprise, in this section of country, may shed some light on the character and doings of the convention.

A goodly and still increasing number of friends of humanity, of civil and religious freedom, of a Christianity, which, instead of being occupied with the incidental, shall be engrossed with its soul and substance, "judgment," for injured and outraged, and a "love of God," which shall manifest itself in deeds of love and kindness and heart-felt reverence for His image, by whose soever it may be borne, and in whatever condition it may be found, have already separated themselves from those corrupt associations, churches. Many others are on the point of secession. Obstacles, formidable in appearance, they are called upon to surmount. Their numbers are few, their resources limited. Amid monstrous claims which are set up by existing organizations to ecclesiastical authority, they are embarrassed for want of light on points of Church order. They do not see clearly what may their relations and obligations to those associations with which they are connected. Should they secede, their numbers are too small, the fear, to enter upon church relations. The mystery of the word, in accordance with the customs of society, they are unable to maintain. The ordinances of Christ's house, how shall they enjoy? These embarrassments not only distress those who would otherwise secede, but also many of them press heavily on those who have already separated themselves from non-Christian churches, and entered by themselves upon the maintenance of Gospel ordinances. "That, by mutual counsel, light might be shed upon those points of respect to which the friends of reform were involved in darkness—that some mode of action which would relieve them from their present embarrassment might be devised, the friends of church reform were called together.

The convention was well attended, and its interest well sustained by earnest men, who felt deeply the importance of the objects for which they had convened.

To those who looked to this convention for light and assistance, permit us to suggest it as our conviction, that the difficulties and embarrassments

* The very thing that in my letter, I did charitably "trust" but that will not prevent others from carrying out the principle.—W. G.

† I should add, perhaps, some difficulty in admitting a man to be a Christian, who plays the part of a Pharaoh, in refusing to let the people go; when the word and the providences of God are so constantly repeating the mandate to his care.—W. G.

which they now labor, it resolutely entered by entering earnestly and heartily upon course of activity similar to that which is urged in the resolutions there adopted, would most-ly. And "instead of the thorn would be the fir tree, and instead of the briar would be the myrtle tree," and that the fruits of exertions would, in the development of their men, abundantly reward them for all their

MINUTES OF THE CONVENTION.

Convention met pursuant to the printed call, Rev. Chester Hildcomb was elected Chairman, and A. Kingsbury, Assistant.

Francis Child and Josiah Newton, were appointed Secretaries.

The following persons enrolled their names as members of the convention:

Leah Green, L. C. Hough, Francis Child, Wm. K. Child, John Cunningham, Wm. Lawson, Francis Lawson, F. Briggs, Philip McIntee, Samuel Camp, B. Green, D. A. Holbrook, Stephen Purdy, Joseph Allen, Charles Foster, David Foster, C. S. Child, Whitcomb; B. F. Hurlbut, J. Prescott, T. Allen, Almon Mills, Charles D. Mills, New Hartford; H. Dyer, Jr., J. C. Delong, A. H. Hunt, Isaac Dorr, David Plumb, Utica; J. Ward, Ira Hills, Arba Child, Jesse Tryon, Vernon Center; R. Seymour, Spencer, Paris; John McCurick, James A. Boyd, Parly, Rome; Francis Hawley, A. Kingsbury, Cazetovio; V. Gilbert, Lucius Spencer, Lebanon; David Child, David Allen, Augustus Ira Wells, Daniel Child, Holland Patent; Roswell Sage, Vernon; Wm. St. John, Deerfield; S. W. Stewart, Clinton; L. C. Mott, Exeter; David McConck, Schuyler's Hill; Freeman Waterman, Taberg; David Sile, Wadsworth; Samuel Wells, Peterboro; J. Leach, Winfield; Rev. Hildcomb, East Winfield; Josiah Newton, Clinton; A. Crosby, Elchfield; L. C. Lockwood, New Windsor; F. M. Hopkins, Floyd; W. Lewis, Canastota; W. L. Larry, Lee; Norman Child, Delta, Moses Shepard, Ohio.

Resolution, a Business Committee of five was chosen, consisting of Rev's S. Wells, D. Sile, F. Hawley, L. Hough and L. C. Lockwood.

The committee having retired, a statement of facts bearing on the object of the convention, was called for, presented by the Chairman and followed by the Rev. Stickney, who read an extract from the report of a pastor of the Utica Presbytery on his renewed refusal to have his connection with that body dissolved. A partial report of the Business Committee was then read and adopted.

The first resolution was called up and discussed by S. Child and David Kendall. The convention then adjourned to half past 1 P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Convention opened with prayer by Rev. D. Kendall. The Business Committee then reported five additional resolutions. The discussion of the first was then resumed by B. Green, F. Hawley, D. Plumb and others—adopted.

Second resolution taken up and discussed by S. Wells, Plumb, B. Green, W. Stickney and others—adopted.

Third resolution called for and discussed by B. Green, S. Sile, and adopted.

Voted that the convention meet to-morrow at 9 o'clock P. M. Then adjourned till half past 7 this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

Opened with prayer by H. Sage.

Fourth resolution called up and discussed by W. Lawson, N. Miller, E. Child, the Chairman and others—adopted.

Fifth resolution taken up and discussed by L. C. Hough, F. Waterman, R. Spencer, F. Lawson, and others—adopted.

Convention adjourned with prayer by Rev. F. Hawley.

JULY 11, 9 o'clock, A. M.

Convention opened with reading the 51st Psalm by the Chairman, singing the hymn, Come, Holy Spirit, and prayer by Rev. D. Kendall.

Eighth resolution called for and discussed by L. C. Hough, L. C. Lockwood, B. Green, D. Clark, A. Kingsbury and others—adopted.

Ninth resolution taken up and discussed by S. Wells, Kendall, and adopted.

The remaining resolutions were adopted without discussion.

Convention then adjourned with singing, prayer by Rev. B. Green and the benediction by the Chair.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. Resolved, That a church is to be acknowledged as Christian on condition that it be "the light of the world," those religious organizations and those only are entitled to our confidence and support, which earnestly and resolutely require their members to embody and express Christian character, both by word and deed, in all the natural relations of life; as well the commercial and political as the ecclesiastical.

2. Resolved, That the unrebuked practice of voting for the oppressor of the poor, for those who practice and patronize fashionable vices, and for those who favor the traffic in intoxicating drinks,—the unabated practice of furnishing for the manufacture of strong drink,—the unabated continuance of the negro pew, and other exhibitions of the spirit of caste,—the relentless persecution of the advocates of Reform resulting often in their excommunication,—and the cherished sectarianism now manifest in bodies called Christian churches, furnish painful evidence that they have so broken their covenant with the Savior as to destroy their Christian character.

3. Resolved, That the charge of covenant breaking as urged against those who secede from such bodies, is false and injurious.

4. Resolved, That we rejoice in the evidence constantly accumulating, of an awakened attention to the claims of a sound morality, too long held as distinct from a pure religion, which is preparing the way for a revival of true Christianity.

5. Resolved, That the duty of secession becomes apparent, as the reasons for that step manifest themselves, irrespective of anticipated or foreseen difficulties or results; i. e. the discovery of the anti-Christian character and activity of an association involves the duty of separation from it, whether they be one or many, or whether the prospect of an extensive secession be flattering or otherwise.

6. Resolved, That numbers are not essential to church activity and success: that where two or three Christians only have separated themselves from corrupt associations, they ought immediately to enter upon the duties and honor the responsibility of a church of Christ, in assembling themselves together for the worship of God, securing as far as may be the ministry of the word in connection with their brethren in other places.

7. Resolved, That our brethren be entreated in their Church activity to adopt the principle of receiving all Christians, irrespective of any opinion or practice not vitally affecting Christian character.

8. Resolved, That every Church ought to appoint one or more of their number, whom they deem best qualified, to the office of religious teacher, who may, in the absence of a teacher of higher qualifications, afford them such instruction as they may be able.

9. Resolved, That we earnestly recommend the circulation of the Christian Investigator, as a paper well adapted to promote the objects of this Convention.

10. Resolved, That Messrs. Samuel Wells, Peterboro, Ira Hills, of Vernon Center, Washington Stickney, of Canastota, Allan Kingsbury, of Cazetovio, and Wm. Goodell, of Honeoye be a committee to call another convention.

10. Resolved, That L. C. Hough and the Secretaries be a Committee to prepare an account of this Convention for publication.

11. Resolved, That we tender our thanks to the friends in this place for their kindness and hospitality during the sittings of the Convention.

L. C. HOUGH, } Committee
FRANCIS CHILD, }
JOSIAH NEWTON, } Publication.

REFORMATION TRACTS.

No. 1, "Iniquity and a Meeting."—No. 2, "Are you a Christian?"—price \$1 a hundred, for sale at the Publisher's, &c.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, SEPTEMBER, 1841.

THE SALVATION OF SOULS.

One of the fruitful sources of barrenness in the church—of childish imbecility and low attainment in Christianity for those accounted to be such,) is to be found in that *also sentiment* of many ministers and other prominent religious professors, that if enough can be done for individuals or communities to get them converted, and made Christians, to get them finally to heaven, to get them into a SAFE condition and out of danger of the pit of despair—why! that is of such infinite importance, to be sure it is, that any further attempts in their behalf are to be regarded as works of supererogation, if not evidences of a trifling spirit, or of unevangelical tendencies on the part of those who would make or advocate them!

Any effort, in any direction, to increase the knowledge and usefulness of Christians, to instruct them in the deep things of God, to encourage them to think for themselves, to promote moral inquiry or theological investigation, to introduce biblical lessons and exercises into churches, to diffuse a better knowledge of church history, church polity, church organization, church discipline—a better understanding of Christian institutions, ordinances, ministry, and Sabbath—any efforts, especially to promote Christian inquiry on subjects of Christian duty, and Christian morality, the lawfulness or unlawfulness of war, slave holding, wine drinking and dram selling—any efforts to divorce men from their vices, their bad habits, their beastly appetites, their subjection to the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, their idolatry of gold, their insane pursuit of delusive and reckless worldly schemes—each and every effort of this nature, earnestly and systematically pursued, shall draw down upon any church member or minister the suspicion of—what? Of being forgetful or regardless of the *worth of souls!* Of being busied about something aside from the *salvation of sinners!* And so it comes to pass that little or nothing must be directly and earnestly attempted to increase Christian knowledge, to restore church order, to understand Christian doctrine, to discharge Christian duty, to study the Holy Scriptures, to divorce professors or non-professors from their lusts, to reform their worldly habits and vicious practices, because all the energies of the churches and ministry should be put in requisition, (so it is said,) for the one exclusive object of "saving souls" that is, saving them from *HELL!* getting them into a safe state; and this, the bulk of community are led, and are left, to infer, may be done *without* any particular effort in any of the directions that have been described—and by a process which shall leave the happy subject of it, in very nearly, if not quite, the same position he was in before, in respect to any or all the particular objects that have just been specified. This is indeed making religion to consist in one notion, if not 'one idea,' and a notion, too, exceedingly vague and indistinct, not to say superficial and delusive.

Undertake now, to point out any destructive error, or crying sin, or disgraceful scandal, that prevails in the church, or is cherished by it, and what will you hear in reply? The next, doubtless, that if you were only engaged in religion, as you should be, if you were duly intent on the *salvation of sinners*, the plucking of brands from the burning, and the conversion of the world, you would have enough, and better business, to occupy yourself with, than "heresy hunting," or dwelling on agitating and unpleasant topics, disturbing the harmony of the church, and abusing pious Christians! In other words:—if you were only zealous enough in making *proselytes*, you would care less for the purity of the Christian faith, you would be less

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. II—No. 10.
WHOLE NUMBER, 30.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., OCTOBER, 1844.

WILLIAM DOBELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL II., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

To be published Monthly, or as often as practicable.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, sent, always in advance and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the same without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy of the paper free. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Five, per dozen . . . \$2 50	Sixty papers . . . \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00	One hundred papers for 3 00

always in advance, and free of postage.

If Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

REFORMATION TRACTS, NO. 4. "ARISE AND BUILD!"

They said unto them, Yee see the distress that we are in—how Jerusalem both waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire. Come, let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach. And they said, Let us be up and build. So they strengthened their hands for this good work." Nehemiah 9: 17, 18.

TO THE FRIENDS OF CHRISTIAN REFORM:—
To those who see and feel the Desolations of Zion, and are waiting for the consolation of Israel.

Dear Brethren—Why do we tarry? Why do we not arise and build? Are we insensible to the desolations around us? Are we yet to be informed that the walls of Jerusalem are in RUINS?—that all her ancient bulwarks against iniquity, are broken down? Have we not heard the voice of these desolations—and heard in them the proclamation of the GREAT MASTER to ARISE AND BUILD? Have we forgotten the model we are to build upon? Or have we no directory for our guidance? Are we at a loss for the motives that should impel us to action? Do we not feel the necessities that are pressing upon us? Are we unacquainted with the sources of aid and encouragement that are provided for us? Do we not distinctly apprehend the infinite interests committed to us? Do we place a low value upon the objects to be secured by our promptitude and fidelity, or wrecked by our hesitancy and half-heartedness? Do the sneers and cavils of the Sanballats and Tobiahs around and among us, dishearten and perplex us? Or, are our hearts, too, "overcharged with surfeiting and cares of this life?"—and "laying up treasures on the earth?" If not, why do we not arise and build?

JERUSALEM IN RUINS!

Is it not even so? Where is the separating wall between the people of God and children of the wicked one? In what existing church organizations (save here and there a solitary exception) do we find anything that could be easily mistaken for such a wall?

The wall of a city is that which encloses all the citizens and defenders of the city, which keeps them together, by themselves, in a place of security; and which shuts out from the city all who are not citizens, but aliens and enemies. Such were the walls of Zion—the city, the church of the living God. But these walls were, long ago, broken down, and have not yet been rebuilt.

There are, indeed, a plenty of walls, in our modern Zion, which divide the citizens from each other, so that they cannot act together for the common defense! And these walls are so contrived and guarded, that many of the citizens are shut out of the city (the visible church) entirely, unless they will submit to authorities which the King of Zion never established!—But these walls

are not the true wall of Zion—they are not calculated to enclose all the citizens, and exclude all the enemies of the city. They hinder the building of any such wall.

The church is without a wall, that does not, by its fundamental principle of church organization, receive into equal church membership, all who give scriptural evidence, by their faith and good fruits, of being the regenerated children of God—and that does not also exclude and reject all who fail to exhibit such evidence. For it is only by the application of that principle, that the church can include and protect its children, and exclude its enemies.

But this fundamental principle is discarded by the modern sects. The walls they build—the church usages they establish, are adapted to separate Christians from each other, and prevent their co-operation and unity. And they likewise shut out of the churches those Christians (admitted to be such) who will not conform in outward rituals and ceremonies, or questions of doubtful disputation among Christians, nor submit to ecclesiastical authorities not established by Christ. These schismatic and despotic usurpations form no part of New Testament church order and discipline. Nor will they permit any such order and discipline to exist, because it is impossible in the nature of the case, for a church to separate between the righteous and the wicked, when the dividing line between the righteous and the wicked does not, even in theory and purpose, constitute the criterion of church membership. The whole essence, significance, definition and pith of church organization and church discipline, involve the separation of the righteous from the wicked. "A church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men." And when usages are introduced which exclude the faithful, and retain the ungodly, the essential character of a Christian church is lost; and there remains no separating line between the church and the world.

And hence the condition of things we now witness. The almost universal complaint and confession assures us that church discipline is extinct, as it must ultimately be, in churches where the first principle and standard of church discipline is discarded. Wicked men, notorious for their dishonesty and oppression, abound in the churches; and for the most part, the churches are controlled by majorities who give no evidence of being regenerated Christians. The ministers and officers of the churches, especially the most prominent and influential leaders of the sects, are, to an alarming extent, of this class, seeking their own, and not the things of Jesus Christ. Experimental religion and vital godliness are at a low ebb. Spirituality is displaced by the idolatry of outward forms, the love of God and man supplanted by the love of the world, and Christian enterprise palsied by the lust of gain, or the pride of vain show. So far from being the salt of the earth and the light of the world, taking the lead and direction of measures for reforming the vices, removing the burdens, and relieving the miseries of mankind, reproving oppressors and pleading for the poor, it is an outstanding fact, well attested by all earnest and self-denying laborers in every cause of Christian benevolence and reform, that the existing churches, with rare exceptions, are the most formidable obstacles in the way, particularly where human rights and the claims of the oppressed are concerned, maintaining, as they do, church fellowship and religious co-operation with slaveholders, receiving the gains of robbery into the treasury of missions,

assisting, through the votes of their members, to the election of the most wicked oppressors to the highest offices in the nation, discountenancing the discussion of the subject, thus becoming the very "bulwarks of American slavery"—and sending themselves up to this condemnation by the substitution of a worldly and selfish expediency, (the ethics of atheism itself) for the plain and unequivocal commandments of God, in the holy scriptures, closing their ears to the voice of remonstrance and entreaty, and winking, in many cases, their church powers, for the suppression of free inquiry, and the persecution of the faithful in Christ Jesus.

It can neither be safe nor innocent to remain in such churches. The providences of God unmasking, day after day, in a most remarkable manner, their corruptions, afford us an instructive commentary upon the explicit requisitions of his word. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Not less significant are the providences and the precepts that unitedly call upon us to ARISE AND BUILD.

BUT HOW SHALL WE BUILD?

1. Build as did Ezra and Nehemiah, in the spirit of *humiliation and prayer*. "The wall of Jerusalem is broken down and the gates thereof are burned with fire. And when I heard these words, I sat down and wept and mourned certain days, and prayed before the God of heaven." Neh. 1: 4, 5. "We made our prayer unto God, and set a watch against them night and day." Ib. 4: 9. "When Daniel understood that the desolations of Jerusalem were well nigh accomplished, he set his face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayers and supplications, with fastings, and sackcloth and ashes." Dan. 9: 3. God promises to build the ruined places, but declares "he will be inquired of, by the house of Israel, to do it for them." Eze. 36: 36, 37.

2. Build in God's NAME and in God's STRENGTH. Build no churches of your own; nor of Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Luther, Calvin, Edwards or Wesley. And, though working and co-operating with each other, do not work in your own strength, nor trust in an arm of flesh. Above all, go not down into Egypt for help.

3. Build on the one sure foundation, CHRIST JESUS. Other foundation can no man lay than is laid. Let no false liberality or worldly expediency tempt you to build in company with those who would build on any other foundation than the hated, but fundamental doctrines of the cross, and the atonement of Christ—*God manifest in the flesh*: the doctrines of human guilt and human helplessness without Christ, the atoning sacrifice and High Priest—regeneration by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith, salvation by Christ alone—the sufficiency of the scriptures—the duty and necessity of immediate and unconditional repentance—faith—and good fruits—the retributions of eternity—the fundamental, immutable, and eternal distinction between the righteous and the wicked—the resurrection of the body—the immortality of the soul, and the life everlasting.—Whether with or without a written creed (or expression of sentiments) distinct from the scriptures, cling to these foundation principles of natural and revealed religion, as to the sheet anchor of the church, without which, Christianity itself would become unmeaning, and the church useless. The spiritual wants of man, as a guilty sinner, yet formed in the image of that God who is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and

in truth, demand for human nature that spiritual religion which is defined only by the doctrines of the cross; and nothing short of the spiritual, new birth they propose, can secure even the moral elevation of mankind as a race, from the degradation of brutal vice. With a less high toned theology than is furnished by those doctrines, the high toned ethics required by the world's reformation, find no basis on which to repose.

4. Build with sound materials, and with none other. Receive those whom Jesus Christ receives, and reject those whom Christ rejects. By their fruits shall ye know them. He that is of God heareth God's words. Open your church doors to the "beloved of God, called to be saints," "sanctified in Christ Jesus," and "faithful brethren, in Christ." Open them to the righteous, who considereth the cause of the poor, but not to the wicked who regardeth not to know it. Open them to the men of "clean hands and pure hearts," but not to the men who profess to have pure hearts while their hands are full of blood and polluted with bribes. Open them to those who have "an unction from the Holy One," who "know the truth, and that no lie is of the truth." But "if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that bideth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." "Not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no, not to eat." "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

5. Build on the New Testament model of church organization, and admit nothing that cannot be found there, by whatever name it may be called, or whatever shape it may assume, whether of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or any thing else—whether Conferences, Yearly Meetings, Associations, Conventions, Presbyteries, (over a number of churches,) Synods, General Assemblies, Diocesan Bishops, Cardinals, or Popes. Study the directions of Christ in Matt. 20: 25, 27; Mark 10: 42, 43; Luke 22: 25, 26; Matt. 18: 15, 20; Matt. 23: 8. Observe the sole supremacy of Christ over the church, the absolute equality of the brethren, the consequent and obvious prohibition of a superior order, a clerical caste, and of the authority of a select few over the mass, the membership, the assembly; in other words, the church, to whom alone is committed ecclesiastical power, and from whose decision to another earthly tribunal Christ permits no appeal. Take notice that the disciples "went every where preaching the word," (Acts 8: 4;) and remember (what none dare dispute) that during the apostolic age, notwithstanding so many preachers with miraculous gifts, including the apostles, devoted themselves to the preaching of the word, there was no clerical monopoly either of preaching or baptizing, among Christians; but all were encouraged to speak according to their gifts, 1 Cor. 14: 23—31, and all the brotherhood were exhorted to become teachers. Heb. 5: 12.—Take notice that a number of elders (the same as presbyters, pastors, or bishops) were chosen in every church from among the brotherhood, either preachers, or others, who assisted (like the officers of voluntary associations in our times) in the transaction of church business, but did not take the business out of the hands of the assembled brotherhood. Take notice too, that deacons were chosen to distribute the contributions of the church among the poor. Remember that each worshipping assembly of Christians constituted a church—that there are no other organized churches mentioned in the New Testament but such, and that all church business was transacted by such churches assembled together with one accord in one place. 1 Cor. v: 4; Acts i: 12, 26; ii: 1 and 46; v: 12; xv: 12.

With these plain directions and examples before them, any number of Christians assembled

together in the spirit of their divine Master, are competent to organize a Christian church. The process is so simple that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. As to the matter of form, or procedure, it is as simple as the form or process of organizing a Temperance Society. It should be done with a deep and solemn sense of accountability to God and dependence upon him. It should be done with unreserved consecration and earnest prayer. But there is nothing mystical or magical about the form. It requires neither the presence nor the assistance of any minister, or others from abroad. It needs no "counsel" unless it be for further instruction or advice. There is no power, or authority in counsels, in ministers, or in any association, or ecclesiastical body, to organize churches. Nor does it pertain to any except the members of the church organized, to do any such thing. So far as the act of church organization is an act of human beings at all, it is simply the act of the persons organizing themselves into a church, of their own free accord. It is an agreement between the individual members of the church, meeting as equal brethren, and a covenant between the church and its Great Head. No man nor body of men on earth can either authorize or forbid the act, nor add nor detract anything from the validity of the organization. And when thus organized by their own free act, the members possess all the ecclesiastical powers that any church can possess. All attempts by any person, or body of men, other than such churches of equal brethren, to exercise ecclesiastical authority, are usurpations to be resisted as pertaining to the man of sin. Their strict independency of all other bodies, the local churches are solemnly bound to maintain. The power of ordaining (that is to say, appointing or choosing) their own church officers, pastors (or elders, presbyters, bishops,) and deacons, is a power pertaining to the churches alone, and in no degree to those who were pastors or deacons before them. Associations of ministers have no more authority to license or ordain ministers, than associations of deacons would have to license and ordain deacons, or associations of church clerks to license and ordain church clerks. In either case, equally, the power of choosing their church officers belongs solely to the brotherhood, the members of the church; and in either case, they are to choose their officers from their own number, as in all other associated bodies composed of equals.

"But we are too few and too feeble." In whom, then, is your strength? Is it in man, or in God? "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I, in the midst of them."—The Savior says this in direct reference to this very subject—the authority and validity of church action. See its connection in Matt. 18.

But how shall we enjoy Gospel ordinances, and the preaching of the Gospel? How shall so feeble a band maintain religious worship on the Sabbath? Answer. How was it done in the primitive churches? Search the New Testament and see! Look again at 1 Cor. 14: 23, 31. In what part of the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, or the Revelations do you learn that the assembled disciples could hold no religious meetings, no baptisms, no celebrations of the Lord's supper without "regularly ordained ministers?" Church history may tell us that neither of these were restricted to ministers, until a long time after the apostles were laid in their graves.

But is it not desirable to have stated public preaching, from men mighty in the scriptures, and devoting themselves to the work? Doubtless it is. Pray ye therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth more laborers into his harvest. Do what you can to sustain them, and especially to train up the membership in such a close study of the scriptures, that many of them may be "able to teach." In the mean time, "forake not the assembling of yourselves together," Make the best arrangements for a supply of preaching, that

you can. For a time, while the churches are in an infant state, a number of churches might be supplied by the alternate preaching of the same man. But do not delegate to any Conference or other body, the power of making the appointments. Let each church, when assembled together, act for itself. And remember carefully that a preacher, like any other man, can be pastor, member, or officer of only one church at a time—that he must be subject, like every other Christian, to the watch care of one local church, on an equality with his brethren.

"And what shall we do about a creed?" If by a creed you mean a binding or authoritative rule of faith or discipline, see to it that you have none but the Bible. Otherwise you renounce the first principle of the Protestant reformation, that "the Bible is the only sufficient rule of faith and practice." But if you simply mean a convenient memorandum of your original church agreement—a statement, for the time being, of your views—a definition of your present position;—draw up a plain statement for that end. Let it either contain no points of doctrine not deemed essential to Christian character, or else, do not make an assent to it, in every particular, a condition of church membership. See to it, nevertheless, that your members, as well as candidates for church membership, are essentially, intelligently, and practically, sound in the Christian doctrines. Never imagine that your written creed is so complete that it contains all that Christians should believe and practice. Never assume that it is susceptible of no further improvement. At all times let it be open for re-examination and change. Never proscribe free inquiry. Never mistake growth in knowledge for heresy—nor condemn as fanaticism, growth in grace and progress in holy living. In fundamentals, there must be agreement, in "doubtful disputations" and "incidentals," forbearance, and in all things, free inquiry and free speech. The churches should be stable, firm in first principles, but ever making progress. They should gird on their armor, but not suffocate their vitals not cripple their limbs with it. Their theological landmarks should be used to unite and not to divide Christ's little flock, not excluding the weakest whom Christ has received, nor yet receiving pretentious wolves in the guise of lambs.

WHY NOT AR. & BUILD?

How long shall the walls lie in ruins? How long shall the enemy blaspheme? How long shall the divine institutions of church and ministry be a by-word and a derision? How long shall they be comparatively powerless for good, and wielded by the enemy of all righteousness? How long shall they drip and mislead the Christians remaining in them, instead of combining their energies, and guiding them by mutual counsels in the right way? How long shall the Christian brotherhood be held in bondage, instead of wielding their God-given powers? How long shall church institutions cover those whom they were intended to unite; and bind up together those whom they were intended to separate? How long shall they lure on, and embolden, the self-deceived, the apostate, and the hypocritical, in their way to destruction? How long shall they drive into infidelity and misanthropy the warm hearted and the strong minded, the foes of oppression, whom they ought to convert, and whose sanctified and instructed intellects and energies they ought to employ for God and for mankind? How long shall they destroy souls, instead of saving them, obstruct the world's reformation instead of urging it onward, bind humanity in fetters instead of emancipating it, sympathize with oppression instead of the oppressed, teach the doctrine of caste, instead of equal brotherhood, and retard the millennium instead of ushering it in? How long shall the triumph of the cross and the redemption of the world linger, for want of churches whose efforts God can consistently bless?

How long shall the promised effusions of the Spirit and the predicted manifestations of the divine glory be withheld, because the holy order of the temple is not restored, for its reception? [See Ezekiel 43: 1, 6, compared with the two preceding chapters.]

Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no Physician there? Has the King of Zion abdicated his throne, or relinquished his sceptre? Is his hand shortened that it cannot save? Has he forgotten his promise to build up Zion—or his decree that out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem? That the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea? Is he no longer the hearer of prayer? Or is he as a mighty man stationed, that cannot save? He will appear, and that speedily? Zion shall be redeemed with judgment and her converts with righteousness! She shall be rebuilt! *The work shall be done!* The question for you to settle, dear reader, is simply whether you will be one of the self-denying and triumphant builders—or whether you will have no part nor lot in the matter. That question, most assuredly, you will decide! But be assured, *"the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together!"*

SIXTH LETTER TO GERRIT SMITH,

And in answer to his fourth Letter.

GERRIT SMITH.—My dear brother, I have, all along, conceived that you have been writing in defence of what you believed to be important Christian truth, rather than in defence of "the positions of the Church of Peterboro," so that no dictates of "modesty" should prevent you from saying all that needed to be said. I should be very sorry to think that the discussion, on my part, was begun or continued for any other ends than the discovery and dissemination of Christian truth; especially do I trust it was not done for so unworthy an object as contending with my dear brethren of the "Church of Peterboro," for whom I have always cherished the most marked and affectionate regard.

If I have indeed "fallen into the common error" (in my fifth letter) "of making a man guilty of holding the conclusions which others draw from his premises," I have greatly erred, and must hasten to make due amends. But I thought I had very carefully guarded against that error by saying, explicitly, that I trusted you would not carry out your "theory" into the results to which, in my mind, they would inevitably lead those who should follow them. I may, indeed, have mistaken your premises, (for I have said, I find it difficult to understand them;) but such a mistake, if I have made it, is not to be confounded with the practice of drawing my own inferences from your positions, and then charging them upon you. To confound things so distinct, would be very nearly akin to making a man guilty of the inferences drawn by others from his premises.

I never supposed that you would, on any grounds, "scoop into the churches" those whom you regard as "all sorts of wicked people." But I confess I did and do fear that your belief that there are slave-holding Christians, connected as that belief is with your other belief that there is "no voting into the church or out of it," would have the effect to "scoop into the churches" some "sorts of wicked people" (wicked in reality, whatever you might think of them,) whom I should not consider to be Christians. Now, it may be that my fears are groundless; but perhaps they may not spring from a defect in charity or candor.

You may reply to this, perhaps, by asking me, as you have done, whether I do not "concede to you the right of Christian fellowship with those whom you believe to be Christians," without insisting that you shall hold "fellowship with such only as (I) think are Christians?"

Doubtless I cheerfully concede to you this inalienable right, brother Smith; but in doing it, I do not surrender nor suspend the exercise of my own inalienable right of telling you honestly, when I think needful, (in accordance with the eighth resolution of the Church of Peterboro,) that I think you are running into a hurtful, and even ruinous error, so far as the purity and existence of Christian churches, or of the anti-slavery enterprise, are concerned, when you admit to Christian fellowship the oppressors of the poor, guilty of the "highest kind of theft." Do you think me "as intolerant as the sects" because I say this? If you do, let me remind you that, in this matter, the "charity" and "Christian unity" so much lauded in "THE SECTS," are arrayed on your side of this question, and that their "intolerance" is chiefly expended upon those who hold with me on this subject. Their excessive Catholicism, quite as palpably as their narrow bigotry, has proved the bane of the sects.

POLITICAL ETHICS.

I certainly understood your letter to Cassius M. Clay as going much farther than saying, that "when you had learned that the candidate would wield his official power on the side of slavery, &c. &c., you had learned enough to determine you not to vote for him," &c., &c. I understood you, as others did, to repudiate the doctrine that votes are to be withheld from candidates on account of their being "sinners," that is to say, *wicked men*. And I have had the unhappiness to learn that, in another state, Henry Clay Whigs (whom the Christian Investigator cannot have mislead) are triumphantly and effectively quoting Gerrit Smith's apparent concession that the measures alone, and not the moral character of the candidate, is to be considered "in the casting of votes." The use of the terms "sinners" and "sinless" does not alter the impression conveyed. In a sense, *all men are accounted sinners*; and very few persons believe that their favorite candidates are absolutely *sinless*. There could have been no need to disclaim what no one honestly supposed the Liberty party held. And those terms were peculiarly adapted, in their connection, to convey the impression that the writer considered it absurd and impracticable to insist on suspending our votes upon the "general" character of the candidates, as well as their measures.

And what other interpretation of your letter to Cassius M. Clay could I gather from the use you made of it, in your discussion with me? You had avowed your readiness to hold Christian fellowship with certain slave-holders; I had urged upon you the inconsistency of receiving to Christian fellowship the men from whom, on account of their bad characters, you would withhold your vote—thus insisting upon a higher standard of moral character in the state than in the church. In reply, you referred me to your letter to C. M. Clay; and you added, "It is NOT because he is WICKED that I refuse to vote for a pro-slavery man; but because that, if elected, he will not use his OFFICIAL POWER for the overthrow of slavery."

Was it a mere INFLUENCE of mind, that you regarded not the moral character, but the measures of the candidate? Or was it only a fair interpretation of the reasons you furnished me?

If I had not understood you as disclaiming the rule of withholding your vote from a man on account of his bad moral character, what relevancy could I discover in your reference and statement about your rule of voting, in the case in hand?—to my complaint that you used a lower standard of moral character in the church than in the state? If you did not mean to say that the moral character of the candidate had nothing to do with the question of your voting for him, pray how did you vindicate your consistency in the matter?

* This information reached me before the July number of the Investigator, containing my strictures, had been issued.

If you do withhold your vote (as you now say you do) from those who have not, "in the ordinary meaning of the expression, a fair moral character," then I have to repeat my complaint that, in holding Christian fellowship with slave-holders, you do insist upon a higher moral standard of character in the state than you do in the church: unless you should insist (as I think you will not) that slave-holders sustain "a fair moral character." I cannot, for a moment, suppose that the "ordinary meaning," in a pro-slavery community, as endorsing the "fair moral character" of men-stealers, could furnish a definition for the use of Gerrit Smith.

I am glad to see the statements you have now made, of your rule of voting; and all I will ask of you is, consistency, not with my views, but with your own.

If you withhold your vote from a political candidate because of his immoral character, because he is a slave-holder; then withhold your Christian fellowship from him, for the same reason: and we shall soon be agreed. You will then make the Christian church, (that in your view contains none but Christians) as morally pure as you would the state.

CONNECTIONS OF THINGS.

It will be seen, I think, by this time, what connection there is between your theories of church organization, and your rule of voting, as expressed to C. M. Clay. Your theories of church organization, as a whole, (not simply the item that "every Christian is a member of a local church") are such as forbid you to exclude a man from church fellowship and church privileges merely because he is a slave-holder. Yet you are engaged in a course of political action which forbids you to vote for a slave-holder. And when reminded, that by this course you are demanding greater moral purity in the state than you do in the church, you answer, or seem to answer, in substance, "No; you mistake the reasons, the rule of my voting. I have not tried to vote wicked and unjust men out of office in the state; I have only tried to vote out men who will not carry out certain right measures I have in view, just at this time." [I give this not by way of "inference," but of exposition. Do I mistake you?]

I never heard of your holding this view of voting until, some few years since, you broached it in the same connection you have now done, as a justification of your extending to slave-holders your Christian and church fellowship. And I never knew a Liberty party man, who was a Christian, hold your view of voting, (I mean the view you were understood to hold in your letter to C. M. Clay,) unless he held likewise your view of extending Christian and church fellowship to slave-holders. I think I may justly claim, then, that I had some better foundation for connecting your church theories with your rule of voting, than the unworthy motive of bringing one of your sentiments into disrepute, by connecting it with another that was unpopular with my readers. And besides, I am not aware that my readers are more averse to your Christian fellowship with slave-holders than they are to the sentiments (concerning voting) in your letter to C. M. Clay. Some, I know, have been annoyed with the latter, who had never before thought much of the former.

But you do not see the connection between your theory of church organization and your belief of the possible Christian character of some slave-holders. But I suppose you see some connection between the different items that go to make up the "theory of church organization" taught in the "creed of the Church of Peterboro;" and I thought you were sufficiently aware that one of my chief objections to that theory was, its reception into Christian fellowship of those whose "doctrines or practices were unscriptural, blameworthy, be it to whatever extent it may;" and slave-holders among the rest. How necessary this item is to the theory, as a whole,

you can perhaps better judge than myself; but it seems to be quite too important to be relinquished; and I cannot but feel a strong degree of assurance, that if you could but be persuaded to give up this, you would find all the other items of your theory, that I dissent from, sliding away from under you, before you were aware, and that you would feel little inconvenience from the loss. Deeply as I lament my continual exposure of falling under the imputation of uncharitableness, (to the view of my most honored and beloved friends,) and even under the half-suspicion of saying harsh things to excite prejudice against them and their views, I cannot do any justice to this subject without, tating it in the connection in which it lies in my own mind.

Let me say, then, that I have always supposed that the "theory of church organization" expressed (not for the first time, however) by the Church of Peterboro—the theory I opposed in Luther Myrick's paper, years ago, has its origin in the too good-natured inclination to consider all our dear friends to be Christians who think themselves so, and welcome them into the church. Some of them may deny fundamental truths of religion—some of them may be rum-sellers, and others may be slave-holders. But we think it possible they may be Christians; and instead of demanding scriptural evidence of the fact, by the exhibition of the appropriate fruits, before we receive them, we seek to throw the responsibility wholly on them, and of course off from ourselves, when we sit down to the table of the Lord. But this inclination we cannot indulge, unless we can have a "theory of church organization" that will square with and sanction it. And what theory will do this? Certainly not the theory that requires us to "vote men into the church and out of it." The responsibilities of such a theory must, of course, be got rid of, in the outset. But how shall it be done, but by pleading, (as the principal "sects" plead,) that none but God himself can certainly know who are Christians—that there may be Christian slave-holders, and Christian rum-sellers, and (it is consistently enough added, sometimes) who deny the Lord that bought them, and will not hear his words; and Christian unity, and the peace of the churches, must not be marred by rejecting them. This item settled, it follows that Christians cannot organize Christian churches, because they are organized by God himself. It follows, that those who consider themselves to be members of the church, have a right to be considered as such. It follows, that if there are any local churches, they are to be composed either of all who think themselves to be Christians, or else (a more plausible theory) of all whom God sees to be such. On the latter theory it follows, too, that the local churches, as distinguished from the church universal, must be designated by their "territorial limits"—that these local churches are such "of mere divine organization, all human arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding." It follows, that "every Christian is a member of the local church where he resides." And a great many other things follow, or will follow the theory, as I have had occasion to show.

Now, I do not say that those who hold this theory of church organization are conscious, to themselves, that they have arrived at it by this process. I do not say that, at any time in their history, they have connected its parts together in this order, by a logical operation. But I am as fully persuaded that the theory of church organization which you advocate is, as a matter of fact, the result of such a process, as I am that any other moral effect ever resulted from a moral cause. And this is the reason why I dwell so largely, in my first letter, on that mistaken LIBERALITY, or CATHOLICISM, that lay, as I believed, at the very basis of the theory I objected to, and that could not fail to use it, in accordance with its distinctive characteristics, and for the expansion and propagation of its own doctrine.

LIBERALISM OF THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

And what offence, or even mistake, did I commit when I adverted, in this connection, to that Colonization Society in the support of which you were once earnestly engaged? Do not suffer yourself, I beseech you, to harbor the unfounded suspicion that I delighted to taunt you with the mistake you then made, in common with many others whom I love and respect—a mistake from which, at one period, I was not myself wholly free; or that I alluded to that mistake of yours for the unworthy purpose of exciting a prejudice in the minds of others against the soundness of your views on another question, in any way connected with it. Be assured, I had no such groveling intention. Be assured that, in my own mind, your former and your present mistake (as I deem it to be) are so closely connected together, that I cannot think of the one without thinking of the other, nor rationally accept your own magnanimous invitation to labor for your deliverance from your present mistake, without pointing out to you its marked resemblance to that former one, the fallacy of which you detected, long ago.

In one of its most marked features, what was the Colonization Society but an organization based upon *human* a broad, expansive, catholic and liberal sound idea that has been described? An organization for religious and benevolent objects (as all churches should be,) laying its chief cornerstone on the pleasing delusion, that as some slave-holders may possibly be Christians, it is wise and Christ-like to receive them as such, without stopping to wait for the evidences of their good fruits! For the life of me, I can detect no essential difference between the principle of receiving slave-holders into a society designed to evangelize the heathen and elevate the degraded, and the principle of receiving them into the churches; except that the latter, being more sacred, should be kept more pure. [Some members of the "old" but "new organized" American Anti Slavery Society, by-the-by, as I learned from its "Standard" are beginning to honor the very Catholic principles they now hold, by regretting the constitutional exclusion of slave-holders from their society! And why not, if they are good members enough for the "Church of Peterboro"?] Do I make an "ungenourous or improper use" of your old and exploded errors, (so heartily repented of, and so amply atoned for,) when I make them the instruments by which you may detect your present errors?

IRRELEVANT MATTER.

We need not decide which is most guilty, the Southern slave-holder, or his Northern apologist, in order to decide that both should be required to bring forth fruits meet for repentance, before being recognized as Christians. And besides, I am not conscious of having yet been informed by you, that the pro-slavery voting professors of religion in Peterboro are denied the fellowship and ordinances of "the Church of Peterboro," any more than are the slave-holding professors of religion at the South. As little to the point is it to decide how far a church may go in receiving unworthy persons without a forfeiture of its own Christian character.

You are sorry to hear Abolitionists and others say, that rum-sellers and slave-holders cannot, by any possibility, be Christians. Let me remind you, again, that this is not the point in debate. What a man "may" by some "possibility" be, is one thing; what a man gives distinct and positive evidence of being, is another. And no Christian, nor Christian church, has Christ's leave to recognize any one as a Christian without that positive evidence: "YE SHALL KNOW THEM BY THEIR FRUITS." And my view of the matter is, that "extortioners" and "man-stealers," while remaining such, especially at the present day, cannot exhibit that evidence. The Spirit of inspiration (1 Cor. 5: 11) explicitly forbids us to fellowship "extortioners"—and, of course, "slave-holders, as Christians."

Without forgetting the infinite forbearance and long-suffering of the Holy Spirit, I must question whether the remark of "the late eminent Doctor Mason, in your application of it, is calculated to make the best impression. The Scriptures abound in manifold exhortations to Christians and churches, against being too liberal in extending their Christian and church fellowship; but comparatively few, if any, against the opposite error of rejecting those whose evidences of Christian character may be doubtful. There is more danger that the church and the community will fix the standard of Christian character and of church membership too low, than that they will fix it too high. The seven churches of Asia, the church of Rome, and all the churches that have ever apostatized, have done so, not in consequence of their being too rigid, but in consequence of their being too lax in the recognition and fellowship of church members.

And if it be true that the Holy Spirit dwells with some with whom true Christians do not so harmonize as to live comfortably with them; it is also true, that Christians who fraternize with more with whom the Holy Spirit does not hold communion. "The late eminent Doctor Mason," and those who listened to his instructions, have never been remarkable, that I know of, for their efficiency in promoting any work of Christian reform.

THE DIFFICULTY NOT REMOVED.

If I now understand you correctly, you would not vote for a debauchee or a gambler, even if you were satisfied that he would carry out the measures of the Liberty party. I take it for granted, then, you would not vote for a slave-holder or a duelist, on a similar supposition. Now, if you had distinctly said this to Cassius M. Clay, you would have made, I think, a very different impression on his mind, and on the public mind, from that which you have now made; and the consequence might have been, that Abolitionists would then have had to remain under the opprobrium of being as "narrow and bigoted" as any body had ever supposed them to be!

But since you would not vote for the duelist, the gambler, the debauchee, nor the slave-holder, because they are so wicked, (for I suppose that this, and not expediency merely, must be the reason,) you must allow me again to press upon you the inconsistency of which you are guilty, the dishonor you are doing to the cause of Christ and the Church, when you recognize as fit for church membership, and as members of the body of Christ, the men who are so wicked that you would be ashamed to think them fit for members of Congress, or for Presidents of the United States. And let me entreat you to give up those unscriptural and irrational theories of church organization and church discipline by which you contrive to justify yourself in maintaining such a position.

TRY THE EXPERIMENT.

If you still think me unreasonable or fanciful in supposing that your religious fraternity with slave-holders is vitally connected with your views of church discipline, your theories of church organization, and your rule of voting for law makers, as expressed in your letter to C. M. Clay, just do me the favor to try the experiment, and see. Imagine yourself, for one half-day, to have imbibed my impressions of the great sin and wickedness of holding religious fellowship, and entering into religious co-operation with incorrigible oppressors of God's poor. [I have a right to say incorrigible; for the supposition must, of course, be, that you would not enter into, or retain, religious fellowship with slave-holders, without earnest efforts to reclaim them; and if reclaimed, you would have no fellowship with slave-holders by receiving them.] Let the thought, then, (merely in supposition,) sink into your mind, that you now feel the necessity of holding no religious fellowship with slave-holders—that you are impel-

to "come out from among them, lest" you should "partake of their sins, and receive of their plagues"—that the "heaven" of one slave-holder in a church, if retained, would be sufficient to "leaven the whole lump," and destroy it. With deep convictions of the correctness of such sentiments, what views do you think you should then take of church discipline? And with such views of church discipline, what theories would you then have to admit of church organization?

Would you not then feel the necessity, for yourself and fellow-Christians, of doing something equivalent to voting men into the church and voting them out of it? Of saying who you will consider and treat as church members? Who you will permit to co-operate with you in your religious activities—to speak in your conference meetings or your pulpits—to sit down with you at the table of the Lord—to assist in deciding whether pro-slavery or anti-slavery men shall be officers in the church?

Certainly you would. And would you not then discover that Christians have something to do with organizing Christian churches, and saying who shall be church members? In other words, would you not see that mutual consent, agreement, and co-operation, enter into the very idea of mutual church membership?

And if so, what becomes of the notion that men may be members of a local church without the consent of the church members—and even without their own consent, or their own knowledge of the fact?

And if a church must decide who are church members, must it not know who are members? And can it not keep a list or roll of their names? Without such a roll, in a large church, how shall it be known who the members are, and whether slave-holders are members of the church or not?

And when you have settled the principle that mutual, intelligent, voluntary, hearty, spontaneous, and well considered and adjusted consent, agreement, and co-operation enter vitally into the elements of church organization—what becomes of the theory of inviolable and territorial church membership, of involuntary church membership, from which a Christian cannot escape without the sin of schism—from which the church itself cannot release him, without a wicked sanction of his schism? And what place or what necessity could you then find for such an item in your church creed as that which provides for the church membership of those "who, in their doctrine or practices, or both, are peculiar, unscriptural, blame-worthy, be it to whatever extent it may?"

And then, with such a standard of church membership and church discipline, who could have any opportunity to remind you of the discrepancy of holding church fellowship with persons so wicked that, on account of their wickedness, you would not entrust them with the affairs of the state, while they assisted you in directing the affairs of the church? And what need would you have to refer them to the paragraph in your letter to Cassius M. Clay? Or what need would there be of your holding the sentiment which that paragraph contains, so little in accordance with the sentiment that "he that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God?"

Most certainly you would not have no representative or consider your church creed to be other than consistent with itself, and exhibiting a consistent whole, from which no one link could be taken away without breaking the chain. Nor could you have no think or represent your ecclesiastical ethics to be in bad keeping with your political ethics. Your labor to reconcile them efficiently shows that you would not. Connected as these things are, and must be, in their nature and relations, why should you expect me to consider them otherwise than as connected? To fail of looking at them in their connections, would be fail of looking at them as they are.

THE DISCUSSION AND ITS OBJECT.

And in my March Review, did I not say distinctly, that my "MAIN OBJECTION" to the language you used in describing your theory of church organization was, its tendency, as I thought, to introduce unsound members into the churches, and retain them there? And was it not what I said on THAT POINT (and with a direct bearing upon the case of SLAVE-HOLDING CHURCH MEMBERS) that was most objectionable in your view? And has THAT POINT been lost sight of, by either of us, in the whole debate? Is it not remarkable, after all this, that you should now expect me to prosecute with you a discussion of our differences on church organization and church order, without bringing into view the "chief" thing that gave rise to the debate, and the most important practical point involved in it? And is it not strange, that in doing this you should go so far as almost to intimate a want of candor and fairness on my part—a willingness to prejudice Abolitionists against your theory of church organization, by connecting it, needlessly or carelessly, with your proposal of church fellowship with slave-holders?

Be assured, once for all, Brother Smith, that it was for no frivolous, or captious, or idle purpose that I took up my pen, when I determined, at much sacrifice of personal feeling, to write that March Review. It has been for no such purpose, nor from a love of controversy, nor from a desire to measure weapons with you or any other man, or to carry a mere abstract point, or to become a stickler for a precise form, that I have continued the debate till the present moment.—The time, the strength, the space, the funds expended in this discussion, I have greatly needed for other work. Prepared manuscripts and projected ones on other subjects, that should have appeared long since, have been crowded aside. No reader of my little sheet can regret, more than myself, this protracted debate. But I feared I saw at the first, in the Peterboro creed, and in the theory of church organization it promulgated, a system of church polity that if adopted by Abolitionists, would of necessity involve them in the guilt and ruin of CONTINUED CHURCH MEMBERSHIP WITH SLAVE HOLDERS. What I then feared to be the meaning of the Peterboro creed in this respect, has, at length, and after elaborate discussion, proved to be its meaning. Is it my fault that this result has been reached? And ought I to have began and conducted the discussion of church organization as involved in the Peterboro creed, in such a manner as not to bring out, in this particular, its moral bearings and results? Believing, as I did, that the theory of "not voting into the church and not voting out of it," would inevitably bring slave holders and their apologists into the church, and entrench them there, (on higher claims of Bible authority than are urged for the same practice by the sects,) believing too, as I did, that, so far from promulgating theories of church order that invite slave holders, it was the duty of American Christians to "come out from among them, lest they partake of their sins and receive of their plagues;" and engaged as I was in an enterprise of church reform, having this principle and belief for its basis, what right had I to neglect doing the precise thing that I have done? Here were Christian brethren all over the country, coming out, or preparing to come out from the sectarian churches, on account, mainly, of their fraternity with slave holders and their apologists, and organizing new churches on the ground of a common christianity that had enjoined upon them a separation from "extortioners," while it banded them to receive all who gave them scriptural evidence of being Christians. Just at this crisis there comes out a printed plan of church organization. It comes from a church commonly understood to have been gathered by secession, as

an anti-Slavery and Union church, yet its theory is nevertheless such that slave holders cannot be excluded from its activities and its common work.—This feature of the plan, however, is not commonly seen, and many who look upon it with favor do not discover in it any such bearings or results. The feature is nevertheless there, and by adopting the theory the result would be reached. Apprehending this to be the fact, could I do less, as an editor enlisted in such an enterprise, than inquire into the matter, and bring out the facts that were found to exist? "Whatever doth make manifest is of the light." If the theory of the church of Peterboro, as a whole, does involve and contemplate communion, co-operation, and church membership with slave holders, is it unfair or uncandid in me to bring out that fact, and to object to it on that ground?

It is true indeed that I have traced the apparent bearings and results of the theory in other directions, and have objected to it strongly on the ground of those bearings and results. This I must needs do, if I would exhibit the subject in the light of what I believe to be truth, and in the connexions I understand it to sustain. If I may not do this, I may do nothing at all. A theory of church government that denies the activity and responsibilities of Christians in organizing churches, denies their right to exclude slave holders, of course. And denying this, it must, of necessity, break down all the distinctive barriers between the church and the world. If any thing can preserve those who adopt and follow this theory from the disorganization of the no-church-government system, the remedy must be found in that application of the theory that, availing itself of the principle of a constrained and involuntary church membership, defined by territorial boundaries, denies in the name of church unity, the right of free social worship, and runs into some corresponding usages of semi-episcopacy or Papacy.

In objecting to the Peterboro theory, on these grounds, I was not bound—no, nor was I at liberty to forget, that church fraternity with slave holders was likewise a distinguishing trait, a necessary result of that same theory. If abolitionists are led to see the unsoundness of the theory, on account of its leading to such a result, that circumstance is no fault of mine, nor am I to be blamed if I have distinctly pointed them to this result, in evidence that the theory identified with it is unsound. The same theory, years ago, led the editor of the Union Herald to the same result. The same theory it was, likewise, that (in a very natural application of it) affected the political ethics, and shaped the political activities of that editor, in a direction that brother Smith will be likely to remember. The Herald intimated, pretty distinctly, (and who could demur?) the narrowness and bigotry of setting up a distinct political party, to promote a moral object, which our principles of church unity and organization, (as he understood them) prevented us from making a church test.

On a careful review of the whole subject, I have no more hope that a trustworthy reformation, either in the church, or in the state, will be witnessed in this community, and in our own day, than I have that the theories of church organization I have been opposing, will be wholly exploded by Christian reformers, and utterly laid aside. Less than this, I cannot, in Christian faithfulness, say. More than this, in connection with what I have heretofore said, I need not add.—My testimony is recorded, and my work done.—I must rest, or turn my attention to other tasks. It is a light thing to be judged of man's judgment. The hope of so laboring in my Master's service, as to meet the approbation of my most cherished and honored friends on earth, has grown fainter and fainter for many years, and is now well nigh extinct. I have long been stationed at a lonely post, and there I must still stand. Significant indications admonish me that my last task may

soon be finished, and, for aught I can tell, this discussion may be the one. If it be so, I cannot assure myself, that in any other labor to which I am competent, my last time and strength could have been more usefully employed. For seventeen years past, my shoulders have well nigh been crushed, under the burdens of the lumber I have been commissioned to remove, that others might build slightly dwellings, and inhabit them on the same site. At this I do not demur. Nor will I grieve myself, nor reproach others, that my work is little understood, while I live, and will be forgotten by those who will reap the fruit of it, before the grass is green on my grave.

You affectionate brother,

WM. GOODELL.

HONEOYE, Ontario Co., N. Y., Aug. 27, '44.

For the Christian Investigator.

SECOND LETTER FROM DAVID PLUMB. CHURCH INDEPENDENCY.

Dear Bro. Goodell,—I have but few words to offer in reply to your copious notes attached to my former letter. Not but that they are all worthy of attention, but I have neither the time nor the disposition to enter into a long discussion on the question at issue. To notice a few points in your remarks, therefore, will be all that I can do, and, I trust, will be sufficient, if not to answer your arguments, at least, to set my own in their true light.

In my former letter I remarked that Dr. Smith "had gone farther in conceding to your views of independency than the Christian principle or scripture precedent would allow." On this you make the following note: "A concession that absolute church independency is inconsistent with Bro. Plumb's theory." Not so. Because I am opposed to your views of church independency, is that the same as to be opposed to absolute church independency? [1.] May not yours be a wrong application of the principle? So I deem it. I maintain the absolute independency of the one local Church. [2.] But you divide this one church into several absolutely independent churches. This independency, I think, is schism, and, therefore, to concede this, is going too far. [3.]

Again. From the Savior's prayer that his disciples "all may be one," I argue the necessity of a visible union of all Christians in a given locality: and in order to show that this visibility does not extend farther than the local church, I make the remark, that this visible intercourse and joint action cannot be universal. On this you inquire, "Then how can the memorable prayer of the Savior be fulfilled, that his disciples 'all may be one,' if, as Bro. Plumb's argument hath it, that prayer amounts to a positive law that they should be one, that this unity was designed by Christ to assume a visible form." If it cannot be universal, you say "Bro. Plumb should have discovered that his whole argument, from the prayer of the Savior, falls to the ground." Now if I could be convinced that universal visible unity, in the same sense as local unity, follow-

ed from my premises, as you did not show any flaw in those premises and as I am unable to discover any myself, I should be obliged to contend for such universal visible unity. [4.] But it by no means follows. Christ prays, that his followers "all may be one, that the world may believe that God hath sent him." Now my argument is, that the oneness of the saints, to produce the effect to make the "world believe that God hath sent him," must be visible, for it must be something that the world can see. Now what union, to be seen by the world, can there be less than association and joint harmonious action? If it is anything less than this, then the sectaries may claim it. Then, says Bro. Goodell, it must be universal, for the Savior prayed for the unity of "ALL that should believe on him." This does not follow, for the reason that it is impossible, in the sense intended. The universal church can never be visible as a witness. It can only be visible in its parts, that is, in the several localities where Christians are sufficiently contiguous to associate. Now, if in all these localities Christians are visibly one, then the universal church is visibly one in the only form in which it can be seen—that is, in its parts; and in this sense the union is universal. And who will say that such a union does not practically "fulfill the Savior's prayer?" [5.] And I am sure, no one will pretend that he meant to adjust his prayer to a mere logical abstraction. If "wherever you see Christians, there you see them 'one,' 'together,' 'with one accord,' is not this enough? [6.] But if instead of this, where you see them, there you see them divided into "absolutely independent bodies," as if pursuing separate interests, does this evince unity and, consequently, prove to the world that Christ was really sent from heaven, from the God of harmony, of unity, and love? [7.]

In my communication I took the ground that there were probably several assemblies in the church at Jerusalem and other populous places, yet but one church. I supposed this would have to be admitted on all hands, not that it was essential to my argument, as you seemed to suppose. In rebutting this view, however, you not only contend that there was but one church in a city or town in the apostolic age, but that there was but one assembly. Nay, you refer to 1 Cor. 5: 4, and say, "they were explicitly directed to transact their business when *gathered together*—that is, as you would mean, in one place. You also refer to the fact that the whole Jerusalem church acted together in the matter recorded in the 15th of Acts. Now if both scripture precedent and apostolic authority, as Bro. Goodell contends, required that the Christians in the primitive cities should act in *one body*, how can Bro. Goodell show from the same authorities (and surely he will not appeal to any other) that the Christians of a given locality may now divide into several absolutely independent bodies and "transact their business" SEPARATELY? Surely, in this position, Bro. Goodell yields the whole point. [8.] He even admits that numbers made on

(4.) So then, in this case he has supposed, Bro. Plumb would sooner go for one universal church government, as the Romanists do, rather than come into the views of local (or congregational) church independency that I have described, and which he considers 'sectarianism' and 'schism.' Put a pin there. Without doubt there is no tenable or tangible ground between the two.

(5.) An excellent argument to prove what I have all along contended for, viz: that the spiritual unity which Christ had in view in his prayer, is perfectly consistent with the separate and independent government and discipline of such local churches as I have described.—What Bro. Plumb has here said of his local churches, is equally true of mine. "The whole can be visible only in its parts," and best visible (no where else truly visible) in the separate congregations, where even upon Bro. Plumb's theory, Christians are obliged to act.

(6.) Quite enough, Bro. Plumb, even in the local worshipping congregation, though perhaps but "two or three are gathered together in Christ's name." And therefore there is no occasion for amalgamating a dozen assemblies or churches into one artificial assembly or church, in order to manifest their unity.

(7.) Wherein does it appear that a thousand separate Christian assemblies or churches in London, among two millions of inhabitants, (who cannot be personally acquainted with each other) would indicate separate interests, and mar Christian unity, any more than the twenty-five separate churches that Bro. Plumb's theory would permit to be independent, in the twenty-five towns of a county? What idea are we to attach to the word place? Is London one place and Oneida county twenty-five places?

(8.) A very remarkable statement! I affirmed constantly, and on the ground of scripture testimonies and

difference in the primitive church, [9] for admitting the Jerusalem to be a church, as I could not the church at Antioch and upwards, I say, "they had a large place of meeting in the temple, or, peradventure, in the open air." Could not this be done now? [10.]

If then, in the largest primitive cities, there was no occasion for more than one church, and no account of more than one, then where can be the authority or necessity of more than one in the cities of the present day? [11.] For my own part, I frankly admit, that I believe Christianity, in the apostolic age, to have been more flourishing and to have had more adherents proportion to the earth's population, than it has ever had since, or ever will have in this present probationary age of the world. [12.] But so this as it may, still contend that neither the Christian principle nor scripture precedent will allow the Christians of a

apostolic direction, which I cited, that the churches at Jerusalem, Corinth and other cities, were not so numerous that they COULD not, and DID NOT transact their business, assembled together, at ONE PLACE. And now Bro. Plumb reasons as though I had said (which I did not, but denied) that these city churches were required to act in one body, if so numerous that they could not all act in one place!

(9.) Not so. For the argument's sake I suppose (what I showed to be improbable, if not impossible) that Jerusalem church to contain 5,000 members, and I stated that in the immense temple at Jerusalem, which the Christians it seems had daily access, or open air, where, in that climate, and according to prevailing usages, large numbers were accustomed to "congregate," there might be accommodations for the assembled action of all the members convened. I made this supposition to show, that even upon Bro. Plumb's extravagant estimate, there was no necessity for supposing (what the account in Acts 15 proves was not) that several separate congregations acted simultaneously as a matter of church business, and then brot those separate decisions together, and took the whole make out the result, as Bro. Plumb proposes to do now! Was this admitting on my part that I held to whatever extent) made no difference in the primitive church? Was it not my whole drift to show the numbers were not so great as to prevent their assembling, "with one accord, IN ONE PLACE," according to the testimony of the inspired historian? Am I now to be considered as having conceded the point?

(10.) How many buildings as large as the Jerusalem temple does Bro. Plumb suppose there are in the United States? And to how many buildings capable of holding 2000 worshippers, could faithful worshippers of our age and nation gain access for the transaction of church business? And what portions of our country are in climate (I do not say latitude) with Jerusalem, Corinth, and Antioch?

(11.) In the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, Christ gives directions for transacting church business, where two or three are gathered together in his name. "The business is to be transacted by the assembly," is, by the Christians assembled. "Tell it to the church." And if he neglect to hear the assembly, next I Does Christ say—Tell it to the fifty or a hundred assemblies that may chance to exist in the town or city or province or nation? Not! Not the kind. He says, "if he neglect to hear the assembly, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Let the prosecution of the matter cease, and be no further. There is no authority nor necessity, in any New Testament precept or precedent for any further than this. Oh! how much mysticism and plexity might be saved, if people would only remember that the word church means nothing more nor less than congregation or assembly, and that those constitute an assembly who assemble! There is no stopping short of the church universal, if we go beyond it. And no church discipline, on Christian or other principles, can be maintained over an individual, but, if we go beyond the bounds of the steadily blessed brotherhood, who are personally acquainted and therefore competent to watch over each other. Here is a distinct and natural boundary to the church; and every other boundary must be artificial.

(12.) Bro. Plumb's low estimate of the copy members of the latter day churches, would lead him to magnify the numbers of the first church.

"Witness the immense gatherings about John the Baptist in the Jordan and Emma; also around the Savior by the sea of Galilee, and when five thousand were miraculously fed."

NOTES TO BRO. PLUMB'S LETTER.

(1.) By the 'term church independency,' I mean (what is commonly meant by those who use the term, and what is always meant by Independents themselves, including Congregationalists and Baptists,) viz: the independency of the local worshipping congregation of Christians. Buck's Theological Dictionary says that 'Independents' are so called from their maintaining that each congregation of Christians which meet in one house for public worship, is a complete church; has sufficient power to act, and perform everything relating to religious government within itself, and is in no respect, subject or accountable to other churches.

Now if Bro. Plumb will bear in mind that this is what I mean when I speak of church independency, I trust he will find my statements consistent and in accordance with facts. Assuredly he will not claim, that such absolute church independency, is otherwise than inconsistent with his theory, which is all I said, and all I could have been understood by the friends of such church independency, to say. And no others would be influenced against his views by my remark.

(2.) This 'one local church' it seems, may be so extensive that it cannot meet in one local place. Why, then call it a local church or assembly? How can the phrase describe several local churches or assemblies?

(3.) Here again Bro. Plumb repeats precisely what I attributed to him, viz: a denial of the right of 'local church independency,' as the term is commonly understood.

Laws and governments, so far as they are deserving of the name, are instituted to remedy this state of things, and they are founded on the principle, that when any one man's rights are invaded, it is the duty and the interest of each, and of all, to resist it. Take away this principle, and the whole frame-work of all civil government, law, and order, falls to the ground.

Republics are averted, and despotisms erected in their stead, because men are too selfish to care for the rights of their feebler and despised neighbors, and will not plead in their behalf when their rights are invaded. This habit, once fixed upon a people, and the double precedent is established, of aggression on the one hand, and non-interference on the other. And this settles the fate of any republic, and the destinies of any people in a short time. Mankind will enjoy their rights when Christianity has sufficiently counteracted men's short-sighted selfishness, to make them care for the rights of the most despised, and the most defenceless of the community. This one consideration is, of itself, sufficient to convince reflecting men, that Christianity, or the religion of disinterested and magnanimous benevolence and self-denial, is essential to the civil freedom.

PROGRESS OF SENTIMENT.

When we concluded, in 1811, to publish the 'Christian Investigator,' as a separate sheet, it was because so few, even among the abolitionists, were prepared to make the slave question a text in the churches, and to deny the Christian character of churches adhering to the slave system, that was not thought advisable to press that topic in the 'Friend of Man,' then under our editorial charge. But a number of liberty papers are now giving prominence to the same sentiment, and by way of specimen, we copy the following from the Cincinnati Herald:

ANOTHER QUESTION.

"We see it stated in the religious papers, that Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, of Baltimore, and Wm. S. Plumer, of Virginia, will meet at my convenient time and place, Bishop Whelan, and any two others whom he may select, and discuss with them this question:—*'Is the Romish church the church of Christ?'*"

We will propose another debate between the two above named gentlemen, and the Rev. S. Crothers, formerly of Kentucky, and the Rev. Edward Smith, formerly of Virginia, upon the question, *'Is a church whose ministers and members buy and sell men, women and children, and withhold from their laborers their hire, the church of Christ?'*

This is a question of just as much importance, we take it, as the former one.

POLITICAL ACTION AND CHURCH ORDER.—No doubt there are many earnest abolitionists, so much engaged in the enterprise of political action against slavery, that they grudge the labor and expense, at this juncture, of a protracted discussion of church order. But what if it shall prove that the ethics, the purity, and the success, of political abolition, depends, vitally, upon the ethics taught by prevailing theories of Church order?—*It shall see.*

THEOLOGY & MECHANICS.

In the progress of the species, it will, one day come to be understood, that the knowledge of God is the comprehension of all science—that men cannot forget the Creator of all things, without exposing themselves to the most ridiculous absurdities, in their efforts to understand the objects around them and to combine and apply them, according to the fixed law, which control them, for the varied purposes of human convenience.—We have been reminded of this by a communication published in a Vermont paper—the 'Voice of Freedom,' and of which we here present some extracts:

"I presume the scientific gentlemen who examined Col. Boon's machine and pronounced it a 'perpetual motion,' would not consider a wind or water mill perpetual motion, because the moving of air, or falling of water is constant. If not, why call a machine that is moved by the contraction and expansion of mercury, or any other metal, a perpetual motion, because the action of the agent by which the machine is moved is perpetual? It is a known principle in mechanics, that no real power can be gained by any combination of machinery, except there is an equal gain in an opposite direction. Some use long levers and large wheels to increase power, never thinking that this diminishes velocity, and of course,

power in proportion; and, as motion is power to give velocity, brings them to the point whence they started.

Perpetual motion, as laid down by Mr. Thornton, a former superintendent of the Patent Office, is 'a machine capable of undiminished power, or power generating itself.' Now, to construct a machine of this description, we must destroy gravity and friction, which greatly diminish the power of machinery.

To do away gravity would be to destroy all weight.—And to avoid friction, we must annihilate gudgeons, axles, joints, pivots, the atmospheric resistance, centrifugal and centripetal forces, and the contraction and expansion of every thing caused by the variation of the atmospheric temperature. It is astonishing how much time and money have been expended by thousands of mechanics, in trying to produce perpetual motions; or, what is the same thing, an effect without a cause."

In other words, it is astonishing how heavy a tax men will greedily pay to their own semi-atheism—their forgetfulness of God. When it comes to be understood that "the laws of nature," as we call them, are nothing distinct from the predetermined mode of divine operation, and that all their efficiency lies in the ever present, and active operation of the divine will—when truths like these come to be honored, and taught as foundation axioms of physical as well as metaphysical science, then, and not until then, will men cease to delude themselves with "their own vain imaginations"—their "oppositions of science falsely so called."

Our writer proceeds:

"Many, who have finally failed in these attempts, have resorted to fraud, by concealing springs, weights, &c., in their machines, and exhibiting them to the public for pay. I would not be understood to class Col. Boon's invention with the humbugs of Hufschlager and others, who have figured largely in the perpetual motion hunt; for the Col. has a power undoubtedly, sufficient to overcome gravity and friction, which he obtains from the expansive force of something; and this is the very reason why it is not a perpetual motion."

If this writer's definition of "perpetual motion" be correct—if the thing he describes, is the thing men have been seeking after, then of course, the effort has been to discover a divinity in matter—to construct an independent deity (so far as mechanical effect is concerned) out of created things!

All this is not more preposterous than some similar theological attempts to account for mental and moral phenomena without the intervention of a divine, vital energy, by mere combinations and appliances, independent of God.

"Some say, that in the infancy of things, When all creation started into birth, The infant elements receiv'd a law, From which they swerv'd not since. That under force Of that controlling ordinance they move, And need not his immediate hand who first Prescrib'd their course, to regulate it, nor. Thus dream they and contrive to save a (Th' encumbrance of his own concerns; and spare The great Artificer of all that moves The stress of a continual act, the pain Of unremitted vigilance and care, As too laborious and severe a task. So man, the moth, is not afraid, it seems To span omnipotence, and measure might, That knows no measure, by the scanty rule And standard of his own, that is, to day, And is not, ere to-morrow's sun goes down, But how should matter occupy a charge, Dull as it is, and satisfy a law So vast in its demands, unless impell'd, To ceaseless service by a ceaseless force And under pressure of some conscious cause! The LOAN OF ALL, himself through all diffus'd, Sustains, and is the life of all that lives. Nature is but the name for an effect, Whose cause is God."

Couper.

Persons may call this poetry, if they please, and look wise, as though poetry were of necessity, fiction! Poetry it doubtless is, but none the less matter of fact description on that account—Poetry it is, and theology, too, and profound and accurate philosophy into the bargain. In those

quarters of the globe, and in those periods of human history, in which theology, or the science of the one living and true God has been nurtured, no other profound science (whatever may be said of the *finis artis*) has ever reached any high point of development. The man who does not learn to connect effects with their Great First Cause, will not be likely to discover the laws by which they are governed, or the springs of their connection with, and operation upon one another.

A COMMON CHARACTER.—He loves all Christians who belong to his own sect, who agree with him in rituals, in metaphysical theology, in the cut of their garments, and in the style of their living. They must be refined, so as not to offend his taste. They must be well dressed, so as not to be regarded as rustic. They must be particular in their appearance, so as not to be accounted slovenly. They must not be too much above him in society, so that he cannot keep pace with them in appearances. They must be very little, if any below him, unless their intercourse can be of such a character as not to mark them as equals. They must not controvert any of his opinions, nor, in his presence, advance any thing different from his views. These, and a few other conditions complied with, he would be glad to enjoy the society of his fellow Christians, expecting always, that they should look up to him as a superior and a director.

DEFINITION.—Church Independency, is defined and reached only in the simple, sole dependence of the Church upon Jesus Christ.

Christian Church Unity finds its correct definition and completion in nothing else, of an entire separation of the Church from every thing offensive to Jesus Christ.

PSALM 139.

1. Lord, thou hast known and searched me through, Thine eyes behold my ways;
My path is open to thy view,
Ev'n from my youthful days.
2. Nor word, nor thought, nor coy desire,
Escapes thy piercing eye;
To knowledge vainly I aspire,
'Tis wonderful, and high.
3. Search me, O God, and make me keep
The secrets of my heart,
To me my sin and folly show,
When from thee I depart.
4. From ev'ry false and wicked way,
My erling footsteps hold,
Nor let me from thy pastures stray,
Nor wander from thy fold.

Payment and Donations for the Christian Investigator up to Oct. 1844.

A. Henry, Conhocton,	\$0 50	M. Waser, New Oage,	0 50
B. Brigham, Vienna, (Goulds)	50 00	Stevens, Petersburg,	0 50
S. Lewis, Honesoye,	0 50	W. Sabie, Onondaga Hollow,	0 50
J. Marston, Paris,	1 00	J. S. Ford, Richfield,	0 50
J. J. Wilson, Port Byron,	0 50	M. Harrington, Sherburne,	1 00
G. Thompson, Litchfield,	0 50	N. R. Brown,	1 00
P. Allen, Camden,	0 50	E. Allen, Augusta,	0 50
H. Jocelyn, Cleary,	0 50	D. Porter, Pompanoy,	0 50
E. Hawley, Hugabenton,	0 50	D. Gorow, Plattkill,	0 50
A. Mitchell, Shingle Creek,	0 50	D. Green, do,	0 50
John Parker, Utica,	50 50	A. Raymond, do,	0 50
M. Lewis, Victor,	0 50	Perris Pitts, Honesoye,	1 00
E. C. Waples, Heston,	3 00	Abel Street, do,	0 25
H. Burpee, Lima,	2 00	Miss E. Wells, Montton, N. Y.,	0 50
A. D. Miner, do,	0 50	Hillman, Salom, Ohio,	0 50
J. Butler, do,	0 50		
O. C. Bartlett, do,	0 50		
			\$21 75

DIED.

At Canastota, Madison Co., N. Y., October 8th, Mr. SAMUEL GOODALL, a beloved brother of the editor of this paper, in the 46th year of his age. He faithfully and lovingly discharged his duties as a husband, a father, a brother, a neighbor, a citizen, a man, and a Christian. As a consistent friend of the oppressed, his support was withdrawn from the sectional political and ecclesiastical, which sustain Slavery. He honored civil government by voting for just rulers, and Christian institutions, by holding his church relations with those who do not consider the commandments of men more sacred than the laws of Christ. He died in the triumph of faith.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II—No. 11.
WHOLE NUMBER, 31.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. NOVEMBER, 1844.

WM. GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

For any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
per dozen, 50 50 Sixty papers, 50 00
per paper for 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing papers.

REFORMATION TRACTS NO. 5.

FELLOWSHIP WITH UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.
Did not that ye should have fellowship with devils? 1 Cor. 20. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" 2 Cor. vi. 14. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." Eph. v. 11.

The passage of scripture first above cited, has so strongly expressed his desire that Corinthian Christians should hold no religious fellowship or fraternity with idolaters, that he considered the same thing as holding fellowship with devils. In the second, he decides whether it be possible for righteous (or for persons truly righteous) to hold fellowship with unrighteousness, (or with unrighteous persons.) And in the third passage, he tells the Ephesian brethren to hold no fellowship or fellowship with the wicked, but to reprove them, plainly intimating that fellowship with them was incompatible with the duty of bearing testimony against their vices.

The same sentiment abounds in the scriptures in a great variety of forms and expressions. The illustration of it is interwoven in prophetic sketches and historical annals.— Sometimes it takes the form of statutory enactment. It constitutes a large part of the burden of prophetic warning, expostulation, reproof, remonstrance, promise, threatening and rebuke. It enters into the confessions, prayers, pious resolutions, and devout appeals of holy men, in their communion with God.— It is found in poetry and in prose—in psalms and in the theological discussion, in sermons and in apostolic epistles—in the story of the missionary enterprises of Ezra and Nehemiah—in the earliest records of human dominion in the Book of Genesis—in the latest revelations of Jesus Christ, by his angel, unto his servant John, in the island of Patmos, in the ears of the seven churches of Asia, in which the sacred canon is closed.

All the doctrines and all the institutions of religion point either directly or indirectly to this central focus, *The separation of the righteous from the wicked*, and where this feature is not observed in the religious instructions and actions of any community, no great progress is made in attaining the ends which religious teaching and religious institutions propose.— Church History may be cited as one

broad, outstanding commentary on this great truth.

HISTORICAL FACTS.

The first apostasy was introduced by the agency of a false teacher admitted into the church of Paradise, and confidently listened to, as an expositor of divine truth. Unholy alliances between the sons of God and the daughters of worldly men produced giants of wickedness and violence by whom the flood of ungodliness was swelled beyond the bounds of restraint or control, otherwise than by the waters of the universal deluge! Abraham was called from the society of his idolatrous kindred in Chaldean, and his posterity separated from surrounding nations by a series of remarkable providences, by miraculous interpositions, and by a system of distinguishing observances and rites, in order that, by this means, a seed might be preserved amid surrounding pollution, the knowledge of the true God kept from being lost to mankind, and a people trained in such a manner as to prepare them for the advent of the Messiah, the Lord from heaven.

The repeated relapses of the chosen nation unto idolatry and sin, were almost uniformly induced by their fraternity and fellowship with the wicked around them, to whose contaminating example they were exposed; and a separation from them was always involved in every effective effort for their recovery. And when, in the fulness of time, this middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down, that the light thus preserved and perfected might be communicated to all nations, the system of church polity by which the old dispensation was displaced, so far from being an abandonment of the principle of a religious separation of the righteous from the wicked, was a much more perfect and complete exemplification of that principle, exchanging the separation formerly made between families and nations, for a separation even between individuals of the same family and nation—however closely allied in the flesh, according to the moral characteristics and spiritual exhibitions manifested by each person. Up to that time, the literal posterity of Jacob, with exception of those "cut off from among their people" for specific and gross offences, were allowed a nominal standing in the church, as its national feature required, while proselytes from other nations were admitted through the medium of prescribed forms. But now, and thence-forward, the churches—which were to be a multitude of local assemblies instead of one national body—were to consist of those whose good fruits and love of the truth designated them as the "faithful in Christ Jesus" and "called to be saints," were to be gathered wherever "two or three" thus met in his name could be found, to associate together. This was announced by the Savior himself, and each assembly of his disciples, as thus defined, was entrusted with the discipline of his church, in the administration of his laws, by forms of procedure minutely laid down, and requiring them to excommunicate, as

"an heathen man and a publican" the offender who could not be reclaimed. [See 18th chapter of Matthew.] The disciples individually and collectively, were required to beware of false prophets, to take heed and beware of men, to know the tree by its fruits. By apostolic epistles, these directions were repeated, and confirmed. The heretic, after the first and second admonition was to be rejected, the person who brought another gospel was not to be received into the house, neither bidden God speed, on pain of being adjudged a partaker of his evil deeds. And "if any man that was called a brother" should prove to be "a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner," no faithful brother was to "keep company with such an one, no not to eat." This was enjoined for the consideration that while the church had no authority to judge those who were without its pale, it was bound to judge them that were within:—that it could not remain a true church without the exclusion of such, for the reason that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump"—that the wicked character of one member would become the wicked character of the whole body, if they knowingly retained him while incorrigible and unrepentant, in their fellowship and communion. And therefore the assembled brotherhood, each member of the church participating in the responsibility and in the procedure, were required to vote him out of the church—to put away from among themselves that wicked person—to do this, for the spiritual benefit of the offender as well as for the preservation of the church—to renounce his fellowship, and account him in the fellowship of Satan, that he might be humbled and ashamed, that his fleshly passions might be subdued, and his spirit saved, in the day of the Lord.—[See 1 Cor. V.]

The time would fail to trace all the variety of allusion, implication, and illustration in which this principle is recognized in the history and literature of the New Testament churches, and during the apostolic age. Suffice it to add that the seven churches of Asia, first admonished and threatened with extinction for their practical neglect of this principle were soon after blotted out by the natural operation of this neglect—that the church of Rome, and in its folds, the great body of the Christian churches, were speedily corrupted, in fulfillment of apostolic prediction, in the same way—and that, in anticipation of this apostasy, the prophetic summons was placed on the last pages of the sacred canon—"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4.

The Protestant Reformation, so far as it deserved the name, was a practical response to this summons. The Protestant Reformation was left incomplete, because the summons was less fully and faithfully obeyed. The Protestant Reformation has turned backward, and now needs to be reformed, because this great

truth on which it is founded has faded from the eye of the so-called Protestant Churches. Whatever of success the early Puritans or any other earnest reformers have ever reached, has been much through the instrumentality of this central and fundamental truth, that the purity of the Church is to be preserved from the contaminating membership and fellowship of ungodly men.

By the neglect of this truth, it has come to pass, that church discipline, in all the existing sects, has declined, and become nearly extinct; while many who would displace the sects with arrangements not disgraced by the frivolous and wicked separation of Christians from each other, have almost seemed to forget that the church and the people of God are to be separated, by any distinguishing marks, or administration of church order, from an unbelieving and wicked world.

Through the same neglect, the churches have ceased to make aggressive warfare against the empire of sin, or to plead for the cause of the dumb. Religion has come to be regarded as something too sacred to regulate the intercourse of man with man, to purify his morals, or administer to his wants—yet not too sacred to be promoted by co-operation with the robbers of the poor, and propagated, to the ends of the earth by the unpaid wages of the defenceless and the heathenized at home!

A world's history, for almost six thousand years, is the history of the mischiefs occasioned by fellowship and fraternity with the wicked—and of the limited and partial reformation of the world, or of portions of it, at different periods of its history, in every single instance connected with the practical adoption, to a greater or less extent, of the opposite principle, namely, of having no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reproving them. Not a single trust worthy reformation has the church or the world ever known, in which this principle was not honored as well as involved. In the almost total absence of this principle, in any healthful application and bearing, among the churches of the present age, we have witnessed nevertheless, its mighty power, in some of the voluntary associations, which (for the want of that principle in the churches) have been used to supply, in some particular directions, their place. Here lies the secret of their power. In illustration of this, we might cite the enrolment of the truly temperate, to the exclusion of pretenders, under the total abstinence pledge—the similar enrolment of immediate abolitionists, and subsequently of those among them who would not dishonor their principles by their pro-slavery votes, in distinction from those professed friends of the enslaved who either rejected the principle of present and immediate justice, or also rendered that principle a nullity by their postponing its practice, for the attainment of lower ends. Fraternity and co-operation with moderate drinkers and vendors of strong drink has always been found incompatible with the promotion of true temperance. Fraternity with gradual or prospective abolitionists, either in theory or in practice, has always been equally in the way of efficient measures on behalf of the enslaved. In every department of

moral and religious enterprise, the same general truth has been found to hold good.

Historically, therefore, the principle of non-fellowship with the wicked, as a condition of reformation and human progress, will be found a fundamental one. And this historical evidence, as it has now been presented, including the history furnished us in the scriptures, along with all the commendments, exhortations, and warnings which the divine author of our religion, by the spirit of inspiration, has recorded in that sacred Book. We might as well deny the testimony of human experience, conjoined with the testimony of God himself, as to deny that the principle is true. And if it be true, there can be no safety but in making it the rule of our practice.

REASONS OF THESE FACTS—NATURE OF THE CASE.

The reasons of these universal facts, are not difficult to comprehend. The principle is as philosophically sound as the facts are historically certain. The precepts, the admonitions, the predictions and the prohibitions of scripture on this subject, are justified by the common sense of mankind, by sober views of the nature of the case, and of the necessary operation of moral causes and effects.

Who does not know that the exhibition of a correct example is of vital importance in the work of teaching moral truth? And who does not know that associated teaching, must be connected with associated example? That the body of men undertaking to teach moral virtue, must be distinguished from the masses of mankind whom they would reform, by the practice of the virtues they would inculcate? If there is to be any associated effort in the enterprise of teaching men their duties, there must be associated effort in reducing that teaching to practice. But this supposes, and involves, of necessity, a separation of the good from the bad, and the unity of the good among themselves; which is the same thing as the refusal of co-operation and fellowship, in the prosecution of such a sublime work, with the unfaithful and the impure.

This is precisely the original idea of the Christian church. And that idea is not yet so entirely lost, that men do not instinctively expect and demand of bodies professing to be Christian churches that they exhibit an example corresponding with the Christian doctrines. But this just expectation cannot be met, unless churches refuse to retain unworthy members in their enclosures—nor unless Christians and churches refuse religious co-operation with the wicked.

And let it be noted, in the next place, that all associated religious and moral effort, in which good men and bad men indiscriminately fraternize and co-operate, involves of necessity, such a compromise, on the part of the better portion of the body, that their own integrity is impaired, their moral strength weakened, and their principles dishonored in the sight of all men. The measures as well as the teachings of such associated bodies must be moulded, of course, by such compromises, till the distinctive standard of truth, virtue, and holiness is lowered down and lost in indistinctness, uncertainty, and confusion. What sort of moral suasion, what teachings and what measures (for example) could be maintained

by a temperance society, composed of total abstainers and of moderate drinkers, rum-sellers and of those who consider traffic immoral? What influence could anti-slavery society exert, that should be composed of abolitionists and slave-holders? What, as a matter of fact, is now the moral and spiritual power of the churches composed indiscriminately of such characters? Or could the doctrine of Christ crucified, a atoning sacrifice, be maintained and promoted through the earth, by churches whose and teachings were controlled or modified by those who deride and condemn that doctrine? Common sense revolts at the folly of attempting to disseminate principles, advance measures, and promote practices or habits, in operation, for that purpose, with those activities, whose habits, whose feelings, whose sentiments are directly in conflict with whatever we wish to promote! Yet is the folly of all those who attempt to promote religion and morality while holding fellowship, fraternity, and co-operation with wicked men.

By such religious co-operation and fellowship with wicked men, we bear testimony to the correctness (in our view) of the characters they maintain. There is no way in which we can more emphatically denounce men good, than by choosing them for associates and fellow-laborers in the work of promoting religion. But to do this, is to found the distinction between the right and the wicked. It is, moreover to be as trust worthy, a religion which is done and false. To give currency to a counterfeit religion, is far more mischievous than to give currency to counterfeit money, because it is of little consequence in the comparison with religion.

By a religious fraternity with those whom we have reason to consider wicked men, we become accessories to their guilt—we become partakers of their sins—partakers of their deeds, and this is one of the reasons suggested in scripture, why Christians should separate from among them, and refuse to give their co-operation and aid. In this, the scriptures agree with the common sense of common law of all nations and ages, to hold individuals and communities responsible for the moral conduct of those whom they hold in fellowship, and with whom they fraternize and co-operate.

Common honesty and common humanity require that we should not hold fraternity with religionists whom we believe to be essentially corrupt—nor with a religion which we consider a false religion, deluding and destroying all who embrace it.

The honor of God, of Christ, of Christianity, and of Christian Institutions, require that we should refuse to recognize as Christians, and to hold in church fellowship, those who give no rational evidence of being Christians.

Religious ordinances and religious measures are most horribly desecrated, and rendered loathsome even to Jehovah himself, when appointed them, when iniquity is committed and wrapped up in them; and bad men are up their vices by their hypocritical pretences.

Bring no more vain oblations, in sacrifice an abomination unto me, the new moons

the calling of assemblies, I cannot with, it is iniquity, even the solemn "18." (Isaiah 1, 13.) But all this about which God hates, is cherished, condoned, endorsed, and perpetuated, as sacred and worthy, by all who continue to hold relations, religious fellowship, co-operation and fraternity with those whose wicked acts belie their religious professions.—a course involves the grossest "absurdity" the most flagrant contradiction. It condescends things "most incongruous" and unsettles all distinctions. "It is a perversion of means of human salvation." It involves attempt to bring Jehovah himself into the hands of Satan" and to make his religion as worship the most effective instruments of wickedness and human destruction. No wonder, then, that the most profound and closest observers of human affairs have concluded that the greatest obstacle to a way of bringing this world, depraved as under the controlling influence of good and evil men, arises from the difficulty of separating the good from the bad, uniting together the friends and exemplars of goodness, in such a manner as to make power effective.

It is to be hoped that the disproportion between good and the bad, even here on earth, is not so great, as the former have natural power sufficient to prevail, to a considerable degree, if circumstances permit this power to be united.—[Butler's 27.]

the "CIRCUMSTANCES" of Bishop Butler, prelate in the National church of England that claims the entire population of the island, good and bad, as its members, prevent a seeing that CHRISTIAN churches were created and destined so to unite the power of men, (as visibly distinguished from the rest of the world) that "one shall chase a thousand, and put ten thousand to flight." And the churches of English Dissenters, with their African progeny, have well nigh placed members under "circumstances" of disadvantage. For if they do not immediately claim all men as church members they claim men "guilty of the highest of theft," and they have been led and compelled to do this, by their sectarian ties and struggles for distinct denominational existence, as the necessary result of that rent vice of their organization which divides men from each other, fritters by their strength, beclouds their example, weakens their profession, and undermines all church discipline, by removing its basis—its FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE, the union, by the ties of church fellowship and communion, of the friends of Jesus Christ, the adherents of Beliel.

Alas! what confused, what disjointed, what planned, what inadequate efforts, do we see, on the part of the friends of Christian reform! And all for the want of understanding, distinctly, wherein the spiritual cause of church organization consists—the *union and cooperation of the righteous—their separation from the wicked, in all the activities of religious effort.*

In one place we see efforts for separate Missionary funds, and separate missionary efforts,

See President Gibson's Discourse—"Iniquity and a

in which the gains of oppression shall not be intermingled with contributions of honest labor, nor oppressors sent forth as preachers of good tidings to the poor. A good beginning—but how is it to be completed by those who continue their fellowship and support of a slavery sustaining sect and ministry at home? Shall we succeed in sending a free gospel to India, while we fraternize with American oppressors, hold fellowship with them at our own communion tables, and wear the fetters ecclesiastical they forge for us, at home?

And how shall our Missionary enterprises be sustained, if petty Shibboleths must divide acknowledged and beloved brethren in Jesus Christ?

Or what moral power shall clothe our solemn withdrawal from the Missionary enterprises of the wicked, while with equal pertinacity, we stand aloft from the Missionary enterprises of each other? If Christians cannot co-operate with Christians, what mighty blow at ungodliness can they strike, by conscientiously withholding co-operation with false professors?

Sometimes we see churches ostensibly gathered on the basis of separation from the supporters of gory oppression. But no sooner does the opportunity present itself, but, behold! the rush of the members into the protracted meeting where the friends and the oppressors of crushed humanity fraternize together, in the attempt to call sinners to repentance!—What a wound to revivals of pure and undefiled religion! Some churches thus gathered, and whose leading members loudly denounce the pro-slavery churches and ministry around them adopt usages and theories, nevertheless, which preclude them from denying church membership to slave holders and sitting with them at the Lord's table!

Some churches adopt resolutions of non-fellowship with slaveholders and their apologists, yet they hesitate not to hold in church membership, without rebuke or discipline, the men who vote for the Pharos who hold slaves themselves, and who plead for the right of slave holding, to fill the highest posts in the nation! And churches that adopt such resolutions, will continue to hold fellowship with churches that *refuse* any such action, and that freely receive slaveholders to their pulpits, and to their communion. Some churches adopting such resolutions continue their denominational connexion, affinity, or correspondence with churches or ecclesiastical bodies, where the most opposite sentiments are known to prevail! Nay—churches have been known to adopt such resolutions, who will not open their doors for the advocacy of the claims of the oppressed, whose ministers cannot be persuaded to advocate those claims themselves, and whose membership would not consent that they should do so. And finally, such resolutions have sometimes been adopted for the known and acknowledged object of quelling and quieting the rising spirit of investigation and discussion on the subject!

It would be a waste of time to attempt proving that such expedients, even those of them that may have been well intended, fall wholly short of that withdrawal of religious fellowship from the wicked, that the God of the Bible requires—that the exigencies of human

nature need—and which church organization and church discipline, whenever restored in their original purity must introduce. When that time comes, the trumpet shall not give an uncertain sound. "The vile man shall no more be called liberal, nor the churl said to be bountiful." Moral discrimination shall re-appear among men, and the people of God distinguished from the slaves of the god of this world. "Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not." "Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old and as in former years."

SECTARIAN UNIONISM.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN UNION, 1. REDUCED INTO THE SERVICE OF THE SECT!

Certain writers, now a days, seem more intent on persuading their readers that *existing Churches and sects* are to be received and treated as Christian, than they are to persuade these same churches and sects to receive into membership as brethren all the individuals whom they consider as Christians. A writer in the Religious Recorder, Aug. 7, says:

"The principle is, that those who give credible evidence of true piety are to be treated as Christians, and that a company of such Christians associated together, for the united service of Christ, *whatever be the form of their organization, or their practical errors*, are to be regarded as a church of Christ."

But suppose "the form of organization" to be such as to exclude, on account of their non-conformity in matters confessedly non-essential to piety, a large number of those who are acknowledged to "give credible evidence of piety." Is this "treating them as Christians?"

The same writer lays down, as "essential to the existence of a Church these three things: "1. There must be a company of true Christians," &c. "2. There must be a permanent organization." "3. The organization must be designed and adapted to promote the objects for which Christ has set up his church in the world."

Very good! Now let us test the claims of the churches of sectarianism, by these three "essential" criteria, particularly the latter. Is not the enrolment together, for the mutual safety, instruction, and usefulness, of those "who give credible evidence of piety" and who, for that reason, are to be "treated as Christians" (while "infidels" however active in some good enterprises "may not be admitted to the church")—is not *this*, one of the chief "objects for which Christ has set up his church in the world"?

So we had supposed. And we had supposed too, that *this* "essential" feature of a Christian church was utterly wanting, in all the churches of the existing sects, because they exclude known and recognized Christians, who do not conform to the *sect*? And the writer in the Recorder, in this same article, abundantly insists that these different denominations and their members may maintain "a spirit of fraternal affection, and cordial co-operation, and mutual forbearance, by which they shall be able, with all their diversities, to 'keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.'" He therefore attests that the differ-

ent sects contain those who are brethren in Christ.

But would he have all individual Christians, mutually recognizing each other as such, enter into "cordial co-operation" in the same churches? Would his "mutual forbearance" amid minor "diversities" secure or seek this? It seems not! He says:

"Christian churches may lawfully have different names, creeds, forms of worship, and modes of action, provided that nothing is done to defeat the ends of their organization. The name of a church is not a concise profession of faith, or an indication of its form of government, and no more necessarily interferes with the fellowship of the churches, than the names of the different fire companies in a great city. To insist that they shall abolish all these distinctions, is as absurd as to ask that the several battalions of an army shall have one standard, one name, one mode of tactics, and one uniform. The result of any such leveling system in an army would be to destroy its energy and render it unfit for service. And all the experiments which have been made to effect an external unity of the church, have produced a similar effect. Just in proportion as unity of form has prevailed, piety has been neglected and the vital energy of the church has subsided. Had as it is, to have so many rival sects, it would be infinitely worse, as human nature is, to have them all united in one.

What is wanted then is not an amalgamation of the different denominations of Christians, but a spirit of fraternal affection and cordial co-operation, and mutual forbearance, by which they shall be able with all their diversities, *'to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.'*"

And so Christian churches may lawfully call themselves churches of Paul, Appollos, Cephas, Calvin, Luther, and Wesley, provided that nothing is done to defeat the ends of their organization, as churches of Christ! But Paul thought the use of such names among Christians, as equivalent to an attempted division of Christ—and as a recognition of Paul, &c. as Saviors—and as evidences that the persons using them were become "carnal." And is there no defeat, here, of the ends of organizing churches of Christ?

Must we understand that the writer considers Christians as much at liberty to organize churches according to their own notions of expediency, as the citizens of Syracuse have to organize fire companies with such regulations as they may think expedient? That Christ has not regulated the form of the one, any more than he has of the other? What then, becomes of the *Divine Institution* of the Christian church? Or what security have we, amid conflicting human opinion and interests, that the legitimate object of church institutions will be attained?

And has Christ authorized the several battalions of his army to set up their own rival and emulating standards, as do the Chieftains of this world? Would they be "unfit for service" without this? What service?

"The experiments which have been made to effect an external unity of the church" by bringing a number of local churches under a common ecclesiastical government, have indeed destroyed the energy of the church. And

"just in proportion as" such "unity of form has prevailed" (the grand object of all the sects) "piety has been neglected, and the vital energy of the church has subsided." This is true. And the whole history of Romanism, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Baptism, Consociationalism, and Associationism furnish instances in point. Let the writers for the Recorder (who have certainly hit the mark correctly, in many instances) understand this.

But when, we demand of them, has it ever happened, that the experiment of Christian Unity that all "who give credible evidence of true piety" to unite in independent local churches, disconnected with all other ecclesiastical bodies, has "produced similar effects"? Was it during the times of the Apostles, when such church unity and church independency are known and admitted to have prevailed, to their utmost extent? Or was it during the earlier times of the puritan independents, before Baptists, and peder Baptists separated from each other, and when those usages, along with vital godliness were so signally restored?

All the failure of these "experiments" in both cases, lay in a departure from the Christian Unity and church independency that "prevailed" at the first, and with that departure "piety" and "vital energy" has always declined.

As a further illustration of the remark with which we commenced, we copy the following paragraphs from the same writer:

Every such company we are bound to recognize and treat as a church of Christ, for the very plain reason, that they are so recognized by the great Head of the Church—AND WE KNOW IT!!

All dogmas and practices by which true churches of Christ are excluded from fellowship, are in direct opposition to the will and authority of the great Head of the Church. It may be true that one church is right and another wrong as to the form of church government, or the mode of administering baptism, or in regard to the toleration of certain practices among the members. The church that knows itself right, may labor to convince the other of its error, but it may not withdraw fellowship till there is conclusive evidence that the erring church is rejected of Christ. "Receive ye one another as Christ also has received us," is the imperative language of inspiration. Now Christ has received us with all our imperfections. Even so must we receive one another.

Free discussion and an open profession of our faith do not necessarily impair the unity of the church. It is our right, our inalienable privilege, to proclaim our sentiments and to defend them. Let all, then enjoy their liberty, untrammelled, unbridged, and let Christians learn to love each other better for their honest frankness, whilst they kindly and faithfully endeavor to convince of their errors, all who may be found wandering from the path of truth and holiness.

All this is evidently said with a view to deter Christians from quitting the churches by whom all these same principles of forbearance, liberality, and unity are systematically trampled under foot, in their *legitimate application*, to wit, the treatment of individual Christians.

If these principles have any value, then the churches are bound to receive into equal church membership, each individual "who gives credible evidence of true piety" "for the plain reason that they are" received "by the great Head of the Church, AND WE KNOW IT!"

"All dogmas and practices" (like those of the existing sects) by which true Christians "are excluded from" membership "are in direct opposition to the will and authority of the great Head of the church." Receive ye one another also, as Christ has received us, in the imperative language of inspiration. Now Christ has received us with all our imperfections. Even so must we receive one another.

The churches of sectarianism, by their political renunciation of these principles, place themselves in an awkward position for claiming the benefit of them in their own favor. Nevertheless, we are willing they should have the benefit of them, so far as they can be immediately applied to their case. But what are facts? This writer has, himself, laid down the principle, and a very correct one, "something more than a mere casual 'company of true Christians' is 'essential to the existence of a church,' for there must be, he says, 'a permanent organization' designed and adapted to promote the object for which Christ has set up his church in the world"—so that the mere fact that true Christians were found in the sectarian churches (nay, the fact if it were so, that all the members were Christians) would not be sufficient, of itself, to prove them true churches of Christ. And this writer says, further:

A church must be composed mainly of Christians, but not Christ's church. And we must have evidence the leading influence is a Christian influence, and that the church on the whole a Christian action, and cannot acknowledge it as a true church.

This is correct ground. And now, let this writer's own definition of a true church, and admitting, as we most freely do, that Christian churches, as thus defined, are to be treated as Christian churches, though they may be imperfect—we are prepared to say that the existing churches of the sects, so few, if any exceptions, are not true churches of Christ, by this writer's definition, and are not to be recognized as such. Our specifications are as follows:

1. The churches of sectarianism, by the inherent vice of their organization, repudiate the principles of mutual forbearance and Christian unity which this writer has insisted upon as fundamental; otherwise they would receive equal church membership all who give "credible evidence of true piety"—and of course they would retain no ecclesiastical connections, which they know, Christ never instituted, because, by so doing, they know they are keeping out of the churches, multitudes of the most conscientious and pious Christians who believe themselves forbidden by Christ to come under such a yoke of bondage. In saying this, we go on the assumption that Christians in this country who maintain Episcopal, Presbyterian, Consociational, and Associational arrangements, do so, not because they think Christ has enjoined them; nor even because they think the first Christians made use of them—but because they think it convenient or expedient to do so! And so they improve their own human devices and contrivances on all whom they admit into their churches. They will not let men into their Christian churches without putting them under the ceremonies, and Diocesan Bishops, and Synods and Associations; and Consociations, which they know and admit, Christ never established. It deserves serious consideration whether such organizations, by whomsoever composed, can properly be called churches of Christ. They seem much more appropriately described by their own chosen name of Methodist, Baptist, Episcopalian, Wesleyan, or Presbyterian. And we may deny that such organizations are Christian Churches, without denying that part, or even all of their members are Christians, because (as this writer says) it is essential

tial to a church of Christ that "the organization be adapted and designed to promote the objects for which Christ has set up a church in the world." One of those objects was to enroll all the friends of Christ, in their proper localities, into Christian churches, thus separating the righteous from the wicked. But this primary "object for which Christ has set up his church in the world"—the churches of sectarianism are neither "designed" nor "calculated" to "promote." To "promote" that "object" successfully, would be to disband every sectarian church in the land, or to model its organization anew.

2. One "object for which Christ has set up his church in the world" is to "destroy the works of the devil"—to reprove every sin, even the sin of voting for the oppressors of the poor—to teach every duty growing out of human relations, even the duty of "executing justice between a man and his neighbor" by choosing men to rule over us who are "just, ruling in the fear of God"—the "object" of "proclaiming liberty to the captives, the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound."

These objects, the existing churches of sectarianism were neither "designed" nor "calculated" to promote; so these churches and their principal guardians and watchmen tell us, expressly. For the most part, they accordingly close their doors to these objects. And if we rightly understand the hints of this writer, himself, about "carrying on an election" he is not prepared to have a Christian church enter upon its appropriate work, of bringing "the kingdoms of this world" into subjection to "our Lord and his Christ."

3. But the churches of sectarianism, (with few and rare exceptions) cannot claim to be churches of Christ, because they are not, in the judgment of an intelligent and conscientious Christian church, "composed mainly of Christians." For twenty years past, it has been a notorious and standing fact, that the very persons in the churches who, on all hands, by their brethren, their ministers, and the surrounding community, would be admitted to be the most prayerful, humble, and devoted Christians in the localities where they reside, have had very little if any confidence in the piety of the great majority of church members—nay, the majority of the ministers of their acquaintance. And this fact is growing more and more palpable, year after year. We speak now of the opinion of a class of Christians who have not been loud and noisy, nor forward to denounce ministers and complain of the churches. We speak of retiring females. We speak of the pious poor, whose opinions and grievances are not often inquired after. Let those who are not aware of this fact, make enquiry, and learn for themselves. The general observation will be found, from Maine to Michigan, to hold good; that the most pious and humble Christians believe the churches in a low state, and that there is very little vital godliness within their enclosures. There may be—there are—those who unpharisaically proclaim the corruption of the churches—let there are those, also, who mourn in secret places, over the fact;—and there are others who feel it a duty to "cry aloud" against the evils they sincerely deplore.

4. By another rule which this same writer lays down, the churches of the existing sects,

will be found wanting. He says: "We must have evidence that the LEADING INFLUENCE is a Christian influence, and the ACTION of the church, ON THE WHOLE, a Christian action, or we cannot acknowledge it as a true church." Here, again, we have a recognition of one of the leading principles for which the "Christian Investigator" has contended, and on account of which it has been extensively proscribed: Witness the course of the N. Y. Evangelist and its correspondents, soon after the Christian Convention at Auburn. How rapid has been the progress of this truth, since that time, when so very few, even among "ultra abolitionists" were prepared for it! By this simple truth, the whole frame work of the existing church organizations, unless speedily reformed and regenerated, by new life from above, must assuredly fall! For all men not doubly blinded by partiality and prejudice must see that, in their present condition, they can not abide such a test. Who does not know that their "LEADING INFLUENCE" is AGAINST every work of philanthropy and moral reformation?—that this influence is the most formidable with which the Christian reformer and philanthropist (the very salt of those churches) has to contend? Who does not know that this is the testimony of that portion of those in the churches, without whose presence and support, no one with the least spiritual or moral discernment would mistake them for churches of Christ? For this would be to take out of the Churches nearly all the active friends of Temperance, Moral Reform, and Emancipation that they contain—and what would there be left? These, with scarcely a dissenting voice, will acknowledge, if questioned, that in their own circles, (however quiet they may have been in public) they do familiarly speak of their church connexions as being among the greatest obstacles to their usefulness in the cause of Christ and his poor! "THE ACTION of the church, on the whole, Christian action?" What proportion of an IMPARTIAL community will award this character to those churches that still retain their ecclesiastical connexions with the Presbyterian General Assemblies—Old School and New—the Baptist Triennial Convention, the Methodist General Conference, and other bodies of that description?—Amid the rapid changes in public sentiment, now taking place, and particularly in this very direction, how long will it be, before such churches will find themselves in a position in which no one except their own deluded members will suspect them of being churches of Christ? By the standard of this writer in the Religious Recorder, who intended no such result of his labors, they must even now be condemned: and a very large portion of his intelligent readers, (whether technically abolitionists or otherwise) could scarcely have failed to make that inference, while reading his article.

And little permanent benefit will the sects derive from such attempts to press into their service those principles of FORBEARANCE, BROTHERLY LOVE, and CHRISTIAN UNITY which call upon all Christians to combine their energies in putting an end to their schismatic arrangements, and their despotic rule.

"Expediency is not a virtue, but virtue is the only true expediency."

"THE HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM."

BY GEO. H. CHEEVER.

Our readers are perhaps aware that this able writer is among the assailants of the Apostolical succession, as held by the Church portion of the Episcopal Clergy. We have recently perused his fourth Lecture on the "Hierarchical Despotism," and have been interested to find that, like Dr. Potts, (albeit a Presbyterian, and now a Doctor of that sect, if we are rightly informed,) he is obliged to take ground subversive of Presbyterianism as well as Episcopacy, and even to rip up, without wincing, not a few of the notions and usages now current among the so called Congregationalists and Baptists of this country, as an indispensable part of their regulations and "order." We notice a few items.

1. The right of lay ordination. On this point it is impossible for any one to be more explicit and radical than Mr. Cheever.

2. The right of preaching without any human ordination at all.

3. The right of laymen, without ordination, to baptize. An instance of this, Mr. Cheever cites in the baptism of Paul by Ananias.—(Acts, ix: 17, 18.)

4. The usurpation of establishing a clerical caste—which subverts the equality of the Christian brotherhood.

5. That a man cannot be a minister of a church, without being first a member of it, on terms of equal brotherhood, as before stated; so that the pastor is "from and for the church"—and not the church from and by the good pleasure of the pastor.

6. The right and duty of all Christians, according to their ability and opportunity, to preach the Gospel—and that such preachers, in primitive times, were "the precious stuff out of which elders or bishops were made."

7. That "ordination" in the Scriptural sense, means nothing more nor less than to "appoint, establish, or set in office, or, (as in the Epistle to Titus,) to 'choose, by holding up the hands, to choose and appoint by vote.'" "But no form, no ceremony, is included in the meaning, or connected with it." That this ordaining "by holding up the hands" to vote, was the work of the brotherhood without distinction.

8. That "laying on of hands is not necessary to constitute a Christian minister." "That there is not one passage in the New Testament in which the laying on of hands is mentioned as a ceremony accompanying introduction into the Christian ministry." "In the ordination of elders by Barnabas and Paul, there was no laying on of hands." Saul and Silas, Timothy and Titus, he observes, were preachers of the Gospel, long before hands were laid upon them, and neither of them are known to have been at any time, pastors or bishops of churches. [The superscriptions of Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus, in which they are called Bishops, in some editions of the New Testament, Mr. Cheever says are spurious, and quotes Dr. Paley as saying they are either false or improbable.]

Apollos was recognized by Paul (in his Epistle to the Corinthians,) as a minister, when it is evident, says Mr. Cheever, that he had never been ordained.

9. It follows that "ordination by other

Christian ministers, is not necessary, to constitute such a minister." And this, too, Mr. Cheever affirms.

10. It follows, likewise, (see item 5) that there may be churches without Bishops, in any sense of that term—that there may be churches without Elders or Pastors. This, too, Mr. Cheever affirms, and cites instances in the New Testament history, where this is recorded to have been the fact. Thus the Church at Jerusalem, (Acts ii: 47,) is called a church; before any elders had been elected. It is also recorded that Paul and Barnabas, ordained Elders in every church. They are called churches before the Elders were appointed. The natural order, Mr. Cheever observes, was churches first, and pastors or elders, afterwards.

In all these particulars, Mr. Cheever's book is quite as ultra and radical as any thing that can be found in the "CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR" on these same topics, notwithstanding all the fright and horror which our writings on those points have occasioned. He agrees with us, too, in affirming that Presbyterianism does not conform to New Testament usages, in this particular, that its Elders are not Bishops—and that Congregationalism likewise does not conform to the primitive model, in not providing, in each church, a plural'y of these Elders or Bishops. He justly observes that "sectarian prejudice must be laid aside, in order to appeal to the New Testament." He agrees with us too, in making a wide distinction between a preacher of the Gospel, who needs no human ordination, and a pastor or elder of a church, to which office he must be chosen by the members.

And yet Mr. Cheever, we presume, remains, and calculates to remain, a Presbyterian! He finds it convenient and reputable to retain his connection with a sect as completely at war, in its practical arrangements, with the fundamental principles he lays down, and the Bible facts he insists upon, as the Episcopalians themselves, against whom he so earnestly contends, and sometimes with a severity of censure, and an asperity of language that we should not choose to adopt!

And this suggests an answer to the enquiry which the readers of the Christian Investigator might be likely to make; viz: Wherein can Mr. Cheever disagree—so far as the nature and organization of church and ministry are concerned—with the "ultraists" and "disorganizers" of Western New York?

We are not aware that Mr. Cheever has ever insisted on the actual separation of the Christian Churches and Ministry from the sin of slave holding, in their Ecclesiastical arrangements. Nor do we know that he holds those strict principles of church discipline that would lend him to such a position—the principles, we mean, that would make the Christian brotherhood responsible for receiving into the churches ALL THOSE and those ONLY who give scriptural evidence, by their faith and good fruits, of being regenerated Christians. Very possibly his attention has not been earnestly directed to these points. But in other respects, particularly including the ten points we have specified, we should think that the difference between Mr. Cheever and the "ultra disorganizers" might, without breach of charity, be thus stated. While they both advocate the

same principles, and affirm the same New Testament facts, Mr. Cheever does it, for the purpose of waging war with a rival sect; the Episcopalians, while the "ultraists and disorganizers" do it for the sake of reducing those principles to practice—for the sake of reproducing those New Testament facts.

A single extract will sufficiently show whether this parallel is a just one. Mr. Cheever takes occasion to make a "distinction between expediency and divine right." And in this connexion he says—

"The Presbyterians may, for centuries, have adopted a form of government which, among themselves, makes ordination by other ministers necessary to the ministerial commission. And hence it would be the highest disorder for any man among them to assume that commission, without such ordination. The Congregationalists may have adopted a similar rule, so that it would be disorderly and injurious not to adhere to it. The Episcopalians may have adopted a similar order, restricting, however, the whole exercise of the Ministerial function to the hidden virtue in the palm of a prelatial bishop. But ordination in neither of these forms, is essential to the Christian Ministry, because, in neither of them can it be shown to be of divine obligation, of the nature of divine precept."—[Page 64.]

Most marvellous! Is it NOT essential, nor of divine obligation—and yet, the Congregational and Presbyterian as well as Episcopal churches, have "MADE" it necessary "AMONG THEMSELVES"—and "for any man among them" to fail of submission and conformity would be "the highest disorder!" What then is ORDER? What can it be, but the very thing, that in the Episcopal sect, Mr. Cheever can plainly discover to be "HIERARCHICAL DESPOTISM?"

The honesty of Mr. Cheever, in so faithfully identifying the usages of Congregationalists and Presbyterians with those of the Episcopalians, is deserving of high praise. And yet, what else could he make out of the facts he had to dispose of?

But Mr. Cheever will say he does not make the form to be "of a divine obligation." Why then, or by what authority do Congregationalists and Presbyterians, "make it obligatory?" Whence their right to enjoin what, it is admitted, the HEAD of the Church does not enjoin? And how can it be, "the highest disorder," to disobey a confessedly usurped, and unauthorized mandate? The High Churchman who can persuade himself, by his mistaken logic, that Christ commands conformity with his forms of ordination, may plead his ignorance as some excuse or palliation of his arrogance. But for the Presbyterian or the Congregationalist, who, with Dr. Cheever, disclaims as absurd, and rejects as audacious, the claim of JUNE DIVINO, for "A SIMILAR ORDER" (mark the concession!)—for them, we say, to hold it "disorderly and injurious" may "the highest disorder"—for any one to decline the form—what climax of effrontery among High Churchmen can equal this? If the latter be arrogant in insisting that men shall comply with forms which he verily believes were ordained of God, on pain of being pronounced "disorderly"—what measure of arrogance must be attributed to the Presbyterian or the Congregationalist who accounts it "the highest disorder," to refuse compliance with forms established—not by the Head of the Church, but by the rulers of the sect?

It will be answered perhaps, that Congregationalists and Presbyterians do not deny the right of their non-conforming brethren to go

out of their sect, and preach, without a compliance with their forms, and further, that they do not deny them to be ministers of Christ.

Very well.—And what then? Mr. Cheever lays great stress on the manifestations of "hierarchical despotism" in the English Church, exemplified in her canons of excommunication against those who would not conform to her ceremonies and rites. The climax of that despotism was the mandate that the dissenters must LEAVE THE CHURCH! Presbyterians and Congregationalists, however, in this matter of ordination, have "a similar order" and when dissenters from those ceremonies arise among them, what is their degree of tolerance, in the case? Why, the dissenters may enjoy their rights, out of the Church!—And how far short of excommunication does this come?

Suppose, in some of their local congregations men should be found preaching without clerical license or ordination—suppose that, on remonstrance, they should nevertheless persist—urging the same facts and principles that Mr. Cheever has urged—what would be done with such preachers, or with such local churches? Would they not be excommunicated from the Presbytery, the Association, and the sect? Try the experiment and see!

But, then, they would not be denied the character of ministers of Christ! Ah! they would not! The difference, then, it would seem, amounts to this—the High Churchman excludes from his church, those who persist in preaching, and who, he believes are not ministers of Christ, and have no scriptural right to preach. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists, in like manner, would exclude from their churches, for disobedience to "a similar order," the men whom they believe and acknowledge to be TRUE MINISTERS OF CHRIST! They would exclude them for doing the very thing that Mr. Cheever has maintained (in this Lecture against the "hierarchical despotism" of the Episcopalians,) they have a right to do, in accordance, not only with New Testament usages, but with the free nature of the Christian dispensation, and "the Constitution of the New Testament Churches!"

If he that know his Lord's will and did it not, is to be beaten with many stripes, in the comparison with him who ignorantly sinned, what estimate shall we make of the guilt of Congregationalists and Presbyterians who knowingly forbid Christian ministers to preach to them and to the churches they control, merely because they will not comply with forms confessedly resting on mere human authority alone; in the comparison with the guilt of those who only practice "similar" usurpations, but whose High Church education has led them to believe their course in accordance with the authoritative commandments of God?

The testimony of Mr. Cheever to the fact that "it would be the highest disorder" among Presbyterians, and "disorderly and injurious" among Congregationalists "for any man" however gifted and pious, to exercise his gifts in the manner which Mr. Cheever himself has shown to be scriptural and in accordance with the genius of Christianity and the original

*Under the reign of Saybrook Platform Congregationalism, in Connecticut, an hundred years ago, lay preachers were not only cut off from the Churches, but thrust into prison, for preaching without clerical authority.

Constitution of the New Testament churches, is a testimony that will sink deep into hearts and memories of thousands. And the time is not distant, when Christians will discover that "forms of government" over the churches which make it "the highest disorder" to follow primitive example, to honor "the Constitution of the New Testament Churches" and exemplify the free spirit of the Christian religion, are disorders themselves, that require to be done away, are despotisms to which the people of God should no longer submit.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, NOVEMBER, 1844.

SUBSCRIBERS who have not paid in advance for the next year, should send their money before the first of January, if they wish to continue. Otherwise we shall be obliged to stop sending to many of them, for want of the means of paying the printer.

"VIEWS OF AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN ITS BEARING UPON AMERICAN SLAVERY." By WILLIAM GOODSELL—Published and for sale by Jackson & Chaplin, Utica.—Price 31 cents single, \$3.00 per dozen, or \$20.00 per hundred. In this work it is maintained that slavery is unconstitutional in all the States, and that the Federal Government, either in its legislative or judicial departments, possesses constitutional power to abolish slavery throughout the United States. Not a few, who have examined the subject, are coming to entertain those sentiments.

TRACT CIRCULATION.

We are making arrangements for a more extensive and regular circulation of REFORMATION TRACTS. If properly sustained, we intend to issue a new tract monthly, adapted to the wants of the times, and bearing directly or indirectly upon the REVIVAL OF A PURE RELIGION and the REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH. It is thought that by this means, a larger number of readers might be reached than in any other way, and at a less expense. Eight page tracts of the size already issued, will be furnished at \$1.00 per hundred, and 4 page or twelve page tracts, at reasonable prices. In some towns there might be circulated 500 tracts monthly; in others 300, or 200 and so on. In every place where there are friends of the cause, something might be done. We wish to know, before hand, how many are wanted, in order to know how many to print. Our friends are invited to send in their orders at once, and say how many copies they will take monthly, or of twelve numbers, as often as published—directing, likewise, the mode of conveyance. When we have received orders sufficient, all that are destined for one county, might be sent to some suitable person to be designated, in each county seat, and

subscribers in the towns could send and get their packages, from thence. Payments to be made in advance, or promptly each month. On the line of the rail road, packages might be sent by the express. Or, on the canal, by boats, in the summer. A tract will be readiness before January, with which to commence the operation. *Send in orders, immediately, post paid.*

'PROPRIETY' versus RIGHTS.

One of the most shadow and yet one of the most successful expedients by which the great mass of the Christian brotherhood (commonly called laymen) are cheated out of the liberty wherewith Christ's people are made free, consists in the device of conceding to them, "in the abstract," their self-evident and inalienable rights, yet intimating to them, at the same time, the "propriety" of the existing arrangements which are contrived to supersede, except in very peculiar and extreme cases, the exercise of those rights.

The right of lay ordination, for example, cannot be denied without admitting the High Church claim of Apostolic succession, and, of course, admitting that the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Clergy are not regularly ordained. And wherever an intelligent brotherhood, with Bibles in their hands, are to be found, it would be a hopeless task to contend against the New Testament fact and the scriptural right of lay ordination. The affirmation of the right has a place, in every argument against the claims of the prelacy, of course. How comes it to pass, then, that the practice of lay ordination should be almost or quite as uncommon among Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, as it is among High Church men? And why is it, that the practice should be accounted as "irregular" and as "disorderly" among the former as the latter?

The people have been told, that although the right of ordaining their pastors, rests with the mass of the brotherhood in the churches, yet there is a "propriety" (forsooth!) in their waiving the exercise of that right, in favor of previously ordained pastors wherever they are to be found, leaving the right to be used only in some rare cases that might occur, or, for example when a few Christians, without any "regular" pastor, might happen to be cast upon some desolate island; &c. &c., when there being no "regular clergy" present, the people may exercise their rights!

A very modest intimation, truly! The right is inherent in THE PEOPLE, to be sure. Primitive example reveals to us the steady and constant exercise of that right by the brotherhood, and in the presence of Paul, Peter, James, and John. But in the presence of our modern clergy, considerations of "propriety" and modesty should induce the laity to waive the exercise of their rights! This is cool—certainly—and altogether unique!

Rights are nothing, but the correlatives of duties.—Rights exercised and duties discharged, are one and the same thing.—The right is a nullity if it may not be exercised. To neglect, or, on appropriate occasions, the exercise of the right, is to relinquish it. This, in the case before us, is sufficiently proved from what we everywhere see. Not one in twenty, among Christians, have any fixed and abiding impression of the right, as belonging to laymen for any practical purpose, and almost instinctively shrink from its exercise.—In other words; they neglect the duties which the right involves.

The ordination (the), is, the appointment of their pastors, belongs to the people, and it belongs to no body else. And "propriety" dictates that those to whom the work belongs should perform it, as a general rule, and unless peculiar circumstances point out an exception to that rule. What would be said of the concession that the members of a Temperance Society possess the right to select and induct their officers, but that "propriety" forbade, except in extreme cases, the exercise of that right, and demanded the President of Temperance Societies should be introduced into office, by those alone who had previously been inducted into the same office? The first century knew no such "propriety" in the Christian Churches, any more than the present century does in its Temperance Societies. If it did, let the proof be produced; to the gratification of the High Church Clergy, and the discomfiture of their Presbyterian and Congregational opponents.

The circumstances of the times on which we are cast, indicate, loudly, the "propriety" of a resumption and exercise of their rights, on the part of the brotherhood, in this particular direction. The exclusive claim of the Clergy to the right of ordination has become the watchword of the man of sin. At this precise point it is, that the claims of semi-Romanism are effectively urged through the High Church Clergy, both in America and Great Britain. In no way can it be met but by asserting the right of lay ordination. This is what the Presbyterian and Congregational opponents of High Church pretensions are actually compelled to do. But then, they are immediately met with the retort that neither Presbyterian, Congregational nor even Baptist usages, arrangements, and regulations admit of the exercise of that same right of lay ordination, any more than Episcopal and Roman arrangements do. That is a matter of fact, the right is not practically recognized in those sects—that its exercise would be accounted disorderly and irregular among them, and this fact they are obliged to admit; nay, they are even careful, in the midst of their controversial debates with High Churchmen, to disclaim any intention of permitting their own principles of lay ordination to be carried out, in their own sects!—Witness the late work of Mr. Cheever. Most manifestly the High Church claim only gathers strength by such encounters and as a matter of fact, such Presbyterian concessions as those of Dr. Potts and Mr. Cheever are circulated by the semi-Romanists as the most effectual weapons they can wield!

So that, as a palpable matter of fact, the absence of lay ordination in the Protestant Churches has become one of the most effective means of facilitating the onward progress of Romanism and prelacy.

And this is not all—nor the worst of the case. Close observers have found that this same notion of a divine and mysterious efficacy in the "sacraments" administered by hands "regularly" (i. e. clerically) ordained, is working the same mischief among Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists, that it has done among High Churchmen. It is eating out the very vitals of Evangelical godliness, among the children of the puritans, even in that portion of them who are not directly seduced into the fold of Episcopacy and Romanism in their outward and visible church arrangements. A latent, nay, half-suppressed yet half-cherished reliance upon rituals, and upon rituals administered through the mysterious powers and prerogatives of the clerical caste, "regularly ordained" is one of the most marked tendencies of the present age. Were it not so, there would have been little danger, in our country, from the broaching of the heresies of Oxford, and such writers and Dr. Potts, Mr. Cheever, and Albert Barnes might have reserved their pens for some other service.

What the age needs is a restoration of the protestant and the primitive practices, along with the protestant and primitive theories. Abstract rights may be preached forever, with little use unless they are exercised. One year's experience of a practical return to the New Testament usage of lay ordination would be worth a half century of idle discussion (that means nothing, in particular, except to put down a rival sect) in the work of uprooting ancient superstitions, and preventing them from striking root anew on fresh soil.

A COMPARISON.—Suppose there is a chain of eighteen hundred links, each link of which has to be examined separately, in order to know whether the chain, or how much of it, is sound and true worthily.—Suppose forty men undertake, successively, the task of examining the chain; but one man becomes fatigued with the task, or becomes desirous of going about something else, and so gives up the examination after he has examined but about forty links.—Another pauses at the end of four score links, another at one hundred, and so on, one going to his farm and another to his merchandise, so that not more than five out of the forty persevere and complete the examination. The operation is, whose judgment respecting the chain, will be worth most, when the vote comes to be taken among them—the five who have examined every part of the chain, or the thirty five who thought the task too prolix, and undertook to come at a result by a more simple process, that is by guess work?

The application.—Satan has been at work, for eighteen hundred years, at the task of introducing into Christ's church of Church order as many links as he can; of his own man-

ufacture, forged in the pit of darkness. Some of them closely resembling, in appearance, the original links of the true chain, and must be closely examined, before the cheat can be detected. There is danger too, that some of the good links may be rejected, along with the bad. Is it best to stop short, before the whole chain is examined, because the task seems tedious and prolix? Shall the work cease because only five, out of forty who commenced can be persuaded to prosecute it faithfully? Or has God given to man any assurance that he shall learn the truth, respecting religious and ecclesiastical matters, at a cheaper rate, on the score of patient investigation, than in matters that are called *scientific*, and *secular*?

CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION.

WHEN SHALL IT BE HELD? AND WHERE?

Now that the Presidential contest is over, is it not high time to renew our efforts for the restoration and extension of a PURIFIED AND PURIFYING RELIGION? How also shall the Augean stables of a corrupt *state* be cleansed, but by the influences of a reformed and reformatory church? How, otherwise, can the kingdom of the Savior, in its purity, be extended and built up? Or by what instrumentalities shall the kingdoms of this world be transformed into the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ?

A correspondence has been opened with a number of individuals in different parts of the State, in reference to the holding of a convention; at an early day, and at some point of convenient access to friends in the central and western portions of the State. As an extension of that correspondence, THIS NOTICE is inserted, that friends of the cause may suggest to us their proposals or suggestions concerning such a convention, as soon as may be. A notice of the time and place ought to appear in our next paper.

A NOBLE EXAMPLE.—It was an excellent resolution of President Edwards that if he ever lived to be an old man, he would endeavor to avoid what he had observed to be a common error of old men, namely, an unwillingness to hear any new views, or to change their opinions, on the presentation of sufficient reasons for such a change. What Edwards resolved to do, Eminens was remarkable for performing. At the advanced age of eighty-eight, he readily perused the arguments offered by the then feeble and despised band of abolitionists, against the Colonization Society, which until then he had patronized. And the result was his utter and public abandonment of that scheme, and his open identification with the abolitionists, by presiding, as he did, soon after, at the opening of the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society in the city of New York. How few instances do we find, on record, of a similar character! The reason is, few Christians are trained to habits of candid, patient investigation, or have ever been taught to make it a part of their piety to be constantly increasing in knowledge, and keeping their minds open to conviction. A

plentiful crop of dogmatism, bigotry and unreasonableness has been, and still is, the result.

THE GREATEST HERESY, in the view of most professors of religion—and the greatest affront you can offer them—is to intimate to them, never so delicately, that there are some points of religious knowledge and attainment that, very possibly, they may not have reached, and withal, giving practicability to the suggestion, by intimating the particular point you have in mind.

If you would preach, or exhort, or converse to the "edification" of such religionists, you must never raise the standard of doctrine or duty HIGHER than THEIR standard. If you do, you will come under suspicion of being a *reactionist*, while at the same time, the same persons are giving the most palpable evidence that they think THEMSELVES perfect, both in wisdom and knowledge.

A NEW ERA IN MISSIONS.—The Boston Chronicle of the 20th and 21st November contains a letter from J. S. GREEN, Missionary of the Sandwich Islands, which opens upon us a NEW ERA in the history of modern missions. Mr. Green, it will be remembered, left the American Board, on account of its connexion with slavery, not knowing how he was to obtain a support. But it seems he is now able to obtain SUPPORT FROM A NATIVE CHURCH, and, in addition, to send to this country, their liberal donations for the Treasury of the Union Missionary Society, and for the Canada Mission. Mr. G. is a brother of President Green.

AN OBJECTION TO CHRISTIAN UNION.

One of the most common and plausible objections urged against the organizing of Christians into the same churches while they disagree on some minor points of doctrine or practice is, that by coming in constant contact, together, they would be in constant contention.

This objection assumes that Christians have not a sufficient degree of the "Spirit of Christ" to converse together on the subjects of their differences. And it may be conceded that those who make this objection are most commonly in a position that could scarcely fail to lead them to such an assumption. Very seldom, if ever, will you hear this objection from a professor of religion who will not betray the fact, in the very same conversation in which he urges the objection, that *he, himself*, cannot easily converse with those from whom he differs, without petulance, arrogance, or anger. Perhaps, after having urged his objections, with no small degree of excitement, he will preclude you from making any reply by turning on his heel abruptly with—"We had better drop the subject! We sha'n't agree."—No marvel that such an one should conclude

that Christians cannot safely converse with Christians from whom they differ.

If a professor of religion finds that he cannot converse with a Christian brother without losing his temper, it is doubtless prudent for him to decline it, and he had better do so before firing his own shot, and then springing upon his brother the "previous question." There is one thing, however, that such a professor of religion should *always* do, in such a case—and another thing which he *should never* do. He should *always* ask himself, in such a case, whether or no he possesses, in a requisite degree, for his own improvement and usefulness, the patient and teachable spirit of a Christian. And he should *never* infer, from his own low state of attainment, that Christians can never put themselves into a position to "*prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.*"—Little progress can the church militant make, till Christians can mutually confer together and instruct each other.

But there is an IMPORTANT TRUTH wrapped up in this common objection, after all. It is only saying, in other words, that Christian Union is impracticable, because Christians have not, in a sufficient degree, the Spirit of Christ. *This is doubtless, the only obstacle, and on its removal, the present sects of evangelical Christians would disappear, and all real Christians unite freely together, in the same churches, while radical errorists and heretics would be excluded.

When a disputant evidently takes pains to avoid, to run round, to evade a point, it is an evidence that he *sees* it, and feels its force, but has not the moral courage to meet it as it ought to be met.

CAUTION!—Those who wish for correct and full copies of D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation* would do well to purchase the Philadelphia Edition, of James M. Campbell, & Co. in preference, to that of the American Tract Society, in whose Edition there are some very remarkable alterations, as well as omissions, suppressing (in our view) or at least, throwing into the dark ground one of the most important principles of the Protestant Reformation, as portrayed by the incomparable D'Aubigne. Particulars hereafter.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator up to November, 1844.

J. P. Mann, Manneville, \$1 00	R. McCurdy, Piquet, 1 00
G. H. Littlejohn do, 1 00	A. Crosby, E. Winfield 1 00
S. S. Jocelyn, N. Y. 1 00	L. D. Tanner, Freetown 1 00
W. Cotton, Clockville, 5 00	J. Corpers, 1 00
S. Seymour, Lebanon, 0 50	H. Wilber Cheshire 0 75
H. S. Redfield, do, 0 50	P. Noble, Honeoye 1 00
A. Smith, Hamilton, 1 00	J. W. Merrill, Groveland 2 00
J. Sims, Cazenovia, 0 50	
D. Holt, Mperisville, 0 50	
A. D. DeForest, do, 0 50	Reduced Commissions & Postage 75
W. Barr, Strongsville, (O.) 1 00	
C. T. Gaston, Lisbon (Ill) 1 00	
D. G. Platt, Wash. (Con) 1 00	
	\$20.50

Friends of this publication will see, by our Receipts, that we need funds.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1, Iniquity and a Blessing, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet,) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build, 4 pages, \$0.02 per hundred.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. II—No. 12.
Whole Number, 32.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N.Y. DECEMBER, 1844.

WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in treacherous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, ON 12 OCTOBER, AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
in, 30 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.
Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring 12
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
if procuring 24 subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from
the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Per dozen, 80 50 Sixty papers. - 82 00
Eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters en-
closed for papers.

MISSIONS OF THE AMERICAN BOARD To the Greek Church in the East.

LETTER OF MR. SOUTHWATE.

Our readers are probably aware that the
American Board of Commissioners for For-
eign Missions, have long ago instructed their
Missionaries in the East to avoid any thing
an open and direct testimony against the
existing superstitions and idolatries of the
Greek church, closely allied as they are to the
characteristics of Romanism. But it is
probably known, so extensively, how
the American Missionaries have gone, by
adoption of this policy, in the conceal-
ment of their sentiments, and even, as it would
seem, in conforming to the usages of the
Greek church. The Letter of Rev. HON-
ORABLE SOUTHWATE, recently published, contains
statements, that would hardly obtain
credit, were it not for the previous infor-
mation, of the most authentic character, ul-
timately in our possession, pointing in a similar
direction; and did we not know how impossi-
ble to maintain a ground of neutrality,
between the usages and monuments of anti-Chris-
tianity and delusion. What should we
say of missionaries who should attempt to
blend among the Catholic population of New
York, Montreal, and Baltimore, without mak-
ing known their dissent from the usages of
Romanism? Should we not say that they
have abandoned the position of Protestants?—
For a series of years, they had actually
been laboring among them, without
making their sentiments, should we be great-
ly surprised to learn that their success, in this
had been the result of their actual con-
formity, in some particulars, with the super-
stitious observances which they had failed to
reject? How could it well be otherwise, in
the very nature of the case?
We are presenting our readers with the state-
ment of Mr. Southgate, we will very briefly
summarize some of the facts previously

known and established, in respect to the mis-
sion of the American Board in the East.

And, in the first place, it should be borne
in mind that the Greek church agrees with the
Romish in praying to the Virgin Mary and
Saints, worship pictures, seeking pardon of
sins by the Priest, relying on fasting as mori-
torious, holding to baptismal regeneration,
transubstantiation, &c. &c.

With a full understanding of these facts,
our American Board, in the exercise of that
plenary Episcopal power which they hold,
instructed their missionaries as follows:

"A precise idea of the object of our Missions to the
Oriental churches, is important to the simplicity and ef-
ficiency of your operations. Your object will be to
demolish those churches, and build up others with the
materials on a plan of your own. It will not be to change
the nature of their ecclesiastical government. Nor will
it be to induce the members to become other than Ori-
ental in their manners and customs. It will not be to as-
sume the office or duties of pastors of these churches,
as you would do of churches you might gather among
the heathen. Nor do you go exactly in the character of
reformers, feeling bound to lift up your voice against all
the outward and visible corruptions and abuses in the
rites and customs of those churches. Instead of spend-
ing your strength upon effects, you will go immediately
to the causes. Instead of stopping at the streams you
will go at once to the corrupt fountains, and there you
will build your tabernacle and take up your abode, and
continually cast in the purifying salt of Divine Grace.

Those Missionaries to the Oriental churches, who begin
with attempting to produce external changes, begin at
the wrong end. Remember that what the members of
these churches regard as true religion, consists wholly
in externals. Their only idea of pure and undefiled re-
ligion is the careful observance of the rites and forms re-
ceived by traditions from the elders. Therefore not what
you as strangers and foreigners, can attack to the least
advantage. These are not the things upon which you
should expend your time and strength. Your direct
aim should be toward internal rather than external
changes. For this purpose keep to the great fundamen-
tal doctrines and duties of the Gospel. Let them be the
whole burden of your prophecy."

The Missionaries adopted this policy; and
the communications of Mr. Smith and Mr.
Powell, originally published in the Missionary
Herald (of the American Board) informs us,
that in their intercourse with the members of
the Greek church they "studiously avoid all
collision with the rites and ceremonies of the
church."

As, therefore, the superstitions of the Greek
church were not to be opposed, by the Ameri-
can Missionaries, nor new churches organized
instead of them, it would not do to admit na-
tive converts into the mission church, even if
they desired it. And accordingly the mission-
aries, (though professedly Congregationalists
or Presbyterians, and supported by those de-
nominations at home) organized themselves
into a church, on a plan utterly at variance
with those forms of church government, for
the obvious purpose, among other things, of
making it next to impossible for a native con-
vert to become a member of it! All the Mis-

sionaries, at their different stations, were or-
ganized into one church, a process which di-
vided the church into branches, located hundreds
of miles apart, which must yet vote on receiv-
ing or disciplining members. It was thus
made easy for the missionaries to prevent the
separation of the converts from the Greek
church!

And this purpose was actually carried into
effect. The church was started by Rev. J.
D. Paxton, who, on the spot, in a letter
first published in the Protestant and Herald,
Louisville, Kentucky, in 1830, after his return,
and addressed to Rev. R. Anderson, Cor. Sec.
of the American Board.

"There are at Beyroot persons, who have given
convincing evidence of piety, and many recently others have
professed conversion and have been baptized; but of these,
when I left, none were members of the Mission church.—
They were indeed allowed to commune with the Mission-
aries, and the Missionaries took a kind of oversight of them;
but they were not admitted as members. They alleged
that they could not in conscience remain in the Greek
church. They have manifested a great concern to be in
the Mission church, or to be organized into a Scriptural
church by themselves; but the great has been gradual.
The plan is to keep the corrupt churches in which
they were raised, but as they declare they cannot in
conscience remain in those churches, they cannot conform
to their rites without committing the sin of idolatry, nor
have fellowship with those churches without having fellow-
ship with idolaters, they are considered as in no church;
and as in these countries and among these communities, it
is considered as greatly disgraceful to be out of the church,
it must be and is most trying to these persons to be with
their families thus situated. While it must have a damp-
ing effect on the zeal of these converts, and does them a
manifest injustice, it must have a most discouraging effect
on others, whose minds may be corrupted by the corrup-
tions by which they are surrounded. The trial to come
out of these corrupt churches is great.—To meet the
reproaches of their relations and friends, and bear the ill
will of a dominant priesthood, is no small matter. But to
come out and then be refused admittance into a pure church
—to be as outcasts from every church, must be deeply dis-
couraging.

The great benefit arising from having a pure church ex-
emplifying living Christianity is lost. Now a pure spiritual
church connected with a plain, and bold exhibition of the
Gospel in all its bearings, is one of the most powerful
means of grace that God has given to man. But this most
important benefit is nearly, if not wholly lost on the pre-
sent plan. The church was to be a light in the world—a
city set on an hill. The "Sapping and Mining" plan re-
verses the matter and keeps a pure church as much as may
be out of sight."

In this way, the distinctive sentiments of
the Missionaries, as Protestants, was careful-
ly concealed for a number of years. The
workings of the plan are thus stated, in another
letter of Mr. Paxton, published and address-
ed, as before stated.

"Just before I reached Smyrna a suspicion got abroad
that the Missionaries, who had been known chiefly as the
promoters of Schools and the distributors of books, were
trying in this way to produce changes in the religion of
the Greek church. An ecclesiastical committee was ap-
pointed by the church to examine into the matter, and keep
a watch upon the schools. This committee suspected
that a teacher in one of the schools favored now nothing
desired to have him removed. This request was briefly
complied with, they published an address to the Mission-
aries and to the public, in which they call on the Mission-
aries to let it be known what is their object. The paper is
poorly written, and does not state with as much clearness
as it ought to have done, the points brought forward. No
one, however, can doubt what their object is. They suspect
that under pretence of promoting schools, the Missionaries
are aiming at changes in the doctrines and practices in
their churches. They go so far as to specify the chief

things in their churches which we believe to be errors, as confession—the power to forgive sins—baptismal removal of original sin—worship of pictures, honor paid to saints and to relics, &c.—and wish to know whether they should and religious sentiments opposed to those in their church—and remind them that if they say any one thing and mean another, posterity will call them disturbers, &c.

The *Missionaries* published a reply to this address, and in it say some very good things, but care is taken to pass over the point on which the Greek committee wished for information. "They insinuate (say the *Missionaries*) that we go about privately and covertly endeavor to make proselytes. We boldly challenge them to furnish proof of any such thing. We speak our sentiments freely as all honest men should, both in public and in private as we find opportunity, but we assure them it is no part of our system to make proselytes. If it were in our power to induce all the Greeks to renounce their church and all the rites peculiar to it, and become Protestants, we would not do it; for this itself would be useless. Our only desire, and the sole aim of all our efforts, is to promote both in ourselves and in professing Christians, that living faith in Christ, which works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world." (Page 30, of the pamphlet.) Again they say, "our only desire is to aid your preachers, your confessors, your priests and your bishops in bringing men to Christ, and to render them sober, temperate, just, lovers of truth, and lovers of God."

About twelve years had elapsed from the time the *Missionaries* had gone to the Mediterranean, and for much of that time the Greek church had engaged their special attention and labors, and yet so carefully had their report been kept out of sight, that the intelligent of that country were left in doubt as to what it was. It was suspected that the *Missionaries* wished to promote changes, and an effort was made to find out if it were thus. There could not have been much done to let these churches know the real and fatal nature of their prevailing errors."

Much more, to the same purport, we might copy, not only from the *Union Missionary Herald*, in which these documents have appeared, but from the *Missionary Herald of the American Board*.

From these facts, which neither the American Board nor its friends have adventured to dispute, we learn

1. That the *Missionaries* of the Board, in accordance with their official instructions, do not reprove the superstitions and idolatries of the Greek church.

2. They do not seek to establish another church or churches for the native converts, in its stead; nor admit them into the Mission church.

3. That their Protestant principles or at least, their mission to propagate them, were thus for twelve years, concealed, and when, at length, suspected and charged with attempting to propagate them, they denied the charge but professed only to co-operate with their priests, bishops, and CONFESSORS!

4. That all this has taken place, although, to use the words of Mr. Paxton: *It is, on all hands, admitted by the Missionaries, that there is no real piety in these churches*—and, as already quoted from the instructions of the American Board, "What the members of those churches regard as religion, consists wholly in externals:—their only idea of pure and undefiled religion is the careful observance of the rites and forms received by traditions from the elders!"

How long our *Missionaries* could "retain their own Protestant principles and practices, under circumstances like these, it were not difficult to foresee.

With these well authenticated facts in our possession, and keeping them distinctly in

mind, we take up the pamphlet of Mr. Southgate.

"VINDICATION of the Rev. Horatio Southgate. A LETTER to the members of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, from the Rev. Horatio Southgate, their Missionary at Constantinople. New York: Stanford and Swords, 130 Broadway.

The object of Mr. Southgate, in this Letter, is the vindication of himself, Mr. Badger, and other Episcopal Missionaries, from the charges against them, in the *New York Observer* of 18th of November, 1843, &c. &c. of having been accessory to the persecution and slaughter of the Independent Nestorians, and attempting to drive the Missionaries of the American Board from that field of labor.—How well he has succeeded in that vindication it is not our present object to discuss; though,

from a cursory perusal we cannot avoid the impression that he makes out a plausible account of the causes of that troublesome affair—causes in operation, independent of any such influences as have been attributed to the Episcopal Missionaries, English and American, and having their origin as he says, farther back than the date of the Episcopal Mission itself. The statements of Mr. Southgate, should, however, be received with all the caution and allowance proper in such circumstances, both in respect to his defence, and the incidental statements he makes concerning the American Mission. We are to remember that he is an Episcopalian of the high church school, and reputed to be in sympathy with Dr. Pusey, and of course not greatly at variance with the Romanists. Thus much we should infer from his pamphlet, and he fully admits that Mr. Badger is "deserving of censure for hostile bearing towards the American Missionaries"—which, he says, he sincerely regrets. But he strongly affirms, and labors to prove, that "Missionary operations and Missionary jealousies had nothing to do with the Nestorian massacre." That such views as he evidently holds in Ecclesiastical matters are calculated to make him scrupulously regardful of the religious rights of Independents or Congregationalists, we cannot, for a moment suppose. And yet, it may not, perhaps, follow, that he has so far forgotten the principles of toleration in which, as an American, he must have been, in part, educated, as to connive in a work of indiscriminate slaughter, on account of religion, or be incapable of stating plain facts, when speaking of a Congregational Mission. This confidence, which we might otherwise indulge, we confess, is much impaired by the experience we have had of late years, of the utter mendacity and truthlessness of a large class of dignified ecclesiastics, in this country, not exclusively Episcopalian, and of the cold blooded and deliberate machinations which, we are well assured, they have been capable of conceiv-

ing, and putting in operation for the violent suppression, both by riotous assemblages and by penal enactments, of those whom they consider (as the Episcopalian consider all dissenters) "disorganizers and fanatics." Thus admonished, we must listen to Mr. Southgate, with some degree of distrust, and reader must weigh his testimony, as he can. All history assures us, that there are falsehoods nor atrocities too monstrous or bloody for the deliberate perpetration of ecclesiastical conservatives, bent on perpetrating their own supremacy and putting down the "ultra fanaticism and innovations" of those who would emancipate the church and world from their domination. Mr. Southgate's Vindication, therefore, to be successful, must embody such sentiments as are either created in themselves, or such as are corroborated by incontestible evidences from some other source.

The fact of a hostility between the Episcopal mission and the mission of the American Board, being admitted on both sides, it devolved on Mr. Southgate to give some account of the origin and cause of that hostility. Here, it is certainly unfortunate for the mission of the American Board that the statements of Mr. Southgate should, to so great an extent, consist of particular details which correspond so closely with the previously ascertained history of the policy and movement of the American Mission, that we cannot credit them without, at the same time, impeaching the veracity of the American Missionaries themselves, and falsifying the official statements of the Board at home, as well as the records of their own Missionary Herald. Still more unfortunate is it for the American Mission that the remaining statements of Mr. Southgate, and those that must be esteemed as decisive of that part of the controversy if admitted to be true, are such as demand that all men acquainted with human nature must have been led to anticipate before hand, as of well nigh inevitable occurrence, the circumstances in which the American Missionaries were placed, the instructions under which they were laboring, and the policy which they were known to pursue, and which the *Missionary Herald* had elaborately detailed at home.

Mr. Southgate confidently affirms that collisions between the Episcopal Mission and the Mission of the American Board, (which calls the Congregational Mission) arose from the fact (too notorious, adds he, to be denied) that the latter had pursued a concealed policy in their intercourse with the eastern churches. Mr. Southgate declares that this concealment was carried so far that the members of the Greek Church commonly supposed the Missionaries were Episcopalian, like themselves, and that, in fact, they were Episcopal Dis-

In consequence of this concealment on the part, Mr. Southgate says (and what is more natural?) the American Missionaries and the American Board were exceedingly hostile to the Episcopal Missionaries, and unwilling that they should appear in the Greek church, in their own distinctive and character as *Episcopalians*, lest the difference between them should become too apparent, and their concealed policy be exploded. At this point Mr. Southgate adduces an extract of a letter from Dr. Anderson, Cor. Sec. of the American Board, to a gentleman in England, as follows:

"The Nestorians can be reviled, as a Church, let them by all means; should we be suffered to go on with indifference from without, except by Romanists, I have expectations that the Lord will make us instruments of his. But should the Propagation Society in any one must see that they will make our influence Episcopal, whatever may be our wishes, prayers to the contrary."

Mr. Southgate, was written before that mission was established. He afterwards says:

"Sooner had the Episcopal Mission commenced in Asia, than the jealousy which had been before manifested broke out into opposition. This opposition was not only shown on the ground as at home, in England and the United States, but Congregational Missionaries in this country will venture to present themselves to the Eastern Churches in open and avowed hostility to the operations of the Episcopal Church. Such a course would entail certain ruin upon their labors, for it would bring out what they seek to prevent—a knowledge of their real character. The state of those institutions which the Oriental Christians regard as inseparable from a Christian Church. They therefore, sought to bring discredit upon Episcopal Missions by assailing them at home, and the Mission in Asia has been assailed in this way. Both in England and America no means have been spared to make it appear that this Mission was a conspiracy against their own souls."

Mr. Southgate's Letter, including the above, contains many further particulars illustrative of the concealed policy of the American Mission and the constant embarrassments which it gave rise, together with the increasing difficulties between the rival missions; Missionaries of the American Board all-complaining, because the policy of the Episcopal Mission was more open and undisguised than their own.

We have only room for the closing part of Mr. Southgate's letter. The part we print in this appears in the same type in the pamphlet.

Had it not been asked, on what ground of common sense or justice, can the American Board or its Missionaries object to our acting upon our own principles in the Episcopal Church, we do possess certain advantages for laboring among the Eastern Christians. Should we not, why are we not bound, to use them? It is, that they conceive every such advantage to be placed, to place them at a disadvantage. If we are to be distinguished as an Episcopal Church, they must be known as Congregationalists. But this we have ever endeavored to conceal. Congregationalists are not which will not thrive in an Eastern soil. Oriental Christians, to use the language of a young man of mine in a letter received to-day, "can no more see a Church without a Bishop than of a man without a head." Most of them never heard of such an idea; and if it should appear in plain sight, they would see in it nothing to desire. It is a misfortune for Congregationalists to be here, it is a misfortune to them, and they would all, I believe, heartily concur in a statement once expressed to me by one of their most able Missionaries: "I have often wished that I was an Episcopalian. I could labor to a much greater advantage if I were one." It is natural, then, that they should wish to conceal their real character, however we

may question the propriety of yielding to such a temptation. Nevertheless, it has been so far concealed, that in this city, where their Mission has been established some thirteen years, the impression still prevails generally among the Armenians, that the Congregational Missionaries are clearest of the English Church, and I am well assured that till within two or three years, they were all supposed to be Bishops. The impression has been strengthened by their adopting our clerical dress, using the Prayer Book, making the sign of the Cross in baptism, and other such like practices unknown to Congregationalists at home.

Now, our mode of acting, while it has been adopted solely for the sake of using our own advantages to the glory of God and the good of souls, tends to break up this old order of things, and to show both them and us as we are. No candid person ought to complain of such a result. Congregational Missionaries ought to be willing to be known as such, or, if this will place them at too great a disadvantage, it is better to leave the field than not to appear in one's true character.

It is the tendency of our own movement, as I have described it, which has annoyed and irritated the American Board and its supporters. It is in vain to say that it is our opposition to them, for in most of the instances which I have adduced, their dislike has been manifested either before our Mission commenced, or as soon as they began. This dislike has increased as our system has developed itself, although it has been attended, on the part of our own Church at least, with no opposition to them. You will observe that in the cases referred to, the complaint has been not of opposition, but of the system, and the dislike is evidently aimed at that. The cry of opposition is an after-thought. It has only been heard in these last days. And what does it amount to? Now interpositions founded on old documents to convict the Church; and a single act of hostility, (which I pledge myself to show to be any thing but hostility,) to convict me.

And, now, what is to be the result? Are we to wear a mask, lest others be detected? Are we to forgo the use of our legitimate means, because others do not possess them? Are we virtually to cease to be Episcopalians, and that when we most need to be known as such, because others cannot bear to be known as Congregationalists? Or are we quietly and steadfastly to pursue our way, turning neither to the right hand nor the left, heeding no idle clamors, but using our gifts as the Lord has given to us and as accountable to Him for the use of them? There can be but one answer to such questions as these. The whole Church will respond as one man in a cause so plainly its own, and, as I before said, great will be my surprise if this response is not felt in a new and unprecedented interest in behalf of our Eastern Missions.

HORATIO SOUTHGATE.

Constantinople, Jan. 9, 1844.

Many reflections crowd on the mind, on a Review of these statements.

The policy of concealment is wretched policy, as well as bad ethics. Their attempt at concealment, brought the Missionaries into suspicion. Hence their schools were broken up, and in many ways they suffered defeat, from their worldly-wise expedients to secure themselves against defeat! This we learn by many facts in connexion with their history.

It is not by their connexion with slavery, alone, that the American Board of Foreign Missions are losing the confidence of the considerate and thinking part of the Christian community. Their want of Christian simplicity, boldness, and honest and open opposition to idolatry and other sins, where they happen to be popular, is a defect for which nothing else can atone or make amends.

The policy that winks at the abominations of slavery in America, will wink at the abominations of the Greek church in Asia, of the Romish church in Italy, or those of heathenism in pagan lands.

So far from making progress against the

"An Armenian Priest said to me but a short time ago. 'What a singular Church theirs must be, when all their Ministers are Bishops.'"

superstitions of the Greek church, the American Missionaries can scarcely fall into those same superstitions themselves.

The Puseyism of the American Board falls very little short of that in the Episcopal church. The latter courts, and holds affinity with, the Romish church—the former with the Greek; and Protestants have always held the Greek and Romish churches to be almost equally corrupt.

The American Board, and its Eastern Mission discountenances accessions from the Greek church, in which, in their own estimate, no spiritual religion remains, but all their religion consists in the outward observance of superstitious forms! How then, can they do otherwise than condemn the Protestant secession from Romanism? And what marvel that all attempts at a similar work of secession from corrupt churches in America, should now be denounced as disorganization and schism!

Since the above was written, we learn by a correspondent of the Emancipator, for Sept. 18, that the Report of the American Board, at its late meeting in Worcester, gives an account of the Mission to the Greek church, and that "the Mission is to be given up, because the people are inaccessible;"—the plain English of which is that the plan of gaining them by concealment, by fraternizing with them, and by seeking to infuse spirituality into their idolatrous forms, has proved a total failure! Any spiritual Christian might have predicted all this, before hand.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM IRELAND.

The following is from Mrs. Nicholson, the biographer of McDOWALL, and an effective contributor to various publications devoted to Temperance, Anti-Slavery, and Moral Reform—better known to many as the persevering keeper of the Graham Temperance Boarding House, in New York. Mrs. Nicholson embarked for Ireland about a year ago, on a tour of philanthropy and inquiry among the poor of Ireland, in whose behalf her sympathies had been, for a long time enlisted, as well as for the Irish emigrants in this country. Its publication, at this time, will be opportune, as an antidote to the poison of prejudice, now fanned to a flame by a class of disappointed aspirants, who, in one breath, can court the support of the friends of the oppressed, and in the next, demand that the Irish and their descendants in this country shall be added to the millions already crushed under the heel of "Native American" aristocracy and hatred.

"DUBLIN, July 10, 1844.

"The eye must see, before the heart can

conceive, what a condition the people are in. The strangest, the most unaccountable contradictions, imaginable, exist here. The country, as far as I have seen, is literally a garden. I rode on the top of a coach, a few days since, fifty miles, and the road, which was as good as road could be, was bordered, the whole distance, with the hawthorn and cinnamon rose hedge, the latter in full bloom, perfuming the air; the new mown grass, here and there, sending out its fragrance: the farms in the highest state of cultivation; the fattest of cows and swine in pastures and by the highway—the mud-walled cabins shaded with roses and hawthorn, and often flowers growing in rich profusion from the thatch on the top: gardens most tastefully laid out, and the streets every where *alive with walking rags!* In the whole distance, passing thirteen considerable towns, I scarcely saw a decently clad woman or child; and the men, had they been "sitting among the elders in the gates," must have been known and wondered at, for their garments claimed no rivalry; in fact, I rode in astonishment, that so much *taste* could be blended with such *mental degradation*, for they certainly appear like children, in the servility of their manners, and though they are bold and persevering in their importunities, yet, a *farthing* put down, a multitude of "God-bless-you"s, and they pass away, without any further sollicitations.

"My practice often is, to go out alone, and enter into every cabin, about the suburbs of Dublin, other places where I travel, and tell them I am from America, and have come to see Ireland and the Irish, and *their wonder knows no limits*. O'Connell and America, are my pass-words, and with these I need no letters of introduction among the poor. O'Connell is their father, if not their god, and America is the good land that has protected so many of the Irish. Not so, among the full-fed aristocrats. With *them*, O'Connell is the *rebel*, who is taking away their gods, and would make Ireland in as bad condition as America, where servants are called *helps* and eat with their masters, and where women are slaves and drudges in their families like servants. This has been said to me, this morning, by a lady in high life. Sorry am I to say that the Protestants here, seem to be, in principle, like our slaveholders at the South; for they tell you that the Irish cannot govern themselves; and should the Catholics have equal rights with them, they would rise and cut the throats of Protestants. And still they must acknowledge that Catholics have led the way to all that is praise worthy in the cause of temperance, and in this respect are to be commended, while they are still bringing

their wine and porter to every dinner they take. A Quaker told me, a few days since, that not a Protestant Clergyman in Dublin is a teetotaler.

"But among the wonder of wonders, to me, is, that, since O'Connell is in prison, with all the warmth of feeling the Irish possess, with their love for O'Connell and their long continued suffering, they do not rise, and fall upon the prison, or upon one another, and deluge the land with blood. They stand and sit about his prison door, waiting in silence, as though they had come to attend his funeral.—But a Repeal Meeting is certainly an interesting place. I attended one, where the beauty, as well as deformity of Ireland was assembled, and where "PEACE AND PERSEVERANCE" were written in capitals on the walls, and not a note of disloyalty did I hear, or a word that savored of revenge: but—"We will work till we die"—and, pointing to the ladies in the gallery—"Nor shall you, like the patriotic women in America, be compelled to tear up your linen for bandages to dress the wounds of your husbands and sons. *Our war shall be a war of peace.*" This was applauded by long and continued cheers, and waving of handkerchiefs from the galleries.

"It is impossible to look at this people, as they now are, with indifference; and, allow me to say that this people have never been known among the nations of the earth as they should have been. There are materials, of the best kind, in the rubbish; if those which have been polished are any specimens for for judging. The truth is, their intellectual faculties, like those of our slaves, have never been cultivated. They have always been in fetters. Their wit is the only faculty daily called into action; and this, if possible, is sharpened by the constant friction it undergoes, from the taunts and sneers of their more favored neighbors, or the continual use made of it, to invent means to procure a piece of bread, 'by hook or by crook,' which must be done, or starve. Their education where it has been cultivated, is of the best kind.

"Their women, who make any pretensions to education would certainly do honor to any nation, if their conversation, letter writing, and music, mean any thing. And some men I have seen, who might look quite awkward in an American genteel parlor, appearing well in their own, and are men of good practical common sense and extensive reading. And, in addition, the lower class of the peasantry, who have not had every feeling of bashfulness and delicacy blunted (if not obliterated) are the most truly polite in their manners, of any people I ever saw. They will brush off a bench or stool, to offer you a seat in the meanest hut, without one apology, and do it with such ease and good will, that you

feel, at once, that you are not only welcomed but that they possess an innate self-respect which entitles him to a place among the human family.

"Never were my spirits better—never were my feet in a larger place for doing good than among this hospitable people. They load with kindness, both Catholics and Protestants. A Catholic Bishop told me I had taken the only true method of learning the character and state of the Irish, that is, by going among the poor: but I must not expect that he would thank or assist me much. Another Catholic Bishop, who keeps a Temperance Hotel, said—"Have you crossed the ocean a woman alone, to visit the poor of Ireland? It is the work of a Howard; but let me see you then, you must not expect great dinner for the rich will not encourage you." I think I might do much good by my pen, if I had the proper mode of introducing myself, as a writer, for they are quite in the back ground, all subjects that we call moral reform."

"The Catholics certainly to be dreaded, but they are not all the same there are in this world. To-morrow, willing, I start for the county of Wicklow, garden of Ireland, and shall probably be sent from Dublin two weeks. I trust, should write you, on my return, I may have something more interesting to say. . . . I am thankful I am not doomed to the arduous drudgery of carrying about a load of world's rubbish on my way to heaven, for more I see of it the more I think it a curse and feel more inclined to pity the rich than covet their riches. A. NICHOLSON

"To William Goodell,
Honeoye, Ontario Co. N. Y."

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY. MUTILATIONS OF D'AUBIGNÉ.

When we penned our brief "CAUTION" on this subject, we laid our account, as usual, a goodly portion of the censure and odium which we never fail to encounter, whenever we say any thing by way of exposing the countless frauds and deceptive evolutions of that portion of the American clergy, or the leading sects, who stand at the head of the Ecclesiastical affairs. Little did we think that before our brief notice could be issued, our little monthly tract, two such papers as the New York Evangelist and New York Observer would come out with a still more full exposure of the deception we ourselves had prepared—that this would be done under the authority and in the name of the Presbyterian Synod of New York and New Jersey, or the official signature of the clerk of their committee, and that the transaction would be characterized, in such a document, as it deserves.

and in language quite as severe as we should have thought proper to use.

But so it is. The Evangelist of Nov. 7, and the Observer of Nov. 9, are occupied, to the extent of full five columns of those huge sheets, in showing up the deception, in very much the same style in which the anti-slavery presses have been wont to exhibit the similar stratagems of the same class of men, in their management of their favorite implement, the Colonization Society, hitherto unparalleled in the annals of Protestant Jesuitism, but by the side of which, not only the American Board of Foreign Missions, but the American Tract Society, as it would now seem, appear determined and destined to stand. The whole matter, from beginning to end, is a series of marvels, showing plainly enough, to those who are not willingly blind, that an over-ruling Providence is at work, to unmask and expose that entire system of priestly imposture, by which the religious community have been so long deceived and misled.

That such a work D'Aubigne's Protestant Reformation should be published by such a combination of men as the American Tract Committee are known to be, was certainly among the wonders of the age. The first thought was, that the same unseen hand that is now directing the Presbyterian conflict with Episcopacy, and the so-called Congregational contest against Presbyterianism, and both, (unconsciously to the principal actors) against the aspirations of all the three sects, was likewise using the Tract Committee to do a service of which they little dreamed. And this, we still believe will be the ultimate fact, though by a peculiarly marked process. A second thought suggested the possibility of its mutilation.—For, since the book would be circulated and read, what could be more natural than that such a body of men should circulate a revised edition of their own? An abridgement of the same work, for the use of Sabbath Schools, had already been put in circulation by the early prudence of the American Sunday School Union, and doubtless with an eye to the suppression of the "ultraisms" of the original work. But as it came in the name of an abridgement, for the use of children and youth, the matter was permitted to pass, without notice. But grown up men, would prefer the whole work. The plaster was not large enough for the sore. What was to be done? The American Tract Society's Committee were emboldened to take the next step and try another expedient. Their Edition, in three volumes, has the appearance of being the entire work. On a page at the beginning of the first volume is this brief notice:—"In this edition, a few sentences, not essential to the integrity of the

work, are omitted." Of alterations (and very remarkable ones there are) the notice says nothing at all! An examination of a few hours, revealed to us the fact that some of the most important features of the Protestant Reformation had been suppressed. The Synod have gone more elaborately into the matter, and made out one of the most astounding documents of the age. Its wide circulation precludes the necessity of our publishing the extracts we had ourselves prepared, or any large portion of theirs. It is sufficient to record, very briefly, a few general statements respecting the omissions, with some specimens of the alterations that have been made.

Where D'Aubigne had written "hierarchy," a term which certainly includes the Episcopacy (to say nothing more) the Tract Society have substituted "the Roman Church."

The fact that Christianity was first corrupted by the setting up of a priestly caste—together with the fact that the Protestant reformation was based on the opposite principle, are either suppressed by the Tract Committee, or thrown into the shade.

D'Aubigne had spoken of the mysterious voice of authority that sprung up among "the pastors" of the churches, meaning those of the second century, when Episcopacy took its rise. For this, the Tract Committee substitute "apostles and teachers"! D'Aubigne wrote "peculiar privileges in the sight of the Lord." The Tract Committee have altered it to "divine prerogatives"—thus turning upon the Popish absolutions what the author had intended for the monopoly of preaching, by the clergy! D'Aubigne had shown how Luther shook the foundation of the papal throne, by assailing the clerical caste, and asserting the equal priesthood of all Christians. These paragraphs are omitted by the Committee.—Another omission is that of a paragraph exposing the doctrine of apostolic succession—and another asserting the validity of lay ordination.

Another class of omissions and alterations, complained of, and exposed, by the Synod, are evidently designed to conceal or suppress the statements of the historian concerning the anabaptists of Germany, and the rise of Presbyterianism in Switzerland, under Zuingli.

But why should the Presbyterian Synod of New York and New Jersey interfere in this matter, and wherein are they aggrieved by the mutilations?

The Committee of the American Tract Society is composed of different sects—Episcopalian, Dutch Reformed, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian, and the plan is, to publish nothing offensive to either of the sects! [A

"Christian Union" upon the condition of silence!] And so the Episcopal member of the Committee, cuts out and alters D'Aubigne's work to his heart's content. The Baptist member does the same. Whether the other members put in for their share of the spoils, we cannot tell. But is easy to see why zealous Presbyterian Clergymen, in their death struggles to prevent their own sons as well as their flocks from going over, *en masse*, to the Puseyites of the Episcopacy, should feel impelled to protest against such manoeuvres.

It is quite amusing to see a Presbyterian Synod so jealous of a priestly or clerical caste. Perhaps there is no sect in the land more firmly attached to that same caste, and more zealous for its preservation. What distinguishes them from their Episcopal rival, is not their dread of the exaltation of a clerical or priestly caste, at the expense of the laity, but their objection to being placed under the control of a select portion of that same caste, themselves. Of the lay ordinations, too, so approvingly recorded by D'Aubigne, or rather perhaps, we should say, the practice of preaching without any formal ordination at all, as some of the French Reformers did, Presbyterianism itself cannot look with more favorable eyes than Episcopacy. But since Presbyterians have, at present, a battle to fight with Episcopalians, they are forced to seize upon the truths of the New Testament and wield them as weapons of defence, though (as Wainwright truly tells them) they thereby pull down their own edifice over their own heads. The Lord reigns and will reign, till Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and even the "priestly caste" of a nominal Congregationalism shall be thrust down, and the Lord Jesus Christ alone exalted in the Church. Hastened be the day!

OPENING THE DOOR TO UNIVERSALISTS.

It has been objected to one of the churches gathered from pro-slavery churches and organized on the principle of receiving all Christians, that it is at loose ends and is in danger of "opening the door to Universalists!"

How is this? Does the opening of the doors of the churches to all Christians, open them to Universalists? Do the professedly orthodox objectors think so? Do they think that Universalists are good Christians? If not, why do they insinuate that opening the doors of the churches to all Christians, is opening them to Universalists?

They know well enough, that the seceders organizing this new church are not tainted with Universalism—have not admitted any Universalists, nor invited any such to join them. They know, too, that the published Declarations of Doctrinal sentiment put forth by them are as explicit against Universalist

views, as any other creeds or confessions of Faith in the country. What mean then, these intimations that the churches in question are "opening the door to Universalism?"

If any thing intelligible is conveyed by this language, the meaning would seem to be that the objectors themselves are shivering in the wind, on this same subject of Universalism—that they are at least beginning to suspect that Universalists may be good Christians.

It has been intimated in the *Christian Investigator*, and in *Addresses*, of Christian Abolitionists to the churches, a number of times* as one of the evil effects of the present position and current excuses of the churches standing aloof from the Anti-Slavery enterprise, that it was inevitably drifting them into close affinities with universalism. The current complaint of these churches and their prominent members and ministers, that seceding abolitionists are denunciatory, severe, and therefore betray an unchristian and Pharisaical spirit—(being the old complaint of universalists against the orthodox)—their favorite maxim that men are best persuaded to abandon their sins without any specific reproaches of them, and without being warned of their guilt and danger—(another well known maxim of Universalism)—their lowered-down standard of Christian character, making the habitual commission of "the highest kind of theft" consistent with credible evidence of being in a state of Salvation—their consequent reception of such, and co-operation with them as Christians, (thus breaking up all intelligible distinction between the church and the world, between the children of God and the children of the devil)—all this has been a matter of common and public remark among thinking men, for a number of years past, and it has been extensively felt and understood that in all this, the professedly evangelical churches of the country—Methodists, Baptists, Congregational and Presbyterian have been rapidly sliding from the distinctive features of their own written creeds, and approximating very closely to Universalism. In most churches of these sects, the soft and subdued tone of preaching, in the particular of solemn, and earnest warnings to "flee from the wrath to come," has been matter of general remark. The same is notoriously true of the periodical and other literature of these sects. Universalists have not been unobservant of these facts; nor silent in respect to them. They have long claimed that the orthodoxy of the country is undergoing a gradual transformation in favor of their views—Universalist editors and preachers are almost constantly exulting in these indications. They claim such Biblical expositors as Prof. Stuart (who has done so much to seduce the churches into their present guilty position respecting slavery) as being favorable to Universalist views; while in the writings of Dr. Emmons and other consistent abolitionists among the orthodox clergy, they pretend not to discover any thing of the kind.

And all this time we see nothing written by the men thus extensively suspected of latent universalism, in refutation, or even in contra-

diction of the charge. Apparently they are willing to enjoy the credit of being as "liberal" and as "charitable" as the most latitudinarian sects in the country. And these, in their turn, have almost ceased to claim these favorite qualities as their distinctive and exclusive possession. Men of the loosest religious tenets are daily heard (and sometimes with oaths) to exclaim with astonishment that the Presbyterians, and similar sects, are in close affinity with themselves! The leading men and ministers of these sects, repeatedly and publicly challenged to show wherein their position, in holding fellowship with notoriously wicked men, differs from practical universalism, are silent as the grave! And now, while the evidences of their own affinity, not to say identity, with universalism, (so far as their ecclesiastical position is concerned,) is becoming daily more manifest, they cap the climax by crying out that churches founded on the principle of receiving ALL CHRISTIANS are "opening the door to Universalists!" Just as though it had become a settled point (not only with themselves, but with every body,) that Universalists are good Christians!

Seriously! If the now churches seceding from the pro-slavery sects, had no other safeguard from a practical religious co-operation with Universalists, the mischiefs and abominations of ultra Universalism, in the churches from which they have seceded, should be sufficient to restrain them! We say, "ultra universalism"—for the old fashioned universalism that says all men will, at some future period, be saved, is fairly cast into the shade by the double distilled absurdity of that Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Universalism, every where witnessed, that considers and treats the most outrageously wicked and abominable characters on earth, as being in a state of salvation now! We insist upon it, and challenge public discussion, orally, or in writing, of the soundness of our position, when we affirm that the churches holding no ecclesiastical fellowship with slaveholders and their apologists, are the only churches in the land in a condition to combat the errors of Universalists, or refuse them, consistently, a place in their communion.

All the mischief of Universalist principles consists in their tendency to make men do the very thing that the principal religious sects of this country are earnestly doing now—namely—obliterating to the full extent of their power, the fundamental distinction between the righteous and the wicked, and promising impunity to incorrigible transgressors, who persist in cleaving to their sins! When a religious community have gone so far as to do this, there is practically, no further step, in the direction of Universalism, for them to take. They have got the end of that journey now, and if they are not aware of it, the only reason is that spiritual blindness has come upon them, and they are groping in the dark.

Let every man, then, who remains a member of a pro-slavery or pretendedly neutral church—(a church in fellowship with oppressors, a church not actively engaged in the cause of the oppressed, the cause of Him who came to preach the gospel of deliverance to the captives,) understand, distinctly, that he is supporting a practical Universalist church

—a church that virtually assures all men of salvation, because it affirms that a present participation in the "sum of all villainies" is consistent with a present state of salvation! Let any such person show reason, if he can, why this statement should not be received. Till then, let the charge of "opening the door to Universalists," rest where we have placed it. And let it, in the mean time, be noted and remembered, that all attempts to evade the true issue, by crying out against "denunciation" and the "want of a Christian Spirit" is only a repetition of the stereotyped language of Universalism.

Another thing should be noted to give these remarks their proper application, and just weight. The more of an abolitionist a man either is or professes to be—the more loudly he condemns slavery, and the more severely he is heard to reprobate the practice of slave holding, while at the same time he endorses the Christian character of slaveholders and their supporters by remaining in church-fellowship with them, the more firmly he fixes himself in a position involving a practical assent to the dogma that all men, even the worst of men, are in a condition of salvation! Those who believe in the innocency and Bible warranty of slave-holding, may escape from the imputation of Universalism, by pleading that the persons they thus hold in Church fellowship are guilty of no crime. But the man who says that slaveholding is man stealing, and yet persists in holding church relations with the supporters of slavery, will forever find it difficult to make men of common sense understand wherein his religious views differ materially from those who believe in the salvation of all men.

PERFECTION.—Those who would define perfection, or entire sanctification, in accordance with the Scriptures, must not define it by mere negatives. The mere absence of positive transgression, whether in heart or life, does not reach the Bible standard. The perfect Christian is *always* abounding in *every* good work. There is no inconstancy, no remission, for a single moment, in the service of God, according to the full measure of his strength; in the man who has become absolutely perfect. And if he has any remaining errors of opinion on religious subjects, they must be such as do not spring either from idleness or inattention, from partiality or prejudice, from bigotry or false charity, from self preference or servility—for all these are *sins*. He must have no more errors than the man can have, who, by perfectly doing the will of the Savior, has learned perfectly the Savior's doctrine, according to his promise. Want of infinite capacities in men, does not render it unavoidable that they should imbibe religious errors, because when the capacities are insufficient to grasp a subject, they can suspend their judgment, and thus avoid imbibing positive error. There will be a great disparity in the degree of religious knowledge in Christians, after they reach heaven, as "one star differeth from another star in glory." But there will be no religious errors in heaven, and for this simple reason, there will be no sin there, to lead men into error. If those who are seeking entire sanctification are aiming at any lower mark than this, they are aiming at a

*See *Christian Investigator*, No. 3, Old Series.—See also *Address of the Christian Convention*, and the *Syracuse Christian Convention*. These Documents do not look much like favoring Universalism!

defective standard of holiness. True holiness is all active and positive. There is nothing passive or merely negative in its character.—It is love:—it is light:—it is life. Perfect love wholly removes selfishness, which is its opposite. Perfect light (which is only another form or name of perfect love,) wholly excludes darkness or error. Perfect life, vitality, or activity, (another manifestation of perfect love,) leaves no room for inattention or idleness.

It would greatly modify many earnest debates about the entire sanctification of Christians, in the present life, if attention was directed to the Bible definition of the thing.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, DECEMBER, 1844.

Christian Reform Convention.

The friends of CHRISTIAN PROGRESS and ECCLESIASTICAL REFORM are invited to meet in Convention at SYRACUSE, on Wednesday and Thursday, January 22d and 23d, 1845, to discuss such religious subjects as the times seem to require, to devise and adopt measures for promoting a spirit of investigation and inquiry; for diffusing, more extensively, by means of the Press, or otherwise, a knowledge of Primitive Church Order; and, in general, to seek, by mutual consultation and prayer, the revival of a purified Christianity throughout the land, and the earth. The Convention to opened at 10 A. M. on Wednesday the 22d.

Charles A. Wheaton,	Syracuse,
John H. Lathrop,	do.
Josiah Wright,	do.
Myron P. Howlett,	do.
N. G. Salisbury,	do.
John Stewart,	do.
Wm. H. Scram,	do.
Wm. M. Clark,	do.
Wm. H. Childs,	Niagara Falls.
Wm. F. Sheldon,	W. Bloomfield.
Gerrit Smith,	Potterboro',
Samuel Wells,	do.
Washington Stickney,	Cannastota.
Ira Hills,	Vernon Centre.
A. Kingsbury,	Cazenovia.
Henry Bradley,	Penn Yan.
John R. Hopkins,	Auburn.
E. Willard Frisbie,	Phelps.
John Mosher,	Canandaigua.
E. C. Winchester,	Bristol Centre.
Marcus Stickney,	Lockport.
William Goodell,	Honeoyo.

FROM NEW ENGLAND.—A Pastor of a church in the northern part of Massachusetts writes as follows:

"Very many, in almost all of the Congregational churches in Massachusetts are quite uneasy in their present position. Their hearts are continually aspiring for pure independence, and if properly enlightened they would leave the great New England Sect, and start out for independency. The Congregational churches in Massachusetts are so controlled and managed that, in fact, they are only another name for the most tyrannical part of Presbyterianism."

CONGREGATIONAL MOVEMENT.—Presbyterianism is getting into such bad odor in Western New York, that systematic efforts are now making, and a lecturer is at work, for the purpose of introducing Congregationalism of New England stamp, in its stead. How much Presbyterian opposition. It is likely to meet, we are unable to say; but should not be greatly surprised if the new movement should find favor with many who have been the most zealous Presbyterians, but who prefer, as a choice of evils, the Congregationalism of New England, (in league as it is, with Presbyterianism,) to the thorough independency, equal brotherhood, Christian union, and strict church discipline, (excluding the supporters of slavery) that the "Christian Investigator" and its friends are laboring to promote.

We do not learn that the new movement proposes or contemplates any great moral tests, based upon the reformatory question of the day. Nor are quite certain whether the system of associations, by which the churches of Massachusetts are indirectly controlled by the clergy, is to be a part of this movement—or whether the system of consociations, composed of the clergy and lay delegation, as in Connecticut, exercising a similar supervision, in a more direct form, will be preferred. Of this latter arrangement Dr. Ezra Stiles Ely, a native of Connecticut, and a leading Presbyterian, has said truly, that it is Presbyterianism, under another name. And the former, in Massachusetts, has acquired a similar character. While this new movement shows the onward tendencies of the age, and is ominous of the utter overthrow of Presbyterianism proper, in central and western New York, it may nevertheless, in the progress of events become, still more than Presbyterianism itself, the central focus of ecclesiastical opposition to the equal rights of the lay brotherhood, the unity of Christ and the restoration of church discipline. We forewarn the friends of New Testament Church order, of a progressive and unfettered Christianity, of an uncompromising and rigid church discipline, to keep their eyes open, their necks free, and their hands clean. Truth and purity gain nothing by compromise.

THE ALTERNATIVES.

After all that is said against "come-out-ism" and against "unionism" it is true that those who are loudest in their use of those epithets are "come-out-ists" and "unionists", themselves. They all belong to sects that have "come out" from some other sect, and commonly on account of what they do not themselves regard to be fundamental in religion. And they are in "union" with slaveholders and their apologists, and others of like character.

The same person that will call you a schismatic because you "come out" from "extortioners, covetous and drunkards," quoting you St. Paul's words—"Who art thou that judgest another?"—will nevertheless insist that it is right to establish separate sects, on the basis of modes and subjects of baptism!

And it is a matter of necessity, and a matter of course, that all religionists, will, and do, in fact, take the ground of separation from some other religionists—and the ground of union with others.

Some standard of separation and some standard of union, all religionists will, of course, have. And one of two principles they must assume in fixing their standard.—They must either unite on the basis of what they regard as *fundamental* in religion, separating themselves from all others;—or else, they must unite on the basis of what they regard as *incidental*, and not fundamental, in religion, rejecting all others! Which of these two principles is most rational and spiritual the reader must judge.

But it may be claimed by the adherents of the present sects, that their basis of religious union includes the fundamentals, along with some other things that they do not regard as absolutely essential in religion. Of the reasonableness and Scriptural authority of such a double standard, the reader must judge.

The practicability of this latter basis may be more than questioned. How is the distinction between fundamentals and incidentals maintained or taught, when BOTH ALIKE are equally made terms of church membership? A church excludes slaveholders, and it excludes likewise those who baptize infants!—Those who baptize children, and those who enslave and sell them by the pound, are here placed on a level! Some writers in the Baptist Register have openly taken this ground. And the usages of the same sect would teach men that it is as truly essential in religion to be immersed, as it is to be free from slaveholding, even if—with their other usages—slaveholders were excluded by them. Very manifestly the distinction between the fundamentals of true religion, (the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and fidelity) and the mere minutiae of "sacrifices" is here covered up, and thrown into disuse.

And wherever this is done, it invariably follows, in a short time, that the mere incidentals or outward forms, come to be regarded as paramount, and the fundamentals sink into mere incidents. Albert Barnes has recently shown that a spiritual religion is never known to live long, where outward forms have come to be placed among the fundamentals, and universal church history (including

that of the present acts in America) prove the testimony to be true.

As a matter of fact, both Baptists and Presbyterians, have assumed outward forms as their basis of church membership, and this leads them to reject the scriptural basis of Christian character, attested by Bible rules. Consequently they hold "extortioners" in church fellowship. In doing this, they either reject the basis of fundamental Christianity as a test of church membership, or else they say that "extortion," even to the extent of slave-holding, (the greatest possible extent,) is consistent with Christian character. And they set aside the directions in 1 Cor. v: 11.

RIVAL ERRORS.

There are two rival errors in respect to the duties of religion and morality that are very difficult to be overcome, for the moment that the one is routed, the other steps into its place. The first error we may denominate *legalism*; the second, *false spirituality*.

The first error, legalism, consists either in expecting justification or pardon by the deeds of the law, or else in supposing that the mere outward act of performing an external duty can be acceptable to God without the inward affection of holy love to God and man, as the ruling motive of the act. The error is, in fact, always found in this double form, for no man whose heart is right with God, in the service he performs, ever imagines his good works can atone for his sins, and none but those who are freely justified or forgiven, by faith in Christ, ever perform any truly good works, from an obedient heart.

The second error, false spirituality, is by far the most prevalent, among the serious and devout religionists of our own times, being perhaps, one of the most strongly marked features of the prevalent religion, particularly where the general outlines of an evangelical belief, (or salvation by faith in Christ) are supposed to be taught. The error lies in supposing that since the motive gives character to the act, and the outward performance is nothing without the inward affection, therefore the holy motive and godly affection may exist, with little or no attention to the explicitly commanded act; that the good motive of the man will sanctify the deeds he commits, though divinely prohibited;—that his holy affection will supply the place of the duty, explicitly commanded, or constitute the performance of that duty, though the act itself may be wanting!

As for example: The prohibition of using a neighbor's service without wages, is held to be a prohibition of doing so, except for a good purpose. When God forbids stealing a man,

or holding a stolen man in possession, false spirituality expounds the prohibition to mean that these acts must not be done "for purposes of gain" or except "for the good" of the stolen persons! When Christ commands us to forsake all, and follow him, to sell our superfluous wealth, and give alms, &c. &c. &c., the exposition a spurious spiritualism gives of these commands is, that we must have "a spirit" to do these things, if Christ should require it of us! And so the fancied possession of a heart to do what Christ has plainly required of us, (without an "if"), is made a substitute for doing the things he commands! A more delusive and dangerous form of Antinomianism than this, the world never saw.

TRUE TESTIMONY.

An active friend of Liberty in Church and in State, writes us as follows:

"So far as my observation extends, it is much less difficult to induce men to act right in politics, than in religion. It will therefore cost more labor and sacrifice to convert men from the wicked and sectarian religion of our land, than from pro-slavery political parties."

Similar testimony is borne by brethren in various locations. What a comment on the prevailing religion of the times! With what a spirit of humility, self-doubt, unreserved consecration, and simple confiding reliance on the Divine aid, should the work of Church reformation be attempted and carried forward!

FROM NIAGARA COUNTY, a trusty brother writes:

"Every day's observation establishes more firmly in my mind, the conviction, that the Anti-Slavery Reform will look in vain to the churches, as at present established, for that moral power which must be brought to bear, before legalized heathenism at all be overturned. If we may judge of a fountain by its streams, is it uncharitable to charge many of our leading ecclesiastical functionaries, together with those who go to make up their churches, with being, not only corrupted themselves, but absolutely corrupting the unsophisticated and unsuspecting. The 5th of November, 1844, will stand, in all coming times, (until the day of their repentance,) pointing, from Dr. Hawes, down to the lowest menial who seeks to obtain popular favor, by a conformity to worldly maxims and policy; as men who will choose a moral wrong for a pecuniary benefit."

TRACT CIRCULATION.

We are making arrangements for a more extensive and regular circulation of REFORMATION TRACTS. If properly sustained, we intend to issue a new tract monthly, adapted to the wants of the times, and bearing directly or indirectly upon the REVIVAL OF A PURE RELIGION and the REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH. It is thought that by this means, a larger number of readers might be reached than in any other way, and at a less expense. Eight page tracts of the size already issued, will be furnished at \$1.00 per hundred, and 4 page or twelve page tracts, at reasonable prices. In some towns there might be circulated 500 tracts monthly; in others, 300, or 200,

and so on. In every place where there are friends of the cause, something might be done. We wish to know, before hand, how many are wanted, in order to know how many to print. Our friends are invited to send in their orders, at once, and say how many copies they will take, monthly, or of twelve numbers, as often as published—directing likewise, the mode of conveyance. When we have received orders sufficient, all that are destined for one country, might be sent to some suitable person to be designated, in each county seat, and subscribers in the towns could send and get their packages, from thence. Payments to be made in advance, or promptly each month. On the line of the rail road, packages might be sent by the Express. Or, on the canal, by boats, in the summer. A tract will be in readiness before January, with which to commence the operation. Send in orders immediately, post paid.

FROM YATES COUNTY—a Correspondent writes—"The cause is extending its influence and is destined to succeed; but it will require great labor. The pride and prejudice of Popery is just as obstinate in the sectarian portions of the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches (including, of course, all kinds of churches where the principle exists) as in the church of Rome."

IRREGULARITY OF MAILS.—Complaints have been received from Joseph Adams, Pon Gibson—D. Biddlecom and J. C. Babcock, Phelps—Benjamin Bradford, Oswego—and Benjamin Barnoy, and H. B. Davis, of Weedsport, that their papers have not been, for some time past, received. We are quite confident that they have been regularly mailed. Whose is the fault?

Subscribers who have not paid in advance for the next year, should send their money before the first of January, if they wish to continue. Otherwise we shall be obliged to stop sending to many of them, for want of the means to pay the printer.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS for the support of the CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, up to Dec. 1844.

J. Kingsbury, Livonia, \$1.00	J. Cobb, Honeoye, .30
S. Gilgus, Lyons, .50	W. H. Orin, Oberlin, 1.00
J. C. Babcock, Phelps, 1.00	B. Church, Talmadge, .31
J. H. Hopkins, Auburn, 1.00	G. S. Lonsdale, Utica, .50
J. Edwards, De Wilt, .50	J. W. Taylor, Bristol, .20
J. Elliott, Wyoming, .50	D. S. Curtis, Perry, .50
L. A. Adlington, Buffalo, 1.00	U. Heymour & B. Gil, .50
M. Sweeney, Lockport, 1.00	Franklinville, 1.50
A. L. Post, Mount Pleasant, 1.00	O. Mardeck, Dryden, 1.00
H. Hartwell, Oak Corners, .50	D. S. Agents, 4.40
R. Sharp, Lockport, 1.00	Z. Brockett, Ball's Bay, 1.00
R. F. B. Brockett's Brs, 1.00	J. Doty, Lima, (by J. W. H.) .25
E. Strong, Hudson, O., .50	J. Strong, Naplesville, Ill., .50
F. Senior, N. Y. Mills, 1.00	E. Lewis, Austinburg, O., 1.00
H. V. Jones, Seneca Castle, .50	D. S. Agents, 3.00
J. Robbins, Copenhagen, 1.00	J. T. Sisson, Short Tract, .50
W. Hall, Little Valley, 2.00	A. Jackson, Macellus, 1.00

Amount, \$32.65

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Inquiry and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling (both on opposite sides), 3 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build, 4 pages, 70¢ per hundred. No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness, 8 pages—\$1 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honeoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. III—No. 1.
WHOLE NUMBER, 33.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N.Y. JANUARY, 1845

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, i., 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, ON A SOTTER ABSTRACTABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
last, 30 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.
Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
send the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

As of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
100 copies, 80 cts. | Sixty papers, 65 cts.
200 copies, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters and en-
closures for papers.

POLITICS UNDER THE LAW OF GOD.

A Discourse by Horace Bushnell.

HARTFORD, CONN. 1844."

The leading sentiment of this discourse,
(based on Isaiah xxx. ii.) is indicated by the
first page—the sentiment that God governs
nations, and rightfully claims to control
political actions of men—that the law of
God is the legitimate and paramount law of
human activity, as well as the other activi-
ties of human life—that no supposed public
interests, reasons of state, or maxims of utility
justify a political departure from moral
principles—that the authority of God is always
held superior and paramount to the au-
thority of man.

And, at least, we understand to be the
principles the author was solicitous to incul-
cate, and we give him credit, likewise, for
expressing some of them with much clearness,
and of applying them with great pertinency
and force to many of the prevalent infrac-
tions of them, in our own age and nation—as
example, the habit of selecting the most
available, rather than the most worthy candi-
date, for voting for the party and not for the
cause—of choosing the least of two moral
evils—and of violating the first principles of
political justice and equity, in such public
measures as the Missouri Compromise—the
Mexican question—the Florida war—and the
entire support of the slave system. On these sub-
jects Mr. Bushnell speaks out, like a well dis-
ciplined and thoroughly disciplined advocate
of the Divine Supremacy, and of human
rights.

What could the man have been thinking
of when in alluding to the late scenes in
Rhode Island, he so suddenly shifted his posi-
tion, and so manifestly took for granted, the
reversal of all these principles—nay,
and a virtual contradiction of them, in or-
der to chime in with "certain" respectable

"sympathies" on the side of that aristocratic
"insurrection"—that military despotism—and
that lawless misrule—(pioneered by the slave-
power in the presidential chair, for the openly
avowed object of sustaining slavery; and suc-
ceeding by the boasted power of exorbitant
wealth) by which acknowledged human rights
were supplanted by the right of the strongest
—the known laws of God set aside by the
usurpations of man—justice turned away
backward for "reasons of state"—and an
equitable government* overthrown by a wick-
ed rebellion?

That we may do Mr. Bushnell no injustice,
we quote entire all he says on this subject:

It is but yesterday that a rebellion was on foot against
the laws of a neighboring State—a rebellion that no
principles of obedience to law, inculcated by scripture or
supported by the reason of morals, could justify. Un-
happily there were certain popular sympathies, which it
seemed might be enlisted by siding with the movement,
and the temptation was too strong to be resisted. Per-
sons in high places came forward to yield their favor
advancing doctrines which, if generally held, would
forever exclude the possibility of an established govern-
ment on earth. And now that something may possibly
be gained, I suppose, to their cause, a powerful body of
men in our Congress are endeavoring to cover this ne-
farious project with their sanction after its fall, and shel-
ter the dead body of the rebellion with a gratuitous and
posthumous sympathy. The opposing party, on the other
side, speak of the affair with a just reprobation. "At
they are supposed to speak only as partisans, and their
reproaches are destitute of moral power. Never was there
a case in which the moral points stood out in bolder re-
lief. It is nothing less than treason on one side, and
law on the other. And yet it is remarkable that the
moral sense of the country is so dulled, in reference to
every thing that can be called politics—moral distinctions
are so far subordinated to the power of party discipline,
that almost no effect is produced by denunciation, on one
side, or the just reprobation it meets on the other. I re-
ally do not suppose that an hundred votes have been
changed in the whole country, either by what has been
for or against this rebellion. And this, too, when there
are in the mass of voters probably a half million of pro-
fessed Christians more or less equally divided between
the parties! A most melancholy and frightful evidence
of the extent to which American politics have become
separated from the law of God and the control of moral
principles!

We have taken up, in this country, almost universally,
theories of government which totally forbid the entrance
of moral considerations. Government, we think, is a
social compact or agreement—a mere human creation,
having as little connection with God, as little of a moral
quality, as a ship of war or a public road. We do not
say that government, when exerted and fashioned by
man, in whatever manner, is forthwith taken by God to
be his instrument and ordinance—that it is moulded below
and authorized or clothed with authority from above—
giving thus to law a moral force, and to the civil consti-
tution the prerogatives of a settled or established order.
Rejecting such views of government, or never learning
to conceive them, it results that law expresses nothing
but human will, and that no one is morally bound by it.
If he chooses to break it and take the penalty, or if he
can shun the penalty by concealment, he is guilty of no

*Except in the one particular of temporarily restrict-
ing the franchise of the colored man, (an inconsistency
into which a majority, (not the leading men) of the con-
vention were seduced by the sneers of their opponents
who thought to defeat them on that ground) the Rhode
Island Constitution so happily attributed to Atheism,
was altogether the most truly Christian Constitution the
country or the world has ever yet witnessed. No other
Constitution has so fully set forth the Supreme authority
of God, and of the Right, over the contrivances and
usurpations of man. These were the obnoxious features
so carefully excluded from the aristocratic Constitution
afterwards forced upon the people by the bayonet.

moral wrong. It also results that a majority may at
any time, and in any way, rise up to change the funda-
mental compact; for there is no such thing as an estab-
lished order of the past, endowed with a moral authority
to bind their actions and determine their legitimate func-
tions. The nefarious doctrine advanced to justify the
Rhode Island rebellion, is, I grieve to say, nothing but
the shallow theory of government generally prevalent
in the country, carried out to its legitimate conclusions.
Holding such views of government, it would be wonder-
ful if we did not separate its functions practically from
God, as far as we separate them in theory. If our na-
ture were not wiser than our philosophy, we could never
feel one sentiment of moral obligation in regard to our
duties as citizens. There would be no crevice left through
which a sense of public virtue could leak into our minds.
That the views of which I complain are atheistic in
their origin, is a well known fact of history, and they
show the fact in their face. That they have operated
powerfully to effect the disastrous separation of politics
from the constraints of duty and responsibility to God,
is too evident.

And so then, Mr. Bushnell has "learned"
and "conceived"—(has he?) "that govern-
ment, when exerted and fashioned by man, in
WHATEVER MANNER (!) is forthwith taken by
God, to be his instrument and ordinance?—
That it is moulded below, and authorized or
clothed with authority from above? That
this gives to law a moral force, and to the
civil constitution the prerogatives of a settled
and established order! That if man reject,
or never learn "such views of government,"
it follows that law expresses nothing but hu-
man will, and no one is morally bound by it?

And this view of civil government, too, is
to displace the "shallow theory" that makes
government "a mere human creation"—"a
social compact"—"having little connexion
with God"—a theory that "separates politics
from the restraints of duty, and responsibility
to God"—a theory "atheistic in its origin!"

Marvellous! Most marvellous! Why!—
what is this "view" but the same atheistic
theory itself, only dressed up with a divine
sanction, and showing itself, in the place of
God, as God? What more plain and palpa-
ble assertion of man's supremacy—wicked
supremacy, too! and of God's obsequious sub-
serviency to that supremacy could have been
penned?

In the matter of this sort of civil govern-
ment, "man, the moth"—it would seem,
first moves! He "moulds" and "fashions"
it to his own taste! Aye! And "in what-
ever manner" best suits his purposes—his pas-
sions—his convenience! Then "forthwith"
the majesty of the Universe—"takes it to be
his instrument"—he "clothes it with authori-
ty from above" and thenceforward, men are
"morally bound by it"! And this is the only
way to prevent "a disastrous separation of
politics from the constraints of duty." &c. &c!

The pirates of Barataria, if successful, then,
instead of having been suppressed—the La-

drone pirates too—and the brigands of Captain Kidd, had they prevailed, instead of having been caught and hung—would have been the legitimate “law and order government”—and opposition would have been treason and rebellion! In other words, there is no other sanction for law, but the will of the strongest! Admirably conservative doctrine, this! What more could lawless ambition ask, than that its success shall be held to carry with it a divine sanction, clothing its usurpations with the authority of God himself?

By this “view” we admit, the party in Rhode Island, enjoying Mr. Bushnell’s “sympathies” can claim the “law and order” on their side! By no other “theory” most assuredly!

No marvel that the rightful authority and divine sanction of civil government should come to be questioned, under the prevalence of such theories as these!

We had verily thought, in our simplicity, that the sanctions of law, instead of thus depending on such capricious and lawless acts of “human will”—expressed the original and essential will of God, and bound men by its and his authority, because it expresses the truth, and the right! “Righteous and just is he!” We had supposed too, that the “established order” and “legitimate functions” of government, rested on a far more solid foundation than any supposed “forthwith” adoption, and sanction, by the all-just and merciful One, of any sort of government that any set of men, in “whatever manner” may “fashion and mould.” We thought they rested on truth and equity, the pillars of God’s throne. But we must stand corrected, if we “learn to conceive” of the correctness of the theory of Mr. Bushnell, and even slave law will become legitimate, and morally binding, then!

The people of Rhode Island, who framed the Free Suffrage Constitution, and organized a government under it, are now universally admitted to have been right “in the abstract!” The discourses of President Wayland and Dr. Tucker, are sufficiently explicit in their admissions of this! The only question, was whether “reasons of State” did not forbid the present adoption of the right! The whole controversy was between acknowledged moral right (in other words, the known will of God) on the one side, and the common subterfuges of all oppressions, on the other. The doctrine of man’s supremacy over moral right—the doctrine of the pretended “social compact”—the doctrine that “civil government is a human creation” that may be “moulded” and “fashioned” by wicked men for their selfish purposes, and yet be morally binding—these

were the atheistic—or worse than atheistic doctrines all along urged by the conservatives of aristocratic rebellion—while in opposition to these, the Supreme and paramount authority of God, and of holy justice were as constantly urged by THE PEOPLE, and only urged, to be derided, and persecuted by a lawless armed mob, under the shape of military law!—“Never was there a case in which the moral points stood out in bolder relief.”

When will Christian ministers, and when will Christian abolitionists learn that the doctrine of popular sovereignty, in civil government, rightly understood, so far from being the atheistical theory, is the only truly Christian theory of civil government, that the world has ever seen, or ever can see?

What is that doctrine? Not, as some have held it* to be, and as others have misrepresented it, the doctrine that God’s laws of civil government must not be executed until the transgressors give their assent; that moral right cannot always be the rule of political action; and that the people can mould and fashion a government as they please, without reference to God’s law, and make it, nevertheless a legitimate and binding government, in the particulars in which it conflicts with moral right, and with the divine will.

But the doctrine is, that God, to whom all power belongs, and from whom alone, all rightful authority must emanate, having created all men equal, having endowed them with inalienable rights, and having placed them under his moral law, in the midst of responsibilities growing out of their social relations, has committed the authority of executing his laws of civil government, not to any select caste of men, (wielding a power over their equals, in which they do not participate) but to the entire mass of the people, whom, in all ages and nations, from the time of the plagues of Egypt, in which the universal law of political responsibility resting on all men, was so signally promulgated and enforced, and thence down through all the successive history of nations, God has held all the people of all nations responsible for the execution of justice between a man and his neighbor.

It is in accordance with this theory, and this only, to say;—nay, it is a distinctive feature of this theory to maintain, that civil power belongeth unto God, that rightful civil government can be “fashioned” and “molded” only

*John Quincy Adams, for example, who maintains, on this ground, that piracy and man-stealing must not be prohibited by Congress, in the District of Columbia. In the same category we may reckon President Wayland, Dr. Tucker, and other apologists of Rhode Island oppression, who admit that the moral right was on the side of the free suffrage Constitutionists, but who pretend (though they know better) that a majority of the people were contented with the injustice, maintain, on that ground, that “law and order” were on the side of the oppressor, along with the power!

by Him, or in conformity to his will:—the no human contrivances or usurpations at variance with his immutable laws of equity and justice, (however successful for a time) can supersede or supplant it, or carry with them a divine sanction, or moral obligation. In other words, that all the authorities to be recognized as truly existing—are of God, and ordained (“fashioned” and “molded”) by him: That such authorities are to be known by the distinctive marks of being “a terror not to good works but to the evil”—of being a “minister of God, for good”—“executing wrath upon him that doeth evil”—that, on the ground, such authorities have a rightful claim for the tribute of a cheerful support, and that “whosoever resisteth” such authority (even if be the aristocracy of Rhode Island, or President Wayland and Dr. Tucker for the chaplains) “resisteth the ordinance of God, and shall receive to themselves condemnation.”

This is the view of Civil Government maintained by the Constitutionalists of Rhode Island; and here lay the head and front of the offending. For this, their lawfully organized government was lawlessly thrown down, the Christian churches broken up on the Sabbath by an armed soldiery, exemplary ministers dragged to prison, and nine-tenths of the effective piety of the State, struck dumb, or driven into exile!

Will Horace Bushnell call this theory of civil government an atheistic one? Will he place it by the side of his own, and show wherein it fails, in the comparison, on the score of an intelligent reverence for God, and for fealty to his irrepensible moral law?

Vainly, indeed, on any other theory, Mr. Bushnell labor to bring “politics under the law of God!” For the law of God in relation to politics is the very law we have described. It is the law of our moral nature. It is the law of the Bible.

How manifestly subversive of divine law and especially at war with those applications of it, that Mr. Bushnell, in this same sermon, has so earnestly labored to make, is the theory he has, nevertheless, taught!

He would exalt the authority of God, but his theory exalts man—however capricious and wicked—above God himself, and supposes God to sanction and authorize a government “molded and fashioned, in whatever manner by man!” He deprecates “a theory of government that forbids the entrance of moral considerations.” But his theory supposes God himself to clothe with his authority, a government not founded on moral considerations! He deprecates, very justly, the notion that government is a mere social compact, a mere human creation. But his theory supposes God to authorize and clothe with his authority a mere social compact, a mere human creation.

fashioned by man, in whatever manner, merely because it has been (and by a very few, and wicked men to it may be) thus fashioned! He deprecates the notion that government has little connexion with God, having no of a moral quality about it. But his theory connects God with civil government by making God himself sanction and authorize just such an atheistic civil government doing little or nothing of morality in its object or its "fashion." He is fearful that civil law will be supposed to express nothing but man's will, so that no one is morally bound by it. But his theory would prevent this by making God communicant to the moral sanction of authority, to whatever governments "human will" may "mold" and "fashion"—as absurd as though it should attempt to do this, by bringing in the authority of God to stamp it with his sanction, so that it might be atheism no longer! He deprecates the disastrous separation of politics from the constraints of duty, and responsibility to God. But his theory would guard against this by making God himself "clothe with authority from above" the very politics "molded" and "fashioned" irrespective of the "constraints of duty and responsibility to God"!

Aburdities like these can result in nothing but self-subversion. We separate the man from his theory because we cannot doubt the rectitude of his intentions. And in doing so we do not dishonor his conspicuous talents, his well cultivated powers. He fails where the first men in the nation are seen to fail. He fails because he falls in with the theory so widely prevalent, in our day—the theory that there can be no civil government with a divine sanction, unless it sanctions all the so-called civil governments that any set of men, for any purposes, by any measures, may succeed in forcing upon mankind!

And this absurd theory lies at the root of all the evils against which Mr. Bushnell has drawn his otherwise effective and powerful pen. Could Christians persuade themselves to let "notoriously wicked men" to places of legal power, had not this same theory deluged them with the notion that civil governments administered, can nevertheless have a "moral force" and be "authorized, or clothed with authority from above"? If this theory is true, why should not the most available men, instead of the most just and worthy, be acceptable to God? For God, himself, by his theory, takes them to be his instruments, clothes them with his authority and approval. Why then, should not God's people vote for them? Why should they not vote for their party, instead of the men? Why should "moral considerations" have weight with them, in the question of supporting a

candidate and clothing him with *their* authority and sanction, since they are taught that, in case the candidate is elected, the great God himself, will "forthwith" vote on the same side, and add *his* sanction and "authority" to their own? What higher example or inducement could they ask or desire? Why should they not lend their sanction and support, in political matters, to "the least of two evils," when taught that the Holy one of Israel, chooses not only the *least*, but even the *greatest* of these evils?*

Who does not know that strenuous efforts against such infamous measures as the admission of slave-holding Missouri, the oppression of the Indians, the Florida war, and the support of American Slavery, have always been met, and successfully overpowered, or compromised, or relinquished, in obedience to the maxims of this same theory of civil government, that make oppression in high places, equally with justice—"the ordinance of God" and "morally binding"—because God—it is said—has "clothed with authority from above" whatever political institutions, has been "molded" and "fashioned" upon the earth? Sometimes the Bible is resorted to, for the evidences of a divine sanction to the slave code in particular. But such a descent into details would be needless, if *all* human political institutions, "molded" and "fashioned" by man, in whatever manner" are "forthwith taken by God to be his instrument and ordinance"—"clothed with authority from above"—thus armed with "moral force" and invested with "the prerogatives of a settled and established order."—The whole includes all the parts of which it is composed. If *all* political human government is invested with a divine sanction and moral force, *slave* government is thus invested, of course.

Other topics of remark and of illustration might be introduced, for the subject is a comprehensive one. We might ask Mr. Bushnell to remember that the people of Rhode Island having, "molded" and "fashioned" their government, in such "manner" as they pleased, (yes, and having done it legally and Constitutionally, too, if *any* American Constitution has ever been regularly formed) the government having been duly organized under that Constitution, officers elected, a session of the State Legislature held, and laws enacted and promulgated—it follows, by his own theory, that it was "forthwith taken by God to be his instrument and ordinance—clothed with au-

*We need not deny that the Providential Government of God makes use of wicked men and tyrants as his scourges, to chastise the wickedness of the people, and especially, their wicked consent to unrighteous governments. But this does not imply a divine sanction and approval of wicked governments, but the very reverse.

thority from above, giving thus to law a *moral* force, and to the civil Constitution the prerogatives of a settled or established order."—Then it was, at a time of general gratulation, of profound peace, and of universal security under the new government, when no man's life or property was in jeopardy, under better laws than the State had ever before enjoyed, and before any pretended fear of plunder or of military despotism had been whispered—then it was, that there was organized "a rebellion that no principle of obedience to law, inculcated by no scripture, or supported by the reason of morals could justify." A more careless or wicked rebellion, the annals of history do not record—nor one whose intelligent partisans have more abundantly, and in more various ways, conceded to have been waged in opposition to the principles of "abstract right"—in other words, the known will of God!

The rebellion succeeded, nevertheless, against the unarmed and comparatively moneyless minority—a majority whose unprecedented tenderness of human life placed them in a poor position to urge a deadly contest with their blood-thirsty tyrants! The wicked rebellion by dint of dollars, and bayonets, by means of mob law and lawless military despotism, and the ruthless and protracted ravages of a wanton and licentious soldiery, prevailed, and blotted out from the map of the nation; a *free* State! These are the facts that posterity will know, however blind a besotted and heaven doomed nation may now be.—The first question for Mr. Bushnell to decide is this—whether *such* a rebellion, against *such* a government, on his theory, could be otherwise than treason and rebellion, during its incipient stages, and its progress? If not, then his theory falls to the ground, lifeless!

For here, then, was a case of armed opposition to an existing government, that was free from the guilt of a rebellion! But if it was a rebellion (as of course it was, upon any known theory of civil government) then the next question for Mr. Bushnell to dispose of, under his theory, is—whether that armed rebellion was transformed into a divinely instituted civil government the moment that its atrocities made it successful? Is SUCCESSFUL REBELLION to one of his own institutions, the great Dicty, to which JEHOVAH himself is to be represented, as bowing down? Say what you will of the contest in Rhode Island—or leave it, if you please, out of the question, the theory of Mr. Bushnell, concerning the divine sanction to all political governments, however established, involves itself in the absurdity of an affirmative answer to the above question.

Christianity must teach men better notions of civil governments, before the nations can be free.

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER OF STATESMEN.

"Little children, let no man deceive you: he that DOETH righteousness, IS righteous, even as he is righteous."
—1 John iii. 7.

This caution of the beloved and loving disciple, came to our remembrance, while we were perusing the article that follows, in the Oberlin Evangelist.

THE CINCINNATI HERALD AND PHILANTHROPIST.

We have long regarded this paper as one of the ablest periodical publications in the United States. We particularly admire the general tone and spirit of its editorial articles, almost entirely free from discourtesy and the language of personal opprobrium, while they leave no room to suspect the editor of lukewarmness or indecision. We judge from a series of letters from Virginia that Dr. Bailey is absent and has been obliged for a season to resign his editorial duties to a substitute, whose articles in general exhibit ability and good temper. But it was with surprise and grief that we read the following language applied to Gov. Slade of Vermont: "He has received this office [that of Governor] as the price of his adhesion to the slaveholder Clay, and of treachery base as that of Treachot or Arnold." This is too much in the style of partisan vituperation for the columns of the Herald. We regret as truly as the writer of that sentence, the attitude of Mr. Slade. We know not but that he has greatly sinned, but we dare not use language like this of a fellow man, much less of a fellow Christian, and one too, who has done good service to the cause of liberty, till his conduct has become so flagrantly bad as to leave no room for the shadow of a reasonable doubt that he is an utter apostate from God and Truth and Duty. To treat Mr. Slade and other professedly anti-slavery Whigs and Democrats thus, is not the way to reclaim them from their errors, but is the way to disgust and repel them. It is to tempt them to separate themselves for ever from men who could inflict upon their feelings and their good name such cruel wounds. When our anti-slavery brethren do palpable wrong, let us rebuke them sharply if necessary, but still as brethren; when they are involved in mischievous error, let us solemnly as we may point out the mischief that their course will produce; but let us reserve the names of Treachot and Arnold for persons whom the world know to be vile traitors, not brand them upon those whom the great mass of anti-slavery men regard as sincere but mistaken friends of human rights. J. M.

With the respected writer of the above, we have no desire to contend. His writings we often read with great pleasure. Nor can we say that some of the suggestions here made are without weight. To temper needed Christian faithfulness with proper Christian gentleness is a lesson, always demanding study, and never, perhaps, perfectly learned. And in each recurring case, different minds will form different conclusions, from their different apprehensions of the facts and circumstances involved. Whether the Cincinnati Editor used the most happy language, is a question in the adjustment of which we would not have volunteered our opinion, but for another and a more serious question that seems to be involved, viz: Is such a man as WILLIAM SLADE of Vermont to be accounted, and recognized as a Christian brother? It is assumed by the writer in the Evangelist that he is, and on this ground it is that he reasons. I am not going to utter a positive affirmation that he is not. But when a well known public character is held up by a Christian teacher, and on the ground of that character, as actually exhibiting the characteristics of a Christian, and entitled to be regarded and treated as such, I cannot, I think, be greatly blamed for enquiring

after the evidences of that fact. The question must, of necessity, arise, in my mind. And on that question I cannot help forming some judgment. And the judgment I form must have some reference to the standard of Christian character I have in my own mind. The judgment I may form, in such a case, I may be called upon to express with the same publicity that has been given to a contrary judgment. By the ministers of the Church of England, the memory of Charles II, (whom the Puritans say was justly executed for his crimes,) is devoutly cherished under the name of "blessed martyr." By one class of religious teachers, Oliver Cromwell has been extolled as a saint, and by another, held up as a monster of wickedness.

And nothing more directly tends to give shape and character to the religion of a people, than the character their religious teachers bestow upon their well known public men, whose actions are identified with the history of their times. The religion of the United States, at this moment, is probably affected and moulded less by the character of William Tennant and David Brainard, than by the character of George Washington, whom our leading clergy, of the different sects, and on testimony of the jovial Episcopal clergy of Virginia, (who could swear as eloquently as they could preach,) have tho't proper to canonize as a Saint. What Washington practiced, very few ministers will venture to declare inconsistent with the character of a Christian. And it was on this very ground, the assumed Christian character of George Washington, that a religious Editor, in New England, first invoked upon the heads of Abolitionists that "popular indignation" that was afterwards meted out to them, for the discredit their doctrines were supposed to be bringing upon the saintship of the national idol.

It becomes a matter of vast importance, then, upon what sort of public characters and prominent statesmen, our influential ministers, connected with our seats of theological learning, bestow the character of Christians.—Upon the church and upon the state there is exerted a commanding influence, that may continue for ages to come. And we take it for granted, that the simple circumstance of church membership, especially in our times, entitles no man, however exalted his station, to be considered and treated as a Christian.

Who, then, is Wm. Slade, of Vermont, that he should be denominated a Christian? His public profession of Christianity, and of that part of it which is now technically denominated abolition, we have no occasion to controvert. But we have yet to learn that such professions entitle him to be judged by

other rules than other men, without any such professions, are judged by, to "his actions his fruits." That "the great mass of our anti-slavery men" at any time, have ever regarded him as "a sincere friend of human rights," is certainly a new piece of information to us. We know of no time in which he has been so regarded, by the intelligent friends of the cause in this region, or farther east. His reservations, his provisos, and his exceptions, have always been more than sufficient to counteract and overbalance any good effect that could flow from his partial concessions to correct principles. Of his "good services to the cause of liberty," we are yet to be apprized. We had always supposed that the greatest obstruction to the progress of our cause was the partial and ostensible adhesion of such men, giving them a seductive influence over the confiding and less reflecting, in our ranks, and repelling the great mass of the sharp sighted and strong minded in the community at large, who have all along suspected the sinister designs of abolitionists, because they have found them infested by artful and cunning aspirants of that stamp, who could talk against slavery, while they gave their votes in its favor. The best "service" that such men, retaining their present characters, could ever give to the cause of liberty, would be to cut themselves adrift from it. If the strong language of the Cincinnati Editor should "disgust and repel" ALL such, our cause would gain strength, and acquire character, beyond what we now see reason to expect. Unfortunately for the anti-slavery ranks, and for the churches, such characters are not quite so readily shaken off from their skirts.

We know it is said we must not judge of men's motives, and in the same breath it is urged, for the benefit of those whose actions are palpably wicked, that the motive characterizes the action! Then we must never judge of the characters of men at all, though the Saviour bids us know the tree by its fruits (not its flowers.) And we cannot help forming opinions of the men's characters—and of the character of William Slade, among the rest.

We can recollect no act of Wm. Slade, that could more plausibly be cited as a "service to the cause of Liberty," than his celebrated speech in Congress, some years since. And yet we do not know of any more deadly thrust he could have given to the anti-slavery cause. Nor can we exercise any of that sort of charity—a false charity we hold it—that could give Mr. Slade the least credit for any intention to benefit the anti-slavery cause by that speech. Who does not know that that speech was calculated and contrived to produce what

it did produce, an effect upon the voters of Vermont, where it was so profusely circulated by the known enemies of the truths it contained, and not upon the legislators at Washington, who, understanding, perfectly, the game, sat quietly, as they never did before nor since, under the infliction of a set anti-slavery speech. They evidently knew, before hand, that it would wind up, as it did, with an exhortation to abolitionists to act in direct opposition to their professions, as the speaker himself had always done!

Before Mr. Slade can claim the character of a *New Testament* Christian, he must procure a new version of the language of John. He must make him say—"He that *talketh* righteousness is righteous." And even with this text for a standard, he must blot out all the latter portion of his speech—that portion for the sake of which, all the better part of it had been uttered. There was not even the *talking* of it in that part of his speech. Nothing more unrighteous or ungodly ever proceeded out of the lips of an American statesman.—It was a most seductive, and alas, a most fatally successful attempt to induce the voters of Vermont, and of the whole country, including the pledged friends of freedom, to vote for Harrison and Tyler—to vote for an advocate of oppression, and a slaveholder—to commit, under deeper aggravations, and greater light, precisely the same sin for which God smote the first born of Egypt, and drowned the hosts of Pharaoh in the Red Sea!

In the deliberate, systematic, habitual and persevering commission of that same sin, William Slade has persisted to the present hour. And not content with sinning alone, he has labored incessantly, to seduce others—to seduce even the servants of the Lord, to join with him in the commission of the same sin. The lures he has held out to them, have been wicked and selfish lures. He has appealed to their love of wealth, to the gains they might derive from the success of partial monopolies and partizan schemes, for the benefit of certain privileged classes, to the neglect of human rights. For the securing of "interests" like these, he has urged them to trample upon principles which he admits to be heaven-sanctioned and sacred. Reminded, constantly, as he has been, of the divine mandate to choose rulers who shall be "just, ruling in the fear of God," he has given the whole weight of his influence and his vote for a man who he knows to be a wicked and profligate man.

It is no breach of charity, it is only an exercise of common sagacity and penetration, to judge that he has done this, with a view to his own personal elevation to office—with a view to a continued seat in Congress—with a view to his becoming Governor of Vermont—

which objects he has actually accomplished, and could not have compassed in any other way. Probably there are not an hundred disinterested and candid persons in Vermont, who will say that they do not think he intended, by this course to accomplish these ends. It would be difficult for any considerate person to doubt it. I have said nothing of his identifying himself with a party that has opened "a new chapter in the development of party corruption," and at whose "forgeries" the nation may well be astounded. Since seated in the Governor's chair he has officially deprecated the pressing of the Anti-Slavery question in such a manner as to jeopard the interests of *that party*, and of the class legislations and monopolies upon which that party is intent.

Now we are quite as willing as our excellent and charitable brother at Oberlin, to make all due allowances for the infirmities of men—for the imperfections of *Christians*. We will not dispute the matter with him, if he shall affirm that there is not a just man living upon the earth that sinneth not. Nevertheless we must contend that *there are* men whose habitual activities and the prevailing bent of whose settled operations and obvious aims are neither selfish nor unjust, nor constantly violative of the fundamental principles of equity they profess to recognize. We must maintain that *such* is the character of all who are entitled to be recognized as Christians. And we must ask, in sober earnest, whether intelligent observers of men and manners, can lay their hands upon their breasts and say they conscientiously believe this character to be exhibited by William Slade of Vermont?

Were it only a solitary or even an occasional relapse, under the influence of some strong temptation, or assault of appetite or passion, into some out breaking and over-scandalous sin—the sin of David or of Peter—and followed with the confession and repentance of those men, the case would wear another and a far more favorable aspect. As it is, the question is, whether a constant and unbroken course of conduct, directly and manifestly in opposition to the principles of acknowledged right, can consist with a credible evidence of Christian character.

We take the ground that it cannot. And however uncharitable we may be deemed, we confess we cannot contemplate the character of William Slade, without a deep and settled conviction that it is the character of a pre-eminent wicked, ungodly, and selfish man.—And this conviction we hold ourselves as free, and as much bound, on proper occasions, to express, as to express a similar conviction in respect to any other public character whose acts the impartial historian records. We

would say it of William Slade for the same high purposes of moral instruction, for which a similar testimony concerning a similar character, is borne by a Mosheim or a D'Aubigne.

And what other judgment could we form? What other ground could we take? Compel us (if the thing could be,) to judge otherwise, and you oblige us to give up all the moral tests, or landmarks of human character, which could enable us to discriminate between good men and bad. We are without chart, compass, or rudder, upon a sea of uncertainties, where all moral distinctions have disappeared! If the character of William Slade is the character of a Christian, by what marks are we to describe the character of a selfish man—an impenitent sinner?

If we convene a solemn assembly (among decent and worldly respectable men,) for the purpose of calling sinners to repentance, and warning them to flee from the wrath to come, who will feel themselves addressed, if we advertise them, before hand, that we do not mean such men as William Slade, seeking such ends, by such means? If *his* course has not become "so flagrantly bad as to leave no room for the shadow of a reasonable doubt" that he is to be included in the warning, to how many else, and to whom, throughout the entire state of Vermont, should it be addressed? If men, pursuing such objects, and using such methods, are to be accounted in a state of salvation, how many, and who, among us, are in need of being saved? If such men, properly belong to the church, what broad line of distinction have we left between the church and the world?

To our own apprehension, the circumstance that Mr. Slade has made use of his Christian and his anti-slavery professions to assist in the attainment of his wicked objects, is the very circumstance that presents, by far, the most aggravated feature of the case. [It places him, with the light he resists, in a worse attitude than that of a Calhoun.] If from *that* circumstance, or any other, the white mantle of Christianity is to be cast over such dark deeds, and the actors shielded from the reproofs descriptive of their characters, all reproofs of iniquity might as well cease. So long as such men can pursue such courses, with such success, and with such impunity, it will be in vain to think of reforming either the church or the world. The standard of holiness may be elevated, in the gross, or in the abstract, but it will be lowered down in the detail, and in practice. Christian holiness cannot permanently thrive in the fraternity of ungodly men, nor inhabit the haunts where wickedness passes currently under its abused name.

Impressed, solemnly, as we are with these sentiments, we cannot but lament the character, rather than simply the "attitude" of Mr. Slade. If any thing is to be said or done for his benefit, by his friends, and if they would

not heal his "wounds" slightly, they must speak to him of his great guilt, and not merely of his "mischievous error." The epithets used by the Cincinnati Herald might perhaps be spared, while there is hope; but in this matter of language, there are errors to be avoided on either hand. Scripture language, the language of the merciful Savior himself, is too scathing for our fastidious times. There is a courtesy and a decorum, so called, that squares well with the Theology of those who first brought it into vogue, who think it unchristian to use the language of Christ, who think it only repels and disgusts sinners to warn them of the divine wrath, on account of their sins. With a theology like this, our Oberlin brother, we know, would not fraternize. But we know of no existing school of Theology now, whose language has not been modified, more or less, by its presence. Reformers, since the days of Isaiah, have always been thought wanting in mildness; and sometimes, as in the case of Luther, they may have been needlessly severe. But for our own part, rather than see the cause of truth suffer from the undue mildness that shelters great men in their sins, we would choose to listen, even to the tremendous denunciations of a Charles G. Finney, himself, as he was wont to them, fourteen years ago, in this State, on account of which he was thought so unchristian, and by means of which he uprooted the previously existing order of things, to make room for the new influences that now center in Oberlin. Long standing abuses are not otherwise reached, and putrid atmospheres are not otherwise cleansed.

The "vituperations" of the political press, so frequently adverted to, have seldom equalled the virulence with which religious editors have visited Abolitionist. But "two wrongs do not make a right." In judging of the character of such denunciations, it is essential to inquire whether they are founded in truth, and whether they are called for, by a regard for the right. We are not of the number of those who see an unmixed evil in the denunciations of the political press. They often embody startling truths, which the people would be wise to ponder. When corruption and forgery are rife in the land, the political press that does not thunder its reproofs, is recreant to its trust. The Christian minister, the revival preacher, is not in solemnly bound to warn men to repent their sins, than is the political Editor, in the fear of God, and in the love of man, to do the same thing, when he sees heartless demagogues, under the cloak of their Christian professions, perpetrating the highest crimes against human freedom, for paltry pelf, or for the lust of office, selling their professed principles in the shambles, betraying the cause of the Savior they profess to love, bringing Christianity into contempt, joining hands with oppressors, and duellists, and gamblers, and licentious men, by whom the just are villified, traduced, defamed—and committing, with greediness, and incessantly, the sin of JEROBOAM, THE SON OF NEBAT, WHO MADE ISRAEL TO SIN.

When such men can shelter themselves behind the horns of the altar—when they nestle quietly and undisturbed in the bosom of the churches—when the watchmen of Zion cannot see the coming desolation, or will not

sound the alarm, when the most unprincipled deceivers can be potted as Christian brethren, and their enormous and heaven-daring wickedness, overlooked, or (when pointed at,) pared down to mere venial mistakes, miscalculations, or errors—then, let the political press thunder—heaven-commissioned, and heaven-approved, to do heaven's own revealed and predicted work—to overturn, and overturn, and overturn, till iniquity be cast down, and the dominion of the nations given to whom it rightfully belongs.

It is not always that religious communities correctly apprehend their position, or the destinies to which they are tending. Like mistaken mariners at sea, and moving through the water under a fair and gentle breeze, they think they are making progress, till some unexpected land-mark heaves in sight, in an unwelcome quarter, revealing to them the fact that an unsuspected under current, more potent than the winds, had been carrying the whole body of the ocean, and the ship, along with it, astern!

From thirty to forty years ago, the Presbyterian and Congregational ministers of this country, with scarcely a dissenting voice, considered it a sufficient proof of the essential infidelity and wickedness of the then existing democratic party, that it honored, with a prominent post, so immoral and wicked a man as Henry Clay. What would have been thought, by such ministers, of the political aspirant, who could have become Governor of Vermont, by such a course as has recently been pursued by William Stoddard? Within thirty or forty years, how many things, indicative of progress, in Christian knowledge and holiness, have been witnessed! How many errors have been exploded—how many improved views and new measures have been introduced—how much, in favor of a higher tone and standard of Christian attainment has been eloquently urged—and how plainly, through the surrounding waters, the vessel has seemed to glide. But where are the land-marks?—Where? Could men who are greeted as Christian brethren, now, have been suspected of being Christians, forty years ago? Where are the land-marks? Where?

In what other department of human activity could professors of religion, for the promotion of the objects on which they are intent, resort to such methods as have been described, or thus trample upon the religious principles they prefer to honor, and yet retain their standing, in the Churches, as Christians?—Could the farmer, the mechanic, or the merchant, in the disposition of their products or wares, postpone, in this manner, the first principles of the religion they profess, without a forfeiture of their character as Christians? Certainly not. But only clothe these same objects in a political garb, let the avowed end in view be the securing of a better market for these same wares or products, by the measures of a national administration, and then the professor of religion may trample upon all that he professes to regard as holy, for the purpose of compassing that object, and nobody must suspect that he is not a Christian! Political sins have come to be regarded as privileged sins, venial sins, which neither the pulpit, nor the religious press, nor the Church by its discipline, is to visit with any severe censure.—

And thus it will always be, so long as the very ring leaders of political corruption can be so cured of being greeted, by the highest men in the Ministry, as fellow Christians.

"Little Children, let NO man deceive you!" by such fallacies. "He that DOETH righteousness IS righteous." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that DOETH THE WILL of my father who is in heaven." Sanctification is nothing distinct from a holy activity in the divine service. "And this is the love of God that we KEEP HIS COMMANDMENTS, and his commandments are not grievous." "No man can serve two masters." "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Ye cannot serve under the standard of duellists, gamblers, and slaveholders, and serve at the same time, under the standard of Jesus Christ. For what communion hath light with darkness? Or what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel—or oppressor?

There is no "royal road" for great statesmen to travel in by themselves, to heaven.—If they will go there, they must be content to go in the same narrow path that is marked out, for other people to walk in. There shall be an highway, and the redeemed of the Lord shall walk there. But there shall go upon it nothing that defileth, or that loveth and maketh a lie."

And if any one is at a loss to know what language the people of God, and especially his ministers should employ when they would address that class of statesmen, with their supporters standing in the nominal Church, who make loud professions of attachment to the cause of humanity and justice, yet nevertheless, snake hands with oppressors and ungodly men in their efforts to obtain places of power, let them open the page of divine inspiration and read:—

"Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom. Give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah! *To what purpose* is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord; I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and of the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats? When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts, bring no more vain oblations. Inconceivable is an abomination unto me. The new moons and Sabbaths, and calling of assemblies, I cannot away with, it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble to me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers I will not hear you. Your hands are full of blood. Wash you. Make you clean. Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes. Cease to do evil. Learn to do well. Seek judgment. Relieve the oppressed. Judge the fatherless. Plead for the widow." [Talk not of choosing the least of two evils!] "If ye are willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the wrath of the Lord hath spoken it."

When the Christian pulpit and the religious

we learn the proper use and application, of language like this, the fetters of oppression will crumble, and the light of the Churches will break forth as the morning. Such words of "regeneration" and "sanctification" will have meaning and significance again, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, JANUARY, 1845.

DELAY OF NEXT PAPER.—In consequence of the contemplated absence of the Editor, on a tour to the east, (should his health permit) the next paper will, perhaps, be delayed a few weeks. If so, we shall endeavor to make up the lost time, by issuing two papers in one month.

Christian Reform Convention.

The friends of CHRISTIAN PROGRESS and ECCLESIASTICAL REFORM are invited to meet a Convention at SYRACUSE, on Wednesday and Thursday, January 22d and 23d, 1845, to discuss such religious subjects as the times seem to require, to devise and adopt measures for promoting a spirit of investigation and inquiry; for diffusing, more extensively, by means of the Press, or otherwise, a knowledge of Primitive Church Order; and, in general, to seek, by mutual consultation and prayer, the revival of a purified Christianity throughout the land, and the earth. The Convention to open at 10 A. M. on Wednesday the 22d.

Charles A. Wheaton,	Syracuse,
John H. Lathrop,	do.
Josiah Wright,	do.
Myron P. Howlett,	do.
N. G. Salisbury,	do.
John Stewart,	do.
Wm. H. Scram,	do.
Wm. M. Clark,	do.
Wm. H. Childs,	Niagara Falls.
Wm. F. Sheldon,	W. Bloomfield.
Gerrit Smith,	Peterboro',
Samuel Wells,	do.
Washington Stickney,	Canastota.
Ira Hills,	Vernon Centre.
A. Kingsbury,	Cazenovia.
Henry Bradley,	Penn Yan.
John R. Hopkins,	Auburn.
E. Willard Frisbie,	Phelps.
John Mosher,	Canandaigua.
E. C. Winchester,	Bristol Centre.
Marcus Stickney,	Lockport.
William Goodell,	Honeoye.

CHEERING INDICATIONS.—The letters we have recently received from brethren in various locations and in different directions, give decisive evidence of progress. The spirit of inquiry is on the increase. Within a short time we have heard from a number of places in which measures are either in progress or in contemplation for organizing Churches on the New Testament model. We think it unadvisable to give publicity, in detail, to all the

facts of this kind that are communicated to us. In some cases, the announcement might prove premature. And, we do not think it best to do any thing that shall even seem to foster or countenance the too prevalent spirit of doing things merely because others are doing them. If our object were to build up a new sect, after some pattern that either ourselves or some convention might think best to prescribe, the work would be a comparatively easy one, and a necessary and natural means of promoting it would be to make some array or demonstration of numbers. What the cause of Christ needs is, men who are capable of thinking and acting for themselves—men who read their own bibles, and determine to practice what they read. The work of rebuilding Christian churches, in order to be a sound work, must be a work of deep reflection, meditation, and earnest prayer. Much sounding of trumpets would not comport with the nature of such a work.

A CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER writes us—
"I am so deeply impressed with the fact that our religion has almost run out into a matter of *devout selfishness*, a round of services, earnest in profession, stiff in adherence to names and creeds, looking after *convenience* and the *popular breath*, that I have come to regard, as of small and doubtful benefit, the reformation of Church Organizations. I have sometimes thought, that faithful witnesses for Christ should stay where they are, till driven out. But I will not further shed the darkness of my own doubts."

Thanks for your frankness, brother. Dr. Aubigne tells of many amiable and pious ministers, in Luther's day, who were troubled with similar doubts. But what if all had been such? Where had been the Protestant Reformation then? Remember the testimony of the same writer, that a corrupt Church was never reformed—and the similar testimony of the Savior that it is "thenceforth good for nothing." And though reformed *organization* be not a new spiritual life, it is in such cases, the *condition* or effect of it.

FROM A PASTOR in Madison County:

"I heartily sympathize with your views of the importance of taking measures for the purification of the fountain of political influence, and the reformation of our christianity. And to effectually reach the former, we shall be compelled to aim at the latter. I think that the bearing of ecclesiastical reform, and the overthrow of all anti-Christian reforms of Church Government, upon the extension of a sound political faith, has been too little appre-

ciated by Christian Reformers of political abuses. Indeed, I think that all reliance upon political measures, merely, for permanent and wide-spread reformation is deceptive and visionary. All great and extensive revolutions, in the state, need for their support and permanence, the powerful spirit of a pure Christianity, and the sound forms of a democratic church government. As wise master-builders therefore, engaged in reconstructing the dilapidated walls of our holy Jerusalem, we must insist, as you have so earnestly done, upon the forms and rules given us by the great Founder himself. I rejoice, greatly, in whatever can afford a rational hope for the amelioration of our abused species; but nothing, in my humble opinion, can exceed the importance of the revolution, which we see only in its beginning. O, that we might see a rallying of spirits, of true and faithful men, throughout our whole country, for the high and holy purpose of rescuing our Temple from the corruptions with which it has become filled—from money changers, and the changers of its pure and glorious light into the darkness of atheism itself.

One grand instrumentality for the accomplishment of this, will be a diffusion of light among the people (on the subject of church corruption and the despotism of ecclesiastics) in the form of tracts, religious periodicals, &c. I think a series of well written tracts, suited to the times, would be of incalculable service to the cause."

FROM CAYUGA COUNTY.—A well known brother writes:

"It is too obvious for denial, that the leaders of the principal religious sects are attempting to conceal from deserved indignation the most atrocious injustice and robbery involved in American Slavery, by covering with the broad mantle of Christianity, the members and ministers of the respective organizations who participate in that vile system. These sects seem to stand, voluntarily, in a position before the world that makes them, in fact, a "brotherhood of thieves," and to be in membership with them, is *prima facie* evidence *against*, rather than in *favor* of, honesty of character. Being convinced of this, more than eighteen months ago, I felt myself compelled to declare in public and in private, the termination of my connexion with the Presbyterian Church, of which I have been for several years a member. The ministers and several members of the session advised me to take a letter of dismission, but, believing that course would technically recognize the church as a Christian organization, I declined. My name is still on record as a member. I have proclaimed, whenever an opportunity presented, the views above given, in

reference to church organization; yet, no steps have been taken to disprove them. I mention these facts, because they tend, strongly, to show the necessity of some measures to promote the organization of churches that will practically recognize the distinction between right and wrong."

The following, from the London Non-Conformist, contains hints which should be studied by the friends of Ecclesiastical Reform in America:

A PLACE FOR EVERY MAN, AND EVERY MAN IN HIS PLACE.

There are few reflecting minds, we imagine, that have not, at some time or another been struck with the voicelessness with which nature carries on her greatest works. The quiet of her operations is truly sublime.—Night and day alternate, the seasons come and go, the planets spin upon their axes and revolve about the sun, in perfect stillness. 'There is no clatter.' The most elaborate processes are completed without any apparent bustle. Within a few short months, the previously bare and desolate earth clothes itself with the richest verdure—puts forth, in countless variety, unnumbered forms of material existence and beauty—and becomes transformed from a wilderness into a blooming garden, filled with the loveliest illustrations of divine beneficence and skill. But the change, stupendous as it is, is silently effected. We see no marks of painful effort—we hear no confused din of preparation. Every agent is in its place—each works out its allotted task—the mightiest is not independent—the most trivial is not superfluous—and the combined result of the incessant and harmonious action of all, is a temple of magnificence, upreared in tranquility as deep as that of solitude.

The phenomenon is not without its moral—and it is an important one. The greatest revolutions are not those which make most noise in their accomplishment. There are established modes of compassing the largest ends, which in their operation, scarcely attract notice. Let us not be supposed to undervalue all that machinery which the moral world, works with some considerable effort every stroke of which society must needs hear. Our necessities would seem, at present, to require such; nor in the present age of the world can it be safely laid aside. What we are anxious to impress upon the minds of our readers is, that much may be done independently of such aid—done by individuals, in their individual capacity—done in quiet so unobtrusive that society shall know nothing of it—and that the result of this unpretending aggression upon ignorance and prejudice, may be a thousand fold more marvelous in the end than any produced by a more visible and organized agency. Would it those who are concerned, for example, in emancipating Christianity from state interference, but recognize the iniquity which we have placed at the head of this article—"A place for every man, and every man in his place," and act upon it not only they, but the whole civilized world would, at no distant date, stand dumb with astonishment at the change which had been produced.

We are all of us too prone to under-estimate "the little"—to treat that as worthless which is not striking—to forget the importance of details—and rather to sigh for a power which we have not, than to turn to useful account that which we have. In the warfare now commenced against a system hoary with antiquity, and rooted in the prejudice and superstitions of myriads, the surest conclusion to which an advocate of Christian willingness can come is, that there is something in this matter which he can do—the wisest thing he can do about it, is to ascertain what that something is—the noblest duty he discharge is, having ascertained, to do it.—The simplest plan of agency is always the most effective.

Let us illustrate the kind of experiment we recommend. We shall imagine an individual, no matter what his locality, or what his circumstances, making out for himself the work which, in obedience to the impulse of the faith within him, he resolves upon performing. The ultimate object, he is well aware, which he, in common with thousands, has in view, must be reached by bringing over many minds to see as he sees, and many hearts to feel as he feels. Every mind thus gained over is a step to the end—a small step it may be, but it is only by such small steps that the goal is to be attained. What, then, will he do? He will deliberately look round him, and ask himself, "Over what minds have I the greatest influence?" Be he where he will, occupy whatever station he may, it is yet certain that there are

disposed to look up to him—some to whom he has many access—some with whom he might try, not hopelessly, the experiment of transferring to them his own impressions, and of reproducing in them his own thoughts. Who these are, it will not be difficult for him to ascertain. They may be his children, or near kinsmen, or dependents, or simply friends—but whoever they are, with them his work will most properly begin. Here is a definite circle within which for him to operate with the greatest probability of success. Having tentatively surveyed it there will be no necessity whatever for him to be casting about with a view to satisfy himself how he can help forward the cause. His little spot of duty lies contiguous to his own home—let him assiduously cultivate that in the first place and, long before he has completed his undertaking, new spheres will spontaneously open up to his view, and invite his friendly care.

Thus, we take it for granted that there is "a place for every man"—now let us further suppose "every man" in his place. What does this involve? Not much in point, either of time, or labor, or expense, or of self-denial—not half so much as many are hasty to conclude. A good resolution, a little pains-taking, method, and perseverance, will accomplish strange things. For example—an earnest friend of the cause meets with an argument which he feels to be most convincingly put. Now, he may do one of two things. He may, as soon as he reads it, sit down and wonder how in the world any common understanding can resist such reasoning, and let all his energy evaporate in his wonder—or he may, of set plan, busy himself, in such case, in bringing that same argument in contact with the minds of those to whom he, have before supposed he has a ready access. And if he will only adapt, as a principle of action, the earliest possible transference to them of all which, whether spoken or printed, has specially fastened upon his own mind, he will himself be surprised at the extent of his own success. He may thus inconceivably economize the means at his disposal, and make them do unthought-of execution. This is but one expedient—but even this one, if perseveringly followed up, will suggest others, all of them easy, natural, noiseless, inexpensive. We have mentioned this one merely to illustrate the adage that in this, as in every other department, "Where there is a will, there is a way."

And now we fancy we hear some of our readers exclaim, "There needs no ghost come from the grave to tell us that." Exactly not. And if they are waiting for some magnificent plan of action, which none but a ghost can reveal, they will wait long enough; and even when the revelation is made, they will find it to be unsuited to their opportunities and their powers. Could we but succeed in convincing them that it is by the watchful and incessant plying of means, so trivial as to be commonly overlooked, that victory is to be achieved, we should render no ordinary service to the cause. Let it only be supposed that all the friends of religious freedom were thus engaged; that every one of them had his sphere, and resolved to attend to it; that none of them esteemed that beneath notice which might aid in bringing about conviction in the mind of another; and that from month to month, in all parts of the empire, a noiseless agency like this was diffusing knowledge, crumbling away prejudice, fanning sparks into a flame—why, what association on earth would equal it for efficiency? In two or three years, at farthest, the whole aspect of this "question of questions" would undergo a change. Society would seethe, and wonder how it was brought about; and priests and placemen would be confronted with an army, the mustering of which they never observed, and the strength of which they would in vain attempt to subdue.

FROM ST. LAWRENCE.—Extract of a letter.—"I am glad to know, that wherever the Anti-Slavery cause is thoroughly carried on, it has a powerful tendency to lead the mind to the reception of those great principles which are the subject of discussion in the Christian Investigator. And I believe the day is not far distant when at least a large share of Christians will clearly discriminate between a veritable Christian church, and a mere sham, and may God speed the day when the religion of this nation shall not give its sanction to crimes of every kind; when a practical Christianity shall pervade the hearts of its possessors, and bring forth works meet to be called Christian."

FROM LEWIS COUNTY.—We hear of some instances of secession. In one case, the seceders were tried and condemned by the church from which they seceded, for the sin of covenant breaking. The seceders have

taken measures for an independent organization, and the circumstance has given rise to much agitation in that region. "Bigotry," says our correspondent, "is almost ready to draw the sword."

TRACT CIRCULATION.

We are making arrangements for a more extensive and regular circulation of REVOLUTION TRACTS. If properly sustained, we intend to issue a new tract monthly, adapted to the wants of the times, and bearing directly or indirectly upon the REVIVAL OF A PURE RELIGION and the REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH. It is thought that by this means, a larger number of readers might be reached than in any other way, and at a less expense. Eight page tracts of the size already issued, will be furnished at \$1.00 per hundred, and 1 page or twelve page tracts, at reasonable prices. In some towns there might be circulated 500 tracts monthly; in others, 300, or 200, and so on. In every place where there are friends of the cause, something might be done. We wish to know, before hand, how many are wanted, in order to know how many to print. Our friends are invited to send in their orders, at once, and say how many copies they will take, monthly, or of twelve numbers, as often as published—directing likewise, the mode of conveyance. When we have received orders sufficient, all that are destined for one county, might be sent to some suitable person to be designated, in each county seat, and subscribers in the towns could send and get their packages, from thence. Payments to be made in advance, or promptly each month. On the line of the rail road, packages might be sent by the Express. Or, on the canal, by boats, in the summer. A tract will be in readiness before January, with which to commence the operation. *Send in orders immediately, post paid.*

IRREGULARITY OF MAILS.—Complaints have been received from Joseph Adams, Port Gibson—D. Biddlecom and J. C. Babcock, Phelps—Benjamin Bradford, Oswego—and Benjamin Barney, and H. B. Davis, of Weedsport, that their papers have not been, for some time past, received. We are quite confident that they have been regularly mailed. Whose is the fault?

PAYMENTS and DONATIONS for Christian Investigator, up to January, 1845.

S. Lyman, Rose, Pa. \$0.50	J. Marsh jr. Victor, \$1.00
J. Briggs, do. 0.50	L. A. Wick, Brown's sq. 0.50
Mrs E. Thompson, Carthage, 0.50	I. Hawley, New Milford, Pa. 1.00
A. F. Holt, Elmira, 0.50	J. Mead, Greenwich, Conn. 1.00
do. G. W. Hathaway, Bloomfield, Me. 0.50	S. Morse, Orangeville, 0.50
S. H. Lathrop, Genesee, 0.50	L. L. Nourse, Hume, 0.50
John Cooper, Hume, 0.50	

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoy, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Inquiry and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arist and Build. 4 pages, \$0.62 per hundred.
No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher.
HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office; Perry, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series Vol. III—No. 2.
Whole Number, 31.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N.Y. FEBRUARY, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DAVID, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
are 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.
any person who will procure four subscribers, and
the money without expense to the publisher, shall
as copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the whole, as follows, viz:
a per dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, 82 00
single papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
from Masters, if requested, will frank letters and en-
close for papers.

CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION AT SYRACUSE.

NOTES.—The friends of Christian Pro-
fession and Ecclesiastical Reform met in con-
vention in the Congregational church in Syra-
cuse on Wednesday, January 22d, 1845, pur-
suant to previous notice.

The Convention was organized by appoint-
ing Dr. Geo. S. Loomis of De Witt, President,
H. Childs of Niagara and J. Green of
Watertown, Vice Presidents, and W. M.
Clark of Syracuse, and E. C. Winchester of
Oswego, Secretaries.

The Convention was then opened with pray-

ers from John Cross, of Temperance
Society, Leo co. Ill., and Gerrit Smith, were

the following persons were appointed a
committee on business, viz: Wm. Goodell of
Honeoye, Francis Hawley of Cazenovia, J.
H. of Watertown, Wm. Dewey of Le Roy,
Stickney, of Canastota, Wm. D. Hen-
derson, of Oswego co., and Wm. H. Childs
of Niagara.

Dr. F. Cotton and E. Allis were ap-
pointed a committee on roll of Members.

The Business committee reported sundry
resolutions and propositions, for discussion.—
(The resolutions and propositions appended.)
Resolution, No. 1, after discussion was laid
on the table.

Dr. F. Hawley of Cazenovia, delivered a
sermon in the evening, on Popery in the Pro-
testant churches.

Thursday, 23d.—Convention was opened
with prayer.

W. M. Clarke moved the following:

Resolved, that we look upon the secret asso-
ciations of Sons of Temperance, Odd Fellows,
Free Masons as anti-Christian, opposed
to the benevolence of the Gospel, which is as
positive as the love of Christ, and co-ex-

tensive with the wants of man, and that they
ought to be discountenanced by all who love
the Savior.

Resolution No. 2, was taken up and adopted.

Resolution No. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, af-
ter discussion were laid on the table.

Resolution No. 5 was adopted without dis-
cussion.

Propositions, Series No. 1, were adopted,
separately without discussion.

Series No. 2, 3, 4, and 5 were adopted
without discussion, except propositions No.
17 and 18 of Series No. 2, and proposition
No. 19, of Series No. 4, which were discus-
sed at length and adopted.

The resolution offered by Mr. Clark for
want of time to discuss it, was laid on the ta-
ble and ordered to be printed with the proceed-
ings of the Convention, as were also the oth-
er resolutions which were reported to the
Convention.

Resolved, That the proceedings of the Con-
vention be published in the Christian Investi-
gator.

Adjourned sine die.

GEO. S. LOOMIS, Pres't.

W. M. CLARKE, } Secretaries.
E. C. WINCHESTER, }

NAMES OF MEMBERS OF CONVENTION.
Honeoye, Wm. Goodell, Cheney Abney.
Cazenovia, Francis Hawley, E. Allis.
De Witt, Dr. Geo. S. Loomis, Mrs. Loomis.
South Richland, Oswego co. Wm. A. Hendrickson.
Wm. D. Hendrickson.
Canadaguis, Ethan Sabin.
Syracuse, Dr. S. Bliss, Chas. A. Wheaton, Wm. H.
Cook, Guy Davis, Montgomery Merrick, A. Fuller, L.
C. Sparks, J. O. Bennett, W. M. Clarke, Mrs. W. H.
Seram, E. Cadwell, C. P. Dutcher, Josiah Wright, E.
Cowles, Halsey Rice, Mrs. Rice, Mrs. Bottom.
Sahna, Benjamin Bentley, Dr. David Brace.
Nelson, Madison co. Niel Eastman.
Granby, Oswego co. Benjamin Lewis.
Le Roy, Wm. Dewey.
Oswego, Seymour Cor, Jr. Sidney Hinman, Hiram
B. Lewis.
Ovid, Seneca co. Elijah Mandeville,
Auburn, Myron O. Wilder.
Pulaski, Oswego co. T. C. Baker.
Volney, Oswego co. James Dutcher.
Hannibal, Oswego co. Zenas Hann.
Cano 4 corners, E. E. Dudley, C. B. Hickok.
Geddes, Thomas G. White,
Fulton, J. C. Babcock.
Watertown, J. Green.
Watertown, David She.
Hristal Centre, John W. Taylor, Julia Ingraham, E.
C. Winchester.
Prieble, Harvey Waters, J. J. Johnson.
Onisco, Emily Cary, Seymour King.
Pompey, Orlin J. Wheaton.
Niagara, Wm. H. Childs, Sarah A. Childs.
Clerkville, Madison co. W. Cotton.
Canastota, Madison co. Washington Stickney.
La Fayette, Lucius Preston, Mrs. Preston, Mrs. D.
Gibbs.
Georgetown, John Holmes.
Phoenix, S. R. Dutcher.
—, Edward Lee, Warren Clark.

[The above roll is probably incomplete.—
We recollect some persons active in the Con-
vention, whose names are not here recorded.

It is difficult to get a full roll of a convention.
—Editor.]

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED TO THE CONVEN-
TION, besides the one recorded in the minutes.

The following were proposed by William
D. Hendrickson.

1. In as much as man in his primitive state
was denominated good and his goodness con-
sisted in his bearing the Moral Image of his
Creator, and being subject to his spirit and pow-
er, therefore

Resolved, That it is the duty of every man
to turn his heart to the Holy Spirit of God and
submit to and obey its teachings; relying upon
its power to produce in him that birth of the
nature of God, which shall qualify him to love
and prize the happiness of his fellow-man
equal to the happiness of himself, whereby he
shall be enabled to refrain from attempting to
increase his happiness at the expense of the
happiness of another.

[Discussed and laid on the table, there being
different views of the phraseology employed.]

2. Resolved, That each individual member
of this Convention strive to suppress every
feeling that would lead them to exalt themselves
above the most degraded of the human family,
but that they take the place of Jesus of Nazareth,
and be willing to associate with, and eat and
drink with, publicans and sinners, so that they
may have access to them, taking them (as it
were) by the hand and leading them out of the
path of vice and iniquity, into the path of vir-
tue, righteousness and holiness, so that both
we and they may all come in the unity of the
spirit and the bonds of peace, dwelling together
as children of one Father even God, who loves
us and desires our happiness both here and
hereafter. [Adopted.]

3. Resolved, That the members of this
Convention distribute liberally of their world-
ly treasures to relieve suffering humanity, by
dealing their bread to the hungry and clothing
the naked and entertaining the destitute, in-
stead of supporting a lofty and arrogant priest-
hood, and building splendid places of worship,
with elevated pulpits to raise one man above
the rest.

[Discussed and laid on the table, there being
different views of the impression that would
be conveyed by the latter part of the resolu-
tion.]

The following Resolutions were proposed
by A. Wells, of Colosse.

4. Resolved, That all the sin in our falls

world is caused by man turning his mind from the direction of the Spirit of God within him, and all that can be done to cleanse him from his sins must simply lead him to wait for, and trust to that Holy Spirit, from which he has departed, for assistance.

[Discussed and laid on the table.]

5. Resolved, That the Gospel of Jesus Christ does not authorize the clergy or any class of men to arrogate to themselves exclusive power or authority over their fellow beings. [Adopted.]

6. Resolved, That stated salaries have had a most baneful effect upon the Church, and make the clergy hirelings to all intents and purposes whatsoever.

[Discussed and laid on the table.]

The following Resolutions, proposed by D. Slie, were postponed till toward the close of the session, when, for want of time to act upon them, they were laid on the table.

7. Resolved, That, in order to the prevalence of our principles, as Christian Reformers, consistency requires that our influence and means be wholly withdrawn from all proslavery and sectarian churches, and that we give our support in favor of those organizations which are or shall be constituted after the primitive model, called and worthy of the name of churches of Christ, or of God, in their respective localities.

8, 9, and 10. We need not publish these Resolutions entire. One of them contemplated a more vigorous effort for the circulation of *Church Reform Tracts*—another recommended the publication, in tract form, of F. Hawley's *Lecture* delivered before the Convention, on the Popery of the Protestant sects—and a third contemplated the writing and publishing of "a special appeal to the ministers and churches, adapted to promote the great objects of Church Reform."

LETTERS TO THE CONVENTION.

The following Letters were read in Convention, and directed to be published.

TEMPERANCE HILL, Lee co. Ill. }
January 10, 1845. }

Dear Brother Smith and Brethren of the Convention:

My eye has just fallen on a notice in the "Patriot," calling a Convention of the friends of "Christian Progress and Ecclesiastical Reform," and I hasten to improve the present moment to bid you God speed. I rejoice to see the names of so many of my old friends and fellow-laborers appended to the call. The noble objects for which you assemble, are well worthy your highest and holiest efforts. The place, too, recalls some thrilling recollections of the past. We once met in Syracuse, for an object not altogether dissimilar from those which call you together on the present occa-

sion; the purification of the Church from the selfishness, and idolatry of sectarianism.—Some who then participated in our deliberations, we shall meet no more on earth. Myrick, the zealous, unflinching advocate of truth; the faithful reprover of iniquity, long "sanctioned, and sanctified" by ecclesiastical usage; the generous, noble-hearted, friend of man; the affectionate brother of "all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity"; the bold, adventurous, self-sacrificing pioneer in the arduous work of clerical and ecclesiastical reform, has finished his earthly labors, and entered into his rest. His eye of fire, and voice of love, cheer not the place of your assemblage. Let his vacant seat, beloved brethren, admonish and stimulate you to increasing energy, and faithfulness in the work now before you.—Shrink not from the stern rebuke of sin, though enthroned on the high places of the sanctuary. Though it should be found nestling beneath the robes of clerical dignity, SPARE NOT THE HYDRA.

Let the stern, and withering rebuke of truth fully spoken, loud as the thunders of Sinai, imperative as the fiat of Jehovah, go forth and its reverberations shall waken in the vallies and on the hill tops, kindred spirits, whose eye of faith will beam with fresh delight, and whose heart of philanthropic zeal will thrill with the quick pulsations of primitive Christian energy, and whose lips of holy love will repeat the solemn, cheerful strain, "GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST; ON EARTH PEACE; GOOD WILL TO MAN." Even on the sparsely settled, but delightful prairies of the "West," are numbers unknown, who will devoutly recognize the agency of the great Head of the Church, in the impulsive power, which may be sent out through the body, by the deliberations, and results of your Convention. We shall look for them with anxious expectations.

May you be guided by the wisdom of the Holy One, be filled with His fulness, be sanctified through His truth, and your efforts crowned with abundant success, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Most affectionately, your brother,

JOHN OKO.

G. Smith, Esq. or the Pres't of Con.

PETERBORO' Jan. 19, 1845.

To the Christian Convention which is to be held at Syracuse, Jan. 22d and 23d. 1845:

I should be with you but that my health, is at the present time, considerably impaired, and but that my private affairs require me to be constantly at home.

I should, however, have very little hope, that, were I to meet with you, I should find my views harmonizing with yours on the great question of church organization.

I still believe, that, when a child is born to a family, it is neither necessary, nor proper, for the family to take a vote whether the child shall be regarded as a member of the family. Its birth is, of itself, a sufficient reason why its parents and its brothers and sisters should recognize such membership. I still believe, too, that when a person is again, in Peterboro', the Christians of Peterboro' are not to vote whether he may be to this, or that, or the other denomination, but they are to regard his new birth as calling him to membership in the church of Peterboro', as making him a member of it.

I take it for granted that the Convention will make a contribution to the support of the Christian Investigator. The within check of Twenty Dollars can be added to their contribution.

In haste, and very respectfully yours,

GERRIT SMITH.

PROPOSITIONS ON CHURCH APOSTASY AND REFORM

Discussed and adopted by the Convention.

SERIES I.—OF RELIGIOUS DECLENSION AND APOSTASY.

1. No church nor religious community claim exemption from the danger of religious declension and apostasy on account of the piety of its founders and first members.

2. The causes or occasions of religious declension are as manifold as the inlets to religious errors, sinful customs, wrong worldly desires, evil thoughts, ungodly passions, and unholy affections.

3. The beginnings of religious declension are commonly unperceived by those who witness and participate in them.

4. The progress of such declension, whether more gradual or more rapid, is not commonly detected by the churches or communities wherein they exist—until the declension has ripened into apostasy, and the church community is past cure, by the means which God ordinarily employs.

5. In all declining and apostate churches and religious bodies, the few who remain and seek a reformation, are uniformly accepted disturbers, and charged with fanatic false zeal, and a bad spirit.

6. A church or religious community in sound state, will always welcome an examination of its faith, polity, and practice: patiently to any complaints or remonstrances made against its course or position, and fully amend whatever may be shown to be wrong.

7. Religious declension, in a church or religious community, never fails to involve, either as cause, concomitant, or effect, membership, in such bodies, of wicked and

men, who are retained there, in violation of church order and wholesome discipline. A neglect of church discipline, when it is habitual, involves a settled departure from church order, and paves the way for such violations in church polity as are inconsistent with the purity and the Christian liberty of the church.

A church that knowingly retains ungodly members in its communion, without efforts to claim them, or after such efforts have been fruitless, becomes a partaker of their guilt, and is corrupted by them, according to the divine maxim that "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."—[1 Cor. v.]

No prayers, no labors, no religious revivals in the bosom of such churches that do not produce the effect, either to reclaim their ungodly members, or to induce the churches to separate from them from fellowship, can suffice to turn such churches from the downward track of apostasy, and ruin.

When the majority or controlling officers and members of a church or religious society become corrupt, and will not reform, they are under the same necessity to separate from them, that the majority or ruling officers are to exclude corrupt individuals; only that the former case is the plain and urgent one.

III.—DEFINITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF A CORRUPT CHURCH.

A church may be said to be corrupt or apostate when its leading members or officers refuse to separate and can neither be reclaimed nor excluded from the communion, fellowship and worship of the church.

The same may be said of a church that persistently and perseveringly retains in its membership any ungodly person who cannot be brought to repentance and amendment.—[1 Cor. v.]

A church ceases to be a church of Christ when it departs from its original purpose, by a departing and settled departure, at any point, from the Christian faith, either in doctrine or practice.

A church cannot properly be denominated a Christian church that is not engaged in doing the work of Christ.

A Christian church is a congregation of faithful men, so an anti-Christian church is a congregation of unfaithful men.

A church cannot be proved to be a Christian church, now, because it was a Christian church, nor because it retains an orthodox doctrine, nor because it retains an orthodox and correct rituals, nor because it professes to maintain a correct practice, nor because its form of church polity is scriptural, nor because it has some true Christians in its membership, nor because the converting influence of the Spirit are not wholly withdrawn from its ministrations and its assemblies.

7. Among the marks of a corrupt church may be reckoned—its conformity to the world—its adoption of worldly maxims and worldly policy—its fear of the opposition and censure of the world—its tolerance of popular sins, its refusal to reprove them, its participation in them, its apologies for them, and its opposition to those who do reprove them.

8. It is an additional mark of corruption and apostasy in such a church, when it will not come to the light lest its deeds should be reprov'd—when it smotheres free investigation in its own body, and will not suffer its members to remonstrate with it, on account of its sins.

9. That church must needs be an apostate church that seeks to find, in the scriptures, a divine warranty for the practices of which she considers herself slandered when charged of a participation in them.

10. The church is apostate that, while it admits the sinfulness of certain prevailing practices, does not lift up a warning voice against them, nor insist on the duty of immediately forsaking them. The church is apostate that admits correct principles in the abstract, which it refuses to honor in practice.

11. The church is apostate that, while it finds fault with all the ways in which a heinous sin is reprov'd and opposed, devises and proposes no other method of opposition and reproof.

12. The church is apostate that excuses itself and its members from reprov'ing and opposing popular sins, because it cannot be done without a pecuniary loss, or without hazard to the interests connected with the present life.

13. It is a mark of corruption and apostasy in a church or religious community, when those within its bosom whose reputation for piety and good works are most relied upon to sustain the questionable character of the church, are nevertheless accounted disturbers of its peace—are, at the same time maligned as deceivers or fanatics and yet solicitously retained in the church or community, lest its Christian activities should wholly cease, its meetings for prayer be deserted, and its religious enterprises be abandoned, for want of support.

14. It is a mark of such corruption and apostasy in a church or religious fraternity when that portion of its members who would be active in doing the proper work of a Christian church are obliged to organize other associations in which they may thus labor, not only without the countenance and aid of the church, but against its persevering opposition, insomuch that the church becomes a clog and a hindrance, rather than an instrument and a helper.

15. It is a similar mark, when a church, instead of correcting and guiding, in a right direction, the public sentiment of the community around it, must needs be operated upon by that general public sentiment, in order to the reformation of its own vices; when, at every step of such dilatory and unwilling progress, it plants itself resolutely against any farther advances; and, so far from ingenuously and gratefully confessing its past errors which it has been forced, in some measure to retract, continues to abuse and to traduce the self-denying laborers through whose agency the reformation has been carried forward.

16. That church is in a corrupt and apostate state, in which the sacrifice of outward and ritual observances is placed before mercy, justice, fundamental morality, and the claims of humanity.

17. A church places sacrifice before mercy when its membership and fellowship are kept wide open to those who agree with them in outward forms, but who trample humanity and morality under foot. The same anti-Christian character is exhibited by a church that excludes from its membership and fellowship exemplary and pious Christians, engaged in self-denying works of benevolence, and charged with no departure from fundamental Christian doctrine, on account, merely, of their non-conformity, in the disputed rituals of religion in respect to which the wisest and best Christians are disagreed.

18. It is a mark of apostasy in a church when it sets up its own authority, or the authority of its officers in the room of the authority of Jesus Christ—when it authoritatively enjoins on Christians that which the Bible does not enjoin, brings their necks under the yoke of usages which Christ never established, and cuts off all appeal to the Scriptures by a reference to the established usages and rules of the Church, making the commandment of God, of none effect, through their own tradition.

19. It is a mark of an anti-Christian church to establish usages which subvert the "holy equality of souls before God" and enthrone a priestly caste upon the ruins of the equal brotherhood of the saints.

20. It is a corrupt church that builds the tombs of the prophets and garnishes the sepulchres of the righteous—that idolizes the reformers of other days, but persecutes and vilifies those who tread in their footsteps.

21. It is a mark of a corrupt church when it loudly professes a regard for human salvation and yet looks with contempt upon the advocacy of outraged human rights—when it apologizes for their violation, when it leaving

ly co-operates with oppressors, allies itself, in its influences and activities, to a despotism in the State; and so far from teaching men to execute judgement, by the choice of just rulers, is busied, by the exertions of its ministry and its members, to prevent the wielding of civil government for its proper ends, and on the other hand, labors to elevate to places of power the men who "frame mischief by a law," who forbid the reading of the scriptures, who annul marriage; the men whose private morals as well as public acts, are a disgrace to a civilized and professing Christian people.

22. To say that churches and religious bodies notoriously corresponding in their leading features, with the marks specified in the preceding propositions, are to be regarded otherwise than corrupt and apostate; would be, in effect, to deny that such a character should ever be attributed to any bodies of men professing to be churches of Christ.

SERIES III.—OF THE PROPER TREATMENT OF A CORRUPT CHURCH.

1. The divine admonition to all Christians united with such churches, is, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

2. Those who, in the face of this divine admonition, adopt the policy of remaining in such churches for the purpose of doing them good, should consider carefully whether they are likely to succeed better by following the suggestions of their own wisdom, than by bowing, implicitly, to the directions of the Great Head of the church.

3. God does not hold men responsible for producing the greatest amount of good, but he does hold them responsible for fidelity to his explicit commands. "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams."

4. The world has never yet witnessed a solitary instance, (so far as we know,) in which an apostate and corrupt church has been reclaimed and restored, either by the agency of good men, remaining in it, or by any other process; but in thousands of cases, the better portion of such corrupt churches have been corrupted by remaining in them.

5. The well known process of renovation and reform, in the presence of apostate churches is by a separation from them, and the gathering of faithful churches in their stead.

6. The history of the Protestant Reformation corroborates these statements. The Reformation was effected by those who seceded from and protested against the church of Rome—while those who only complained of her corruptions and yet remained in her bosom, so far from producing any reformation, relapsed into its corruptions themselves—and greatly impeded the progress of reform.

7. While it is true, that the mere act of seceding from a corrupt church, does not secure the spiritual life of the seceders, it is nevertheless certain that a refusal or neglect to secede from a church known to be corrupt, is almost invariably the occasion of spiritual lounness, if not the precursor of spiritual death.

8. It is not difficult to see why all efforts to restore spiritual life to an apostate church, while remaining in religious fellowship with it, have so signally failed. All such efforts involve a compromise with Beliel—a fellowship with sin—an endorsement or testimony in favor of the Christian character of a church which is nevertheless anti-Christian. God cannot consistently bless and prosper a practical lie—nor will wicked men be led to repentance by being assured that good men consider them righteous.

9. It is a great error, then, which some men commit, who, while convinced that a church or religious body is destitute of the Spirit of Christ, discourage secession from it, and hope by their exertions and labors, to restore it to spiritual life. Such was the error of the American Missionaries in respect to the Greek church. Instead of being reformers, they were corrupted themselves.

10. The same error and the same result may constantly be witnessed. The cases are common, in our own country, in which men continue their ecclesiastical connection with churches and religious bodies that they consider corrupt and apostate. And the consequence is, that they insensibly decline in the spirit of piety and self-denial, then begin to frame apologies for their brethren, and then, by a course of compromise, relapse into the same unholy practices themselves. And this is the very process by which corrupt churches become incorrigible, and often extinct.

11. The course of divine Providence, (illustrating the divine predictions, and the divine threatenings,) affords ground for the belief that all corrupt churches, will, in this way, become hardened in their apostacy, and given up to destruction.

12. The duty of renouncing and exposing corrupt churches becomes as imperative, therefore, as the duty of seeking salvation for ourselves and for lost sinners around us.

13. The presence and the influence of a corrupt church and ministry, present an insuperable barrier to the restoration of a pure religion, and to the planting of pure churches. The influence of such a church and ministry must first be broken down or reduced, before men will be prepared to receive the religion of Christ.

14. For the reason just stated, Jesus Christ occupied the greater part of his ministry in

such terrible denunciations of a corrupt church and ministry as are recorded in the 23d chapter of Matthew. There is no reason to think that the scenes of the day of Pentecost have been reached without this preparatory process, which so enraged the Pharisees, that they crucified the Lord of Life and glory for this cause. And he exposed them chiefly for their participation in the oppression of the poor, and for the spiritual despotism wielded.

15. An acquaintance with the Protestant Reformation, with the Puritan dissenters especially with the restorers of Congregational church Independency in England, will reveal to us the fact that they succeeded in the restoration of a purer religion no farther than they succeeded in first withdrawing the influence of the people from the church and ministry that had misled and corrupted them.

16. The labors of Wesley and Whitefield in the bosom of the church of England (though not, perhaps, at that time wholly untainted) did not arrest its downward progress towards Romanism. The few of the flock of Whitefield who re-organized, embodying all the present available remains of his labors. Wesley's work would scarcely have survived him, had he not organized the converts by themselves. And though he did secede from the Church of England nor his converts to do so, yet his successors found it necessary to take that step, as their only alternative and protection from the fate of the Mother Church.

17. In our own country, the most powerful revivals have left no perceptible traces behind them in a twelve month—and partly because the converts of those revivals have been gathered into the bosom of corrupt churches.

18. And all efforts to elevate the standard of holiness among Christians, have chiefly failed, and must ultimately fail entirely, from the same cause—and from the reasons stated already. A sufficient reason, of itself, is fellowship with an apostate church is, of itself, an unlawful and unholy act, which God proves and forbids.

19. The prejudice is quite unfounded, that a corrupt Church and Ministry must not be publicly exposed, lest infidelity should triumph and religion fall into disgrace. Nothing more honestly can honor religion, or remove the cause of infidelity furnished by the presence of a corrupt church.

20. And it is not true that the community at large, (who are not professing Christians) have no interest at stake, in the character of the corrupt church, and have no right to interfere into the merits, and decide upon the pretensions of the prevailing religion. Their moral nature, as accountable beings qualify

and compel them to judge. God commands them to judge, and to judge righteously, upon the correctness of their judgment, their eternal salvation depends.

21. The Protestant Reformers, with Luther at their head, and following the example of prophets, apostles, and the divine founder of Christianity himself, did not scruple to direct their appeals to the community at large, and call upon them to throw off the yoke, renounce the delusions, avoid the example, condemn the abominations, detect the sophistries, and escape the doom of a corrupt Priesthood, and a demoralizing church.

22. Since the virtue of a people is the only safeguard of their liberties, and since the politics and the government of a people cannot permanently rise higher than their current religion, the people should be warned against the support of a corrupt religion, as against the sure cause of their own corruption and ruin.

23. Especially should a free people be taught to lend no support to a religion that does not recognize human rights—that apologizes for oppression—that lends its support to oppressors—or that affects neutrality on the great and pending question of human chattelhood and enslavement. A people who have not sufficient virtue and discernment to spurn such a religion, with the churches and ministry that embody it, are preparing to become slaves.

SERIES IV.—CHURCH REFORM.

1. In times of religious declension, and especially of extensive corruption and apostacy, in the churches and ministry, it becomes the people of God to be humble, and prayerful, looking simply for divine guidance, and relying solely on the divine aid.

2. There is no power short of the Omnipotent energies of the Holy Spirit, that can ever create a divine life, either in the individual or in the community where it is extinct.—And for the exertion of this divine energy, men are dependant wholly on the free mercy and unmerited favor of God. This inestimable blessing should be sought—not in idleness, inactivity, or despondency—but in the confiding use of appointed means, and in the loving and resolute discharge of self-denying duty.

3. Although the discovery and adoption of a scriptural church polity cannot, of itself, create or restore a divine life, yet as a means and instrument, an effect or a condition of that life, it is to be diligently inquired after, earnestly prized, and faithfully restored.

4. The history of Papacy, of Prelacy, and other forms of unscriptural church polity, is the history of the decline of vital godliness—and the history of the revival of a purer reli-

gion is identified with the history of *Protestantism, dissent, and reform.*

5. As pure religion cannot flourish under the influence and in the bosom of an impure and corrupt church—as a church cannot be otherwise than corrupt while it knowingly retains corrupt members—as such corrupt members will abound in, and control, and characterize the churches that do not maintain a wholesome and strict discipline—and as no such gospel discipline can be maintained in the presence of an unscriptural church polity, it follows that a correct system of church polity is essential to the existence and growth of a pure religion in the earth.

6. The days of primitive godliness were the days of primitive church order—the days of anti-Christian apostacy were the days of ecclesiastical usurpation—the days of comparative refreshment and revival of true religion have ever been the days of comparative enlargement from ecclesiastical usurpation and restored Christian freedom—and the full return and universal reign of gospel holiness will never be reached or realized without the complete overthrow of spiritual usurpation, and consequent triumph of primitive order and freedom.

7. To expect, then, the restoration of a pure religion—of a church and ministry opposed to profitable and popular sins—without the restoration of New Testament church order, along with the Christian liberty and wholesome discipline, wrapped up in them—is to cherish the delusive and visionary hope of attaining the end without the means—of possessing the whole, in the gross, without possessing, or caring for, the parts of which, in detail, it is composed.

8. In all suitable and adequate measures of church reform, in the presence of abounding corruption—great care should be taken not to reject or discard the right and the true, along with the wrong and the false; yet equal care should be taken to lay the axe at the root of prevailing evils, and not rest content with the mere pruning of the tree, by lopping off the unsightly branches.

9. In attempting such a reform, the question should not be—how much it is convenient or apparently practicable, with existing implements and materials, to perform or effect—but how much does God, and truth, and Scripture, and reason, and conscience require to be done. Instead of asking what is expedient, we should inquire only what is right.

10. Instead of looking around us or behind us, to see how much of existing usages, or of time honored habits we can retain, for the gratification of others, or for the sake of conformity to our fathers, without an absolute violation of God's written word; we should

rather turn away our eyes from the present and the preceding ages, passing over the whole track of our contemporaries and predecessors, till our eyes light on the apostolic period, the New Testament Record, the divine precept, the authoritative prohibition, the essential doctrine, the obvious end, the living spirit of the Christian revelation, and solicitously mould our church institutions on the model there given. To attempt anything less would be to aim at imperfection—to court defeat.

11. The true conservatism and the true radicalism will be found to unite in the policy of proving all things—holding fast that which is good, and rejecting that which is evil.

12. It is a known and commonly admitted fact, with those who do not incline to Romanism and Papacy, that the Protestant Reformation, defective and partial at the time, was but a half reformation that needed to be completed; and having been since corrupted rather than improved, needs, doubly, to be itself reformed.

13. The only rule and measure of an adequate and safe reformation is the original model of church order contained in the New Testament.

14. That model is to be understood only in the light of the great Christian doctrines, the spirit of the Christian religion, and the objects for which Christian institutions were given.

15. As the church was designed to be a reformatory association, its membership is to be guarded by a strict discipline that shall render it an association or assembly of faithful men.

16. As the church was designed to teach and impress the doctrine of individual responsibility, its polity must be such as to give full and free scope to the exercise of all man's natural and inherent rights, and take none of them from him.

17. As the church was designed to teach, to impress, and to exemplify the "holy equality of souls before God"—so its "order" is essentially violated by the erection of any caste, or the establishment of any exclusive monopoly, whereby the essential equality of a common brotherhood is violated or infringed.

18. As the church was designed to teach the essential and radical distinction between the righteous and the wicked, and to exhibit the contrast between them, by associating the righteous together, by themselves, it follows that none but those who exhibit scriptural evidence of Christian character should be admitted or retained in the churches—while none should be excluded by whom such evidence is given.

19. As the significance and utility of church organizations depend, vitally, in their including all those *and those only* who give evidence of being the children of God, by regeneration,

it follows that no churches can claim the character and name of Christian churches that are not gathered and governed on this model.

20. No churches or bodies of men can have any right to require of Christians, in becoming or remaining members of a Christian church to submit to any authorities not established by Jesus Christ.

21. The local church, (consisting of Christians who voluntarily associate for the worship of God in one place) being the only ecclesiastical organization warranted in the New Testament, is the only one that can be established without usurpation, among men.

22. The officers of a local church, such as Pastors (sometimes called Presbyters, Bishops, or Elders)—with the Deacons, are chosen, appointed or ordained, by the vote of the equal brotherhood, from among their own number, as the officers of other voluntary associations are chosen—and nothing further is requisite, either for their induction into office, or to the validity of their official acts.

23. Whenever by the graces of his Spirit, and the other qualifications which he bestows upon man, God prepares, inclines, and thus commissions any Christian man to enter upon the duties of a preacher of the gospel, he has a right, because it becomes his duty, to preach the Gospel and no man or body of men has a right to forbid him.

24. But no man has a right to be a pastor or officer of a church until chosen or appointed by the brotherhood of that church.

25. In apostolic times, there was no monopoly either of preaching or of baptizing.—The disciples "went every where preaching the word." And preaching and baptizing were common to Christians in general until sometime in the second century, when, for the first time (by an unauthorized innovation) they began to be restricted to those whom the Pastor (or Bishop) might appoint.

26. There is no warrant or example in the New Testament for the assumption, by ministers, or pastors, of the right to appoint or ordain their successors in the ministry—and there is no evidence that any such wage existed in the apostolic age.

27. There is no evidence that the ceremony of laying on hands, either by ministers or others, was ever used, in the times of the apostles, as connected either with the induction of men into the ministry, or into the pastoral office.

28. The apostolic age knew nothing of any "associations of ministers" or of Pastors, apart from the brotherhood (or laity) and granting licences to preach.

29. It is the testimony, both of Episcopal and Congregational writers, that the rise of spiritual despotism was in the "conclaves of clergy, apart from the laity" and that this was before diocesan Episcopacy had its rise.

30. The preceding propositions concerning ordination, concerning preaching and baptizing by laymen, and concerning the laying on of hands, have been abundantly affirmed by

learned Presbyterian ministers, in their controversies with Episcopalianism, within a short time—and the proofs are accumulating that a return, in these particulars to the usages of New Testament times, will be found necessary, in order to interpose any effectual barrier against the inroads of prelacy and Romanism.

31. Any person capable of reading the common English version of the New Testament is capable of understanding the institutions of the Christian church and ministry, as Christ and his apostles left them.

32. The extreme simplicity of these institutions is the chief obstacle to their being understood and restored by those who have been accustomed to artificial arrangements of human device. When the whole of the New Testament model of church order is exhibited, most men are still looking after something further, and inquiring "What is your plan?" Taking it for granted that some formulary of human invention must be added to Christ's simple rules.

33. A Christian church or assembly, on the New Testament model is a simple voluntary association of equals, composed of those only who give evidence of being Christians, and governing themselves by Christ's laws.—It is the most simple and perfect democracy the world ever saw, or which was ever conceived. To restore Christian churches, men must learn the democracy of Christianity, and the Christianity of democracy.

SERIES V.—WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE?—HOW CAN IT BE ACCOMPLISHED?—WHAT IS GOD DOING?

1. That which *ought* to be done for the reformation of the church, can be done—*must* be done—and under the controlling Providence of God, will be done.

2. The great fundamental truths of Christianity, as exemplified and taught in New Testament church institutions and church order, were *revealed* to Christians that they might be *honored* and *obeyed*. "If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them."

3. The living spirit of the Christian institutions—the spirit of equal brotherhood—the spirit of holy separation from ungodliness—the spirit of benevolent and reformatory enterprise, and self-denial—must animate the *hearts* and mould the activities of Christians; or the institutions of Christianity can neither be restored nor maintained.

4. And when this spirit of Christianity is restored, it will not fail to *embody* itself in the institutions which are its proper expression, its legitimate fruit, its available instruments of accomplishment.

5. The question of sufficient strength, ability, and influence, (either in the country at large, or in any particular location) to restore the simple but majestic and powerful institution of Christ, is a question *not* of numbers, nor of names—but of holy allegiance and unflinching fidelity to Jesus Christ. "Where two or three" (however despised and feeble) are organized "together in his name, there is He," with his infinite fulness, Supreme authority, and almighty power, "in the midst of them."

6. It is not an essential condition of a Christian church (however desirable it may be)

that there should be sufficient numbers and wealth to erect a meeting house, or sustain a pastor to devote his entire time to ministerial labor. The first Christians, for more than one hundred years after the day of Pentecost, are recorded to have been without advantages of this sort. The same has been true of some of the purer portions of the Christian world, in later times.

7. Professors of religion who are waiting for more favorable outward circumstances, for more wealth or more numbers, before they can return to the order of Christ's spiritual house, contenting themselves, in the mean time, under the yoke of spiritual bondage, and in close fraternity with the workers of iniquity, may be assured that they do not yet possess the spirit that would enable them to profit by the purest Christian institutions, if circumstances should throw them into their bosom.

8. There is absurdity and latent skepticism wrapped up in the plea that we must needs worship in an anti-Christian church rather than worship, publicly, no where—that we must educate our rising families under a spiritual despotism, in the bosom of spiritual corruption, and in fraternity with spiritual wickedness in high places, rather than give them no religious education at all! Rather than do *thus*, a Christian should worship on the Sabbath at home, or under a shady tree, inviting his neighbors to worship with him, and gathering a church (as did some of the early Christians) in his own house.

9. To wait as many do, for some *showy movement*, or for some powerful leaders, in the enterprise of church reform—is to lean upon man rather than upon God. It is more over to mistake the character of the particular reformation now needed.

10. The churches have been given over to barrenness and spiritual death, because they have trusted in leaders—because they have been deluded by showy pageants—because they have swam on the tide of successive popular movements. In order to be truly reformed, the churches (or the Christians that should compose them) must abjure leaders, pageants, and popular direction—returning, in simplicity to Christ, as their Great Head.

11. The partial reformations from Romanism that have been made by our fathers, have been partial and defective because they have been moulded by a few powerful leaders, by the clergy, and their titled and wealthy patrons, and not by the Christian brotherhood at large. The aristocratic principle—the germ of spiritual pride—has therefore been retained in the churches, and moulded the usages that have come down to us.

12. What the cause of Christ now needs, is a reformation coming from the *mass* of the Christian brotherhood themselves—a phenomenon the world is waiting to see before it can be reclaimed—before the equality of the Christian brotherhood, or the human race, can be fully understood.

13. The needed reformation, then, can be moulded by no popular leader, no one human mind should be trusted to guide it. It must come up, in freedom, simultaneously, from tens of thousands of Christian hearts—the voice of each must be heard and pondered by

—from a thousand vallies and hill-tops, where secluded Christians are walking with God—from men and women who have Bibles, and read them for themselves—who act because God speaks—who go forward because Christ's leads—who build because the Holy Spirit guides and impels them—who stand firm because Omnipotence, and not human authorities, sustain them—from these, and in this manner, must the reformation of the church come.

14. Every Christian, therefore, has his part of the work to perform; and no one can perform it for him. There is a place and a work for every man, and that place and work, Divine Providence has marked out for him.—Each one is to "build the part of the wall over against his own house."

15. The Providences of God indicate, that the work of a thorough reformation in the church is not only determined upon, and approaching, but already commenced, and in progress.

16. The first thing needed, was the exposure of existing abominations in the high places of the church and ministry. This exposure, by varied instrumentalities, God commenced, a number of years ago, and the work is still going forward, by one astounding development after another, as rapidly as the community can be made to understand them. By the disgrace, and downfall of the false, God is preparing the way for the true.

17. The confidence of a people, and especially of a religious community, in their false teachers who mislead them, is the greatest obstacle in the way of a reformation of religion. That confidence is rapidly giving way, at the present time. Thus was the Protestant Reformation announced before hand—and heralded in. Who, so deaf, as not to hear the same trumpet now?

18. Another preliminary step needed, was the study and discovery of the fundamental elements of a false and despotic religion, on the one hand and of free and pure Christian institutions, on the other. That study and that discovery God has lately been forcing upon the people of this country against their wills. And leading ecclesiastics in the Presbyterian and Episcopal sects, (in their polemic contentions) have been made the unwitting instruments of these discoveries. All the truths needed by Christian Reformers, in rebuilding the true temple, are thus hewn out for them, gratuitously, to their hands.

19. It remains that those who see and mourn the desolations of Zion, should "arise and build." And already that work has commenced. Their enemies may sneeringly inquire—"What do these feeble Jews?" But all they have to do is to go forward in the strength of the Lord. The work is His and it will finally prosper.

20. There is no occasion, then, to despond, or to feel that little or nothing is done. Great changes of sentiment have already been effected, and are still in rapid progress.

21. "The harvest is great, but the laborers are few." While praying the Lord of the harvest, to send forth more laborers into it, Christians should stand ready to enter the field themselves, and to sustain those that labor.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, FEBRUARY, 1847.

GERRIT SMITH'S LETTER TO THE CONVENTION.—Our excellent brother Smith, with his accustomed magnanimity, has afforded us another practical commentary on the safety and the wisdom of an Editor's acting the part of an independant man, and not suffering his desire of support, or the fear of losing it, to deter him from pointing out and opposing what he thinks to be wrong, in the writings of his most munificent patrons, and esteemed friends.

Thus admonished and strengthened, we should be doubly faithless if we should suffer brother Smith's Letter to pass, without such remarks as we think it demands.

The figure brother Smith has employed, though well adapted to convey the truths it was intended, in the New Testament, to illustrate, is ill-adapted, we think, to illustrate the subject to which bro. Smith has applied it. The cases are not parallel. And no marvel; for "parables, and figures of speech, do not run on all fours." They cannot resemble the things shadowed forth by them, at all points.

We admit that it would be a very ridiculous thing for the parents and brothers and sisters of a child, born into this world, to "vote whether the child shall be regarded as a member of the family." And for this simple reason. The fact of its bona fide birth into the family is not a question that needs inquiry or decision! From the birth of the first son of Adam to the present hour, it was never known that any person ever professed to have been born into the world, who had not actually been thus born! The profession of the birth is demonstrative EVIDENCE of its verity; and it would be ridiculous to call in question the profession! Whenever this can be said truly, of the spiritual birth, and of persons professing to have been spiritually born, then, and not until then, will we admit the fitness of the illustration employed by bro. Smith.

Let the parable be stated so as to make the cases parallel, and then see how it would apply.

Suppose it were an indisputable fact that three fourths of all the infants ever introduced into human families, and bearing the outward appearance of children, were "bastards and not sons"—were the progeny of foul fiends, introduced by them for the most malignant purposes, and armed with the most deadly poisons and contagious plagues, for the destruction of the human race: Suppose whole nations to have been desolated by them, for sixty centuries—the human family at one time, reduced by them, to eight souls, saved by a flood, and suppose, afterwards, again, the darkness

of the middle ages to have been superinduced by them! Suppose the benevolent Father of all men to have warned families against the reception of such counterfeit children, giving them specific rules for the detection of the cheat, and saying, by these marks "shall ye know them"!

We desire to be told whether, in such a case, there would be any thing ludicrous, unnecessary, or improper for a family, (when a new infant presented itself) to examine it, by the divinely appointed standard, and decide whether it exhibited evidence of belonging to the family—to the race?

"Its birth" says brother Smith "is, of itself, sufficient reason why its parents, and its brothers, should recognize [its] membership" in the family.

Very true! But what if there be no proper evidence of its birth, into the human family—the Christian family? All the inquiry, the evidence, the decision, is upon that point. It is not to be assumed as intuitively known and self-evident.

Undoubtedly, as brother Smith says, every person "born again" in Peterboro' is entitled to membership in the Church of Peterboro.—"ENTITLED!" That statement is in accordance with the theory we maintain. And brother Smith has been a land-holder long enough to understand that titles are to be carefully examined by proper rules and appropriate evidence—and decided upon, before the claimant under the title, takes possession.

What God knows by intuition, man must ascertain by evidence; and is liable to mistake, after all. Hence that unavoidable distinction between the church visible and invisible, which bro. Smith sometimes seems to recognize, and sometimes seems to forget.

Our former discussions with bro. Smith have been criticised as too voluminous. We make amends now, by comprizing the whole matter in a nut-shell.

CLERICAL ORDINATION.

The following extracts from D'Aubigne's History of the Protestant Reformation, deserve to be studiously pondered, and the more so, since it has been discovered that the Committee of the American Tract Society have thought proper to suppress them!

In the account of John Le Clerc, a wool carder, who, without ordination, came to be regarded as minister of the church of Meaux D'Aubigne has the following passage.

"The idea of one universal priesthood, known in such living power to the first Christians had been revived by Luther, in the sixteenth century." But this idea seems then to have dwelt only in the Lutheran Church, and was really acted out only among the congregations of the Reformed Churches. The Lutheran congregations (agreeing, in this point with the Anglican Church), took, it seems, a middle course, between the Romish and the Reformed Churches. Among the Lutherans, every thing proceeded for the Pastor or Priest, and nothing was counted valid in the church, but what was regularly conveyed through its rulers. But the Reformed churches, while they maintained the divine appointment of the ministry—by some sects denied—approached nearer to the primitive condition of the apostolical communities."—[Philadelphia Edition page 324.

The above is wholly suppressed, in the edition of the American Tract Society! So is, likewise, the following, which occurs in D'Aubignes account of the eminent French Reformer, William Farel.

"It is in order to a valid ordination, Rome requires the imposition of the hands of a bishop deriving unintercepted succession and descent from the Apostles. She does so—because she sees the tradition of men above the authority of the word of God. Every church in which the supremacy of the Word is not acknowledged, must needs seek authority from some other source, and then, what more natural than to turn to the most revered servants of God, and ask of them, as we do not know that we have in God himself? If we do not speak in the name of Jesus Christ, is it not at least something gained to be able to speak in the name of St. John or of St. Paul? One who has with him the voice of antiquity is indeed more than a match for the rationalist, who speaks only his own thought. But Christ's minister has yet a higher authority. He preaches—not because he is the successor of St. Chrysostom or St. Paul—but because the word which he proclaims is from God. Successional authority—venerable as it may appear—is yet no more than a thing of man's invention, in place of God's appointment. In Farel's ordination, we see nothing of successional derived sanction. Nay more, we do not see in it that which becomes the congregation of the Lord—among whom everything should be done decently and in order," and whose God is "not the God of confusion." In his case there was no setting apart by the Church; but then extraordinary emergencies justify extraordinary measures. At this eventful period, God himself was intervening, and himself ordaining, by marvelous dispensations, those whom he called to bear a part in the regeneration of society; and that was an ordination that abundantly compensated for the absence of the Church's seal. In Farel's ordination we see the unchanging work of God, entrusted to a man of God, to bear it to the world; the calling of God, and of the people, and the consecration of the heart. And perhaps no minister of Rome or of Geneva was ever more lawfully ordained for that holy ministry."

A LESSON FOR ABOLITIONISTS.

The late news from Ireland, in the London Non-Conformist, conveys an instructive lesson to the friends of American freedom. Those who expect to regain or secure the blessings of civil and political liberty by the instrumentality of those who are subjected to a spiritual despotism, would do well to ponder this lesson. O'Connell has perseveringly labored for the restoration of his countrymen's plundered rights. The Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland are the oppressed. The professedly Protestant Government and Church of England are the oppressors! The Romish clergy of Ireland have favored the agitations of O'Connell, and he has relied much on their assistance, almost up to the present time. Instead of instructing the Irish peasantry in the doctrines of civil and religious freedom, holding the one as inseparable from the other, he has chosen the apparently easier course of combatting but one despotism at a time—of wielding the one as a weapon against the other. He has reverenced the arrogant claims of the priesthood, and availed himself of their almost unlimited power over the populace. To their spiritual despotism he has thus lent his sanction, and in return, has had their co-operation in his work of overturning political oppression! "A masterly stroke of policy"—our superficial politicians would say! Not a few who demand the political enfranchisement of the enslaved are, very prudently, acting upon the same maxim. "One thing at a time," say they—"Do not encumber our anti-Slavery enterprise with a crusade against clerical usurpations. Let us rather court the clergy, and, may-be, they will cease kicking us, by and bye, and help us as the Irish clergy are helping O'Connell, and the crushed Irish!" And what if they should? Would it be worth more to us than the knowledge and love

of civil and spiritual freedom, on the part of the people? Let the sequel of O'Connell's experiment testify!

A change has come over the face of Irish affairs. Affinities, political and moral, are finding their proper objects, and true level.—The Church of England, seeking affinity with the Romish, drags the Government of England along with it. Sir Robert Peel, the British Prime Minister proposes the equal support of the Romish church and the church of England in the Irish establishment. The Puseyite priesthood of England and the Romish priesthood of Ireland, (in loving fraternity, now) divide and monopolize court favor and governmental appointments. This process has been going on, for some time. Now, for another development of the plot. The court of St. James, it would seem, has been tampering with the court of Rome. Matters are adjusted at length. The papal throne, tottering, even in Italy, gladly stipulates for British support, and pays the requisite price. A papal bull, all at once, bursts over the head of O'Connell! The Irish priests are strictly forbidden, by his Holiness, to aid, in any way, the Repeal Agitations of the Irish! And the mandate is at once obeyed! Bishop after Bishop responds to the summons, and O'Connell and the Irish peasantry are deserted and stabbed to the heart in the hour of their utmost need!

What is to be done? With the first gush of indignant surprise, O'Connell protests loudly against the Bishops, and hints defiance at the Pope! Irish Repeal Meetings, too, bid His Holiness send them "as much theology as he pleases, but keep his politics at home." For the moment, one is almost led to hope that O'Connell and the Irish, finding their true position, are about to strike for spiritual and political freedom at the same breath.—But the very next mail dashes the hope.—How shall O'Connell, in his dotage, teach the Irish people the lesson of submission to spiritual despotism, that he has been teaching them, all his life long? It cannot be done. O'Connell tamely retreats, and covers his defeat with a projected embassy to Rome, to set the Pope right! He might as well appeal to Lambeth or St. James! The struggle for Irish liberty meets the fate of every similar struggle that does not go for the emancipation of the inner man.

Post Masters or Subscribers, returning papers for discontinuance, should always give the name of the Post Office, as well as of the person.

"Stop John Smith's paper." But where does John Smith live? Suppose we spend a day or two in looking over our direction books, to find out; and then find that we have seven John Smith's on our book—which of them shall we "stop"?

We have received an abusive note, on the margin of a return paper from one Post Master, because we have not complied with his directions to "stop" Mr. A. B.'s paper, and after all, we can neither tell where the Post Master nor "A. B." lives—as we find no less than three subscribers of the same name, on our books, after a long search. Three minutes' time would be sufficient, if we only knew the Post Office from which the paper is returned.

NOTICE!

CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION, AT HONEOYE.—A Convention (by adjournment from West Bloomfield) will be held at Honeoye, Ontario county, on Wednesday and Thursday, March 19th and 20th, to discuss the great question of Church Reform. The discussions are expected to embrace an examination of the existing religious parties or sects, their relation to Slavery, and also the bearing of their organic structure and ecclesiastical usages, upon the propagation of a pure religion, and the preservation of civil and religious freedom. An inquiry into New Testament church order will, of necessity, be involved. The friends of Christian progress are invited to attend.

A CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION will be held at South Butler, Wayne county, N. Y. on Wednesday and Thursday, April 16th or 17th, for the discussion of the subjects usually discussed at such Conventions. A general attendance is requested.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to February, 1845.

J. Plumb, Paris,	\$ 50	A. Wells, Colosse,	
E. Hitchcock, do.	50	L. B. Babbitt, Syracuse,	
B. Allen, Whitesboro',	1.00	W. H. Scratt,	
J. Smith, W. Groton,	50	W. Clark, Lenox,	
B. Brown, E. Lansing,	50	W. Twichell, Syracuse,	
N. Robinson, Moravia,	50	H. Rice, do.	
J. Snyell, do.	50	G. Smith, Peterboro',	
O. W. Pitts, Honeoye,	3.25	S. Lightbody, Utica,	
G. Dunkle, Larned's Crs.	50	Mrs. Nye, do.	
L. Tisdale, Canandaigua,	50	G. W. Durant, Renss.	
C. A. Wheaton, Syracuse,	13.00	Warville,	
C. H. Metcalf, Fly Creek,	1.00	W. Goodell, Abington,	
A. H. Hunt, Utica,	2.00	Connecticut,	
J. A. Northrup,	50	G. Lard,	
A. Root, Jordan,	50	E. Sharp, do.	
O. Teal, Syracuse,	50	A. Norton, Paris,	
P. Hawley, Cazenovia,	50	W. L. Twitchell, Rushville,	
E. Allen, do.	50	J. S. McKenzia, Vienna,	
Y. Lewis, Lenox,	50	J. H. Dawsons, Lakeville,	
E. Cowles, Otisco Center,	50	H. Quimby, Honeoye Falls,	
J. J. Johnson, Preble, for		J. Sperry, Henrietta,	
self, M. Trowbridge, and		E. D. Porter, Rochester,	
M. Worcester, Tully Crs.	2.00	S. W. Frisbie, Phelps,	
J. Myers, Salina,	1.00	W. H. Olin, W. Bloomfield,	
B. Lewis, Granby,	50	J. Barnett, Peterboro',	
W. H. Childs, King, F.	1.00	Mary Ann Ingles, Mid-	
J. Green, Watertown,	50	dlefield Center,	
E. Lewis, Sullivan,	50	N. Smith, Nelson,	
H. Lewis, Lenox,	50	E. Graves, do.	
M. P. Worden, Fayetteville,	50	Miss E. Verplank,	
H. Woodford, Pompey,	50	Randout,	
G. S. Loomis, De Witt,	2.00	P. Field, Charlemont,	
E. Bannister, Syracuse,	50	Massachusetts,	
J. O. Bennett, do.	1.00	O. Lovejoy, Princeton, Ill.	
A. Raymond, Plains Kill,	1.00	S. M. Booth, Meriden,	
J. Stanton, Cassville,	3.00	Connecticut,	
E. Mandeville, Orid,	50	J. Richmond, L'vonia,	
L. Gurnee, do.	50	Mrs. Hale, Sparta,	
H. Burton, do.	50	G. Henderson, Volcott,	
A. Stafford, Syracuse,	50	H. Gilbert, Allen's Hill,	
W. K. Sackett, do.	50	do. for O. G. Can-	
Dr. L. Clary, do.	50	ter, Phelps,	
S. P. Hinman, Oswego,	50	A. D. Miner, Litch,	
H. A. Putnam, Cornish,		Mrs. A. Paul, Northamp-	
New Hampshire,	1.00	ton, Mass.	
L. Kingsbury, Syracuse,	50	Mrs. H. Galpin, Exeter,	
D. Thurston, Winthrop,		A. Wasson, Cuylerville,	
Maine,	1.00	H. Truesdell, do.	
W. C. Gildersleeve, Wilke-			
barre (Penn.)	5.00	Amount,	100
G. F. Horton, Terrytown,		Deduct Commissions,	
Pennsylvania,	1.00		
J. Jackson, Watervale,	25		\$101

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale at Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1, Iniquity and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred. No. 2 & 3—Are you a Christian, and the Christian High Calling, (both on one sheet) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred. No. 4—Arise and Build, 4 pages, \$0.25 per hundred. No. 5—Fellowship with Unrighteousness, 8 pages, per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher, HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office; Perry, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series. Vol. III—No. 3.
Whole Number, 35.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MARCH, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
copies, shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

per dozen,	\$0 50	Sixty papers,	\$2 00
per eight papers for	1 00	One hundred papers,	3 00

For Masters, if requested, will frank letters en-
closed for papers.

SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE.

This is the grand central truth of the gos-
pel, around which every other truth clusters.
It is the basis of the Christian's hope—the
foundation of the Christian church—the test
by which every doctrine, and every pretension,
every religion, and every individual, and
every religious community must be tried. So
said Peter:

"This is the stone which was set at naught of your
rulers, which is become the head of the corner. Neither
is there salvation in any other; for there is none other
name under heaven, given among men, whereby we
must be saved."—Acts iv, 11, 12.

The soul of man needs to be saved. This
is saying, in other words, that it is lost. The
man came to seek and to save that which
was lost. Whom else could he have occasion to
save? The soul of man is lost to all good—
lost to all virtue—lost to all holiness—lost to
divine favor—lost to all hopes of restora-
tion, amendment, forgiveness, or redemption,
without the aid of Almighty power. That
power is in Jesus Christ. He alone is the Sa-
vior of lost men. His nature, his character,
his offices, his work, unitedly prove that salva-
tion is in him, and that there can be salvation
in no other. The nature and character and
work of man, prove that none other than
Christ can possibly save him.

The soul of man is immortal. Its creation
was the work of Almighty power. "Nothing
can be created but by power, most assuredly, can re-
newal—can regenerate, can sanctify, can re-
deem." "Salvation belongeth unto God."—
Psalm cxviii, 1. Salvation is in Jesus Christ, the Son of God—
manifest in the flesh—the brightness of
the Father's glory—the express image of his
person—the mighty God—the everlasting
Father—he who, in the beginning was with

God, and was God—who was made flesh and
dwelt among us. He was wounded for our
transgressions, the chastisement of our peace
was upon him, and with his stripes we are
healed. All we, like sheep had gone astray,
we had turned every one to his own way, and
the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us
all. He was set forth to be a propitiation for
our sins. He died for our sins, and rose
again for our justification.

Do we need an atoning sacrifice? He,
himself, was that sacrifice. Do we need an
atoning High Priest? He, himself, is the
High Priest of the New Covenant, in whom
the typical Priesthood of the former dispensa-
tion found its anti-type, and in whom it was
terminated and abolished. Do we need a
power from above to change our vile affections
—to incline us to accept the salvation he has
provided? Christ himself is exalted to give
repentance, as well as remission of sins. Do
we need the quickening breath of the Holy
Spirit, to create in us clean hearts? The
gift of that Spirit is his gift. Do we need a
mediator between God and man? That me-
diator is the man Christ Jesus. We have in
him a High Priest that can be touched with
the feeling of our infirmities, who was in all
points tempted as we are, yet without sin.—
He knows how to succor them that are tempt-
ed. He is every where and at all times pres-
ent, with each one of his people, to the end of
the world; yet forever seated at the right
hand of his Father on high. Do we need the
Spirit of life, dwelling within us? He dwells
in the hearts of his people. Do we need dura-
ble riches and righteousness? Do our immor-
tal spirits pant after a portion that can be
found only in God? Riches of infinite grace,
and righteousness dwell in Christ Jesus. He
is the portion and the rest of his people. Do
we sigh for the vision of the ineffable and in-
visible One? Are we fainting for the pres-
ence of the Majesty whom no eye can see?—
Do we say, with one of the ancient saints—
"Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us"?—
Behold him in the person of Emmanuel.—
Mark! Christ! He is speaking to thee!—
"Have I been so long a time with thee, and
yet hast thou not known me? He that hath
seen me, hath seen the Father, and hath say-
ed thou then, show us the Father? Believest
thou not that I am in the Father, and the
Father in me?"—"I and my Father are one."
Do we need an unerring example. Behold

him in the man of Nazareth. Do we need
an infallible prophet and teacher? Never
man spake like this man. Do we need a
King to rule in and over us? He is King on
the holy hill of Zion—head over all things to
the church—the fullness of Him that filleth
all in all. Do we need a Deliverer—a Cap-
tain—a Guide—a Conqueror—to subdue the
enemies within and around us—to lead us to
sure conquest—to vanquish Death, Hell, and
the Grave? He is the Resurrection and the
Life! He has trod the wine press alone,
when, of the people there was none with him.
He has led captivity captive, and entered be-
fore us into the rest he has provided for us.—
He is the vine and his disciples are the branch-
es. In him alone can they bear fruit. He
is the Way, the Truth and the life and none
come to the Father but by him. He is the
Light of the world and the Life of men.—
"This the true God, and Eternal Life!"—
"And this is life eternal, that we believe on
him."—SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE!

REFLECTIONS ON THIS FUNDAMEN- TAL TRUTH.

THE RATIONAL RELIGION.

1. Christianity, which reveals salvation by
Christ, is the only rational system of religio-
n, because it is the only system that unfolds any
thing like an appropriate and adequate pro-
vision for the spiritual necessities of which
every earnest and awakened human spirit must
be conscious. Whoever looks into himself,
and knows himself, knows himself to be lost,
and in need of just such a Savior as Jesus
Christ. Every other scheme of salvation falls
infinitely short of the exigencies of his case.
Men have labored to build up a "rational reli-
gion" without recourse to the gospel. And
they have labored to dress up a "rational
Christianity" (falsely so called) from which
might be excluded the doctrine of justification
by faith in the atonement of Christ. But all
such attempts have signally failed. They
have been broken cisterns, holding no water.
Whenever the soul of man becomes athirst for
salvation, it finds them of no value. Thou-
sands and tens of thousands have made the ex-
periment with the same result. Whole com-
munities of religionists have made the experi-
ment, and the piercing cry of distress comes
up from them, that the waters of salvation are
wanting, and their tongue faileth for thirst.

THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

2. Christianity is destined to become a world religion. It is adapted to the wants of universal humanity, and no other religion can ultimately stand in its presence.

A religion of some sort, men must and will have; because man is constitutionally a religious being; that is, he is made to find his happiness in something out of, and above himself; and that happiness, however blindly, he must and will seek. If he loses the idea of the "true God and eternal life," some false notion will usurp its place, and stand in its stead.

And not only will men have a religion of some sort, as being constitutionally under a necessity of having one, but being selfish and sinful, and of course guilty and wretched, they are impelled to seek a religion which will offer them forgiveness of sin, and reconciliation with their justly offended Maker and Judge. All the sacrifices and ceremonies of the various pagan religions have their origin in this fact. And no refinement of manners or light of philosophy can save men from these superstitions. *Salvation by Christ*, and nothing else can deliver mankind from the tyranny of false religions.

SPIRITUAL WORSHIP.

3. If a just and scriptural description has been given of the process of salvation by Christ, it is manifest that a saving faith in Christ cannot be separated from the supreme worship of Jesus Christ, as truly and properly God.

This statement is only the statement of an existing and self-evident fact. The statement is not (what some have conceived it to be,) the mere theological proposition that God will consent to save none but those who worship Christ as "the true God." However true such a proposition might be, it is not the statement now made.

We are speaking now, of no authoritative arrangement, arbitrary, or otherwise, by which a future and eternal salvation is suspended upon the condition of a present worship of Christ, as the supreme God. We only remark the obvious and outstanding fact, visible enough to all who take the trouble to look at it, that all persons who understandingly and cordially confide in Christ for salvation, do, by that very act, and as a matter of necessity, worship Christ as the Supreme God.

For what is this work of human salvation? What does every redeemed and regenerated soul, understand and feel it to be? Whoever is saved, understands, in some measure, what he is saved from. He knows something of the obstacles in the way of that salvation. He knows what it is to fight and contend with his spiritual enemies. He knows, at least, some-

thing of the nature of spiritual necessities.—He knows he must look to a power out of himself. And the very supposition in the case is, that he looks to the power of Jesus Christ.—And what is it that he asks and expects Jesus Christ to do for him? Can he pray to Christ for salvation, unless he believes that Christ hears him? Hence the very desires of his heart? And knows all his spiritual wants? Omnipresence and Omniscience, Incommunicable attributes of the Deity are plainly ascribed to Christ, in the outset. Whoever comes to Him, must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him. What is it to be saved? What is that is asked at Christ's hand? For what does the soul rely on Christ? For the breath of a new heavenly life? For the regeneration of the soul? For the gift of repentance? For the forgiveness of sins? For reconciliation with God? For justification?—adoption? sanctification? For the renewing and indwelling influences of the Holy Spirit? For love? joy? peace? For wisdom? righteousness? complete redemption? For strength in the day of temptation? For final conquest over sin, and admission into heaven?

All these enter into the very idea—the definition of salvation;—do they not? "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." But who can do all this but God?

No greater absurdity or self-contradiction can be uttered, than to talk of relying on Christ for salvation, and yet refusing to worship him as the Supreme God. For the salvation of the human soul—a soul defiled and enslaved by sin, is incontestibly the most magnificent and wonderful achievement of Almighty power, wisdom and grace. As such it is celebrated in the scriptures. As such it is gratefully acknowledged by all redeemed sinners on earth and in heaven. The highest and sublimest strains of worship, ever recorded or conceived, are those that ascribe the salvation of redeemed souls to God and to the Lamb. This highest of all possible or conceivable worship, every human soul that relies on Christ for salvation, renders to Christ, of necessity, and as a matter of fact, in the very act of confiding in him for salvation.—Such a confidence is, of itself, the ascription to Jesus Christ, of all the infinite powers and perfections of the only living and true God. It is looking to him for the greatest and highest benefits ever conferred by Jehovah himself upon any beings in the universe. To worship Christ as the supreme God; and to trust in him for salvation are only two different expressions, to describe one and the same thing. Take away the one, and the other disappears also.

To say that Christianity is the appropriate name of true religion—that the people of God are properly called Christians—that the church of God is the same thing as the Christian—is to exalt Christ to an equal honor with the Father—the same honor that Christ himself claims.—[John v. 23.] The work of redemption and salvation is evidently the greatest of God's works, is emphatically the work to which all his other works are preparatory and subservient—to the intent that now our principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church, the manifold wisdom of God, according to his eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus Lord." To talk of trusting in Christ for this, and at the same time of not worshipping him as the Supreme God, is to utter gross absurdity, self contradiction and nonsense.

THE BASIS OF THE CHURCH.

4. If the doctrine of salvation by Christ is the foundation doctrine of the gospel, then is the foundation of the Christian church. And other foundation can no man lay than this. All edifices built on other foundations are not founded on Christ—are not founded on Truth. Whatever showy appearances they may bear, they are built upon the sand. The chief corner stone is rejected by the builders whose building is too narrow to accommodate all the living stones in the spiritual temple of Christ. It is rejected likewise by the builders whose boasted liberality constrains their edifice so broad as to include the hay, and stubble of this world, that are not laid upon Jesus Christ!

SECTARIANISM—ITS ESSENCE AND CHARACTER.

5. A consideration of this subject may reveal to us the impiety and wickedness of sectarianism in the church, and (what is of equal importance, at the present time) reveal to us, likewise, wherein the nature of the sin of sectarianism essentially consists.

If salvation in Christ—salvation by Christ be the essence of Christianity itself, the foundation of the Christian church—then there is no sectarianism (as some strangely seem to suppose) in holding steadfastly to that truth, insisting that church membership and Christian fellowship be restricted to those who fully receive and appropriate the benefits of SALVATION BY CHRIST. Other foundations can no man lay than this. All who build on that foundation most assuredly belong to the church universal, and by exhibiting credible evidence of that fact, in their belief, confession, and practice of the truth, have a right to be recognized and received as members either of the local, organized churches, or the Providence of God and their fitness, may enable and incline them to

And the same rule under which they rightfully claim admission, becomes, of course, the rule of precluding from such local church membership and Christian fellowship, who do not build on the one only foundation of human salvation—Jesus Christ.

The wickedness and impiety of sectarianism—the essence and nature of sectarianism—consists in its refusing local church membership and general Christian fellowship to all in any who give rational and scriptural evidence of being on the corner stone of human salvation, Jesus Christ—in requiring any thing else except such evidence, as a test or condition of such church membership—or in establishing in or over the churches and their members, ecclesiastical arrangements and authorities not established by the Lord Jesus Christ, who is Head over all things in the church.

The foundation doctrine of SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE is virtually and practically set aside, in the church, when any thing other, except scriptural evidence of actual salvation by Christ, alone, is required as a test or condition of church membership. To ex-observance of any of the outward ordinances or rituals of the New Testament itself, in their utmost simplicity and purity, into a superior condition of Christian fellowship or church membership, (in the cases where the men of evidently pious and regenerated Christians, concerning such rituals differ from each other) is manifestly to exalt those rituals at the expense of JESUS CHRIST, the only Savior of lost men. It is to teach that those rituals instead of Jesus Christ and his atonement, or along with them, (to supply its deficiency) is essential to the salvation of the soul. It is to symbolize with the Romish church, in her manifold institutions of outward ceremonies in the place of salvation by Christ alone.

The crying sin of SECTARIANISM is its driving into the back ground, the fundamental doctrine of SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE. Without a direct and open denial of that doctrine (which the Romish Doctors themselves seldom ventured) it insidiously and stealthily substitutes other things (as do the Romish priests) in the place of it!

If salvation is by Christ alone, then it is by infant or adult baptism—by sprinkling or immersion—by this formulary or that—by the Shibboleth or the other—by this speculation or the other, on points which do not involve the denial or the reception of SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE. And the church and her officers and ministry have no right by enforcing uniformity in these matters, to set out a practical lie—to deny, in actions more forcible than words, the grand founda-

tion truth of the gospel—salvation by Christ alone.

When sectarianism separates, or seeks to separate from each other, the members of Christ's mystical body, united as they are and should be, in truth, united on the sole basis of their common salvation by Him, the essence and the malignity of the impiety rests ultimately and chiefly in this, that it strikes a deep and deadly blow, against the fundamental truth of salvation by Christ alone.*

If salvation be not solely and wholly by Jesus Christ and his atonement, then the disorganizations and schisms of sectarianism dwindle into comparative insignificance—they become mere venal indiscretions—inexpedient and inconvenient arrangements—as they are commonly admitted to be—but not chargeable with the deep guilt of maiming the body of Christ, and tearing asunder the ligaments which bind together the members of that body, divinely cemented together in the bonds of a common salvation by Him. Blot out or conceal the doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, and you destroy the only bond of that union, the only foundation of any "Christian union" at all—the only foundation of the Christian church itself. Blot out or conceal that doctrine, and you leave the multitudes of religionists, every where, with as many conflicting schemes and expedients for salvation as the human imagination can suggest or devise.—What vital union can there be among such?—And what is broken when they are split into sects? Nothing!

And as the guilt of SECTARIANISM chiefly and primarily consists in its practical denial of salvation by Jesus Christ alone, (a denial evidently involved in its rejection of those whom Jesus Christ saves,) so it is found to be of the same nature and tendency with that mis-called LIBERALITY that receives and embraces as Christians, those who more openly and directly discard the same sure foundation stone—salvation by Jesus Christ. Thus the Sectarian on the one hand, and the Unitarian on the other, arrived by a different process to one and the same practical result. And that result is the substitution of something else, in the place of salvation by Christ alone.

It avails nothing in behalf of the existing sects to plead in their defence, that they teach verbally and creed-wise, the doctrine of sal-

*Nothing can be more fallacious or self-condemnatory than the defense set up by some, that because all true Christians are, in fact, united in a spiritual brotherhood, therefore, sectarian barriers set up between them cannot and do not divide them, and hence no guilt can attach in the erection of such barriers! It might as well be urged that because Christians cannot be, and are not separated from Christ there can be no harm in treating them as though they were not Christ's! When acknowledged Christians are shut out of the church, Christ's brethren are shut out, and the treatment of the least of these he regards as the treatment of himself.

vation by Christ alone. This, at some periods, and to a great extent, was done by the Romish church itself. Neither Staupitz, nor Luther, nor Lefevre, nor Briçonnet, nor Farel appear to have disturbed the Romish hierarchy very much, by preaching, in a didactic or declamatory way, the doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, until, by their direct applications of that doctrine, they exposed the impiety, absurdity and blasphemy, of those other rival Saviors that superstition and imposture had unitedly set up in the church.—Just so, in our own day. The doctrine of salvation by Christ alone, makes a very beautiful show on paper, in our sectarian church creeds, and does much to keep them in credit, with true Christians. The doctrine may be preached, in the abstract, in most pulpits, not only without offence, but with applause. But let that same doctrine be brought to bear, as it should do, against the sectarian idols, the superstitions and usurpations now reigning in the churches, and what would become of the popularity of the doctrine, then? In the sequel, we shall see! The experiment is yet future, but it will come!

SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE, THE GRAND PRINCIPLE OF CHURCH REFORM.

5. The way is now fairly opened for affirming that the doctrine of SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE, is yet destined to become the grand instrument of that second Protestant Reformation, now so much needed in the church, and the first glimmerings of which, begin to appear.

This must be true, if, as has been attempted to be shown, that doctrine is the grand central truth of the gospel. A decline and corruption of religion in the church, such as we now witness, must, of necessity involve, and imply a departure from the fundamental principles of the gospel itself. And there can be no solid reformation, until the living energies of that vital principle be restored.

THE POWER OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMERS.

So far as any real reformation was effected, at all, in the time of Luther and the Protestant Reformers, SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE, was the vital principle, the invincible and all conquering instrument of that reform. And just at the points where the reformation was left incomplete, where remaining superstitions and abuses were retained, (as the Hebrew warrior spared the Canaanites, and left them to be scourges to the false prudences and lenity that had failed to extirpate them,) in each instance of this kind, it is easy to see, the error lay in failing to touch the soul demon with that spear of Ithuriel—SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE."

Mark, here, a few specimens of the power with which this weapon was wielded by the sixteenth century Reformers.

Salvation by Christ alone was the one grand discovery of Luther. It was the one grand discovery of Zuingli—of Lefevre—of Farel—of the other reformers. Let us see how they made use of it.

Salvation is by Christ alone. Then salvation is not by the papal indulgence! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then Salvation is not by the Pope! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then forgiveness of sins cannot be by Confessors and Priests! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then Salvation is not by the merits of the saints! Salvation is from Christ alone. Then invocations to the Saints and to the Virgin Mary are not needed, and must be offensive to Christ! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then the efficacy of relics must be an imposture! Salvation is by Christ alone.—Then the perpetual sacrifice of the mass, (instead of the one sacrifice of Christ,) is an abomination! Salvation is by Christ alone.—Then money paid to the priests, avails nothing for our departed relatives! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then is there an equal brotherhood of all believers in him! Pope, Cardinal, Priest, Bishop, are all on the one level of equality before Jesus Christ! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then the bull of excommunication from the Pope is disarmed of its unearthly terrors! It cannot destroy soul and body in hell! Salvation is by Christ alone.—Then we depend not for salvation upon the church! Salvation is by Christ alone. Then fidelity to Christ is all that is needed, to secure salvation! Salvation is in Christ alone.—Then will I not fear what man can do unto me! Salvation is in Christ alone. Then all the decrees of Popes, Cardinals and Emperors are to be held null and void, when they conflict with the sovereign commands, and the paramount authority of Jesus Christ! Salvation is from Christ alone. Welcome, then, fires, faggots, excommunications, stakes, dungeons, tortures! Welcome, cross of Jesus Christ!—Welcome death, resurrection, glory, eternal life!

Such was the armour offensive and defensive with which the Protestant Reformers conducted their warfare. Such was the nutriment that sustained them, the new life that quickened them, the light from above that guided them, the courage that inspired them. They were strong in the strength of Jesus Christ.—It was his voice, speaking through them, that started nations from their slumbers. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the end of the earth." Thousands and tens of thousands heard the voice of the Son of God, and they that heard, lived. The ancient faith of Chris-

tianity was restored, its ancient power was reproduced and wrought over again, in its measure, its primitive works. The Totzels of Romish imposture quailed before it. Hierarchies trembled; superstitions vanished; heavy institutions crumbled; emperors could not silence it; the Vatican could not arrest it. The rage of the monks, the sophistry of the schools, the authority of the church, were no stubble before the conflagration. SALVATION BY CHRIST was the watchword of the Protestant Reformation. Nothing else can rally again, to the rescue, the hosts of the king of Zion, now. Nothing short of SALVATION BY CHRIST, can meet the exigencies of the church and the world, at the present time.

Talk of "Christian Union" as we may, deplore and denounce the schisms of sectarianism as we will, nothing can bring together again the scattered fragments of a broken and disjointed church, but the restored faith of *salvation by Christ alone*. An enslaved and corrupt church can be liberated and purified by nothing short of the living power of faith in salvation by Christ.

IS THIS FAITH IN THE CHURCH?

Examine, in a few particulars, how widely the church has wandered from the doctrine of salvation by Christ. And mark how the restoration of that doctrine would be as life from the dead.

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then salvation is not by the outward rituals and ceremonies of the church!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then baptismal regeneration is a fiction, and eucharistical sanctification is a delusion!

Is salvation by Christ alone? And is it freely offered, without money and without price to all men? Then salvation cannot be monopolized by a self-constituted corporation called the church!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then salvation is not by a clerical caste—self-erected, self-constituted, self-perpetuated, self-controlled, and holding, by superstitious usage and concession, the monopoly of religious teaching and of the rituals. Then, too, the sacred of "Apostolic Succession" is exploded!

Is salvation by Christ alone? And is Christ the One Mediator between God and man?—Is He the only High Priest of the new Covenant, and is all other priesthood abolished, save the priesthood of the equal brotherhood, of which all regenerated Christians are members? Then the official mediation of a self-constituted priestly caste, without whom the gospel ordinances cannot be enjoyed, nor the saving word authoritatively and properly preached, is among the usurpations of the Man of Sin, to be destroyed at the brightness of the Savior's appearing!

Is salvation by Christ alone? And is the Savior of his people from their sins? Then the local, the organized Christian church is a brotherhood of equal Christians, acknowledging no authority or rule over it, but that Jesus Christ!

Is salvation by Christ alone? And is Head over all things to the church? Then salvation is not in the Diocesan Bishop, nor the General Conference, nor in the year Meeting, nor in the Synod, nor in the Presbytery, nor in the Convention, nor in the Association, nor in the church Session. No Christian is obliged or permitted by his Savior to put his neck under the yoke of an anti-scriptural and self-erected jurisdiction!

Is salvation by Christ alone? And is the sole King in Zion? Then all such assumed authority over his people is an invasion of his exclusive prerogatives—an infringement of his rights!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then who are saved by him stand on the footing of equal brethren; and he who assumes to take it over God's heritage, disdaining the watch care of the equal brotherhood, claiming to be held amenable only by "peers" in a self-elevated caste, assumes to *above* the church of Jesus Christ, out of *pale*, and amenable, not to the authority of Jesus Christ in the church, but to a body of men who virtually claim to be *out of*, and yet "the body of Christ"!

Is salvation by Jesus Christ? Does he save his people from their sins? Then assemblies of men working wickedness are not churches of Christ, and ought not to be recognized as such!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then salvation is not by the distinctive shibboleths of party or sect, dividing asunder the members of the body of Christ, and no Christian should retain a place in any such sect!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then Christians are under no necessity and have no right to secure to themselves the supposed benefit of adhering to the church that departs from Jesus Christ!

Is salvation by Christ alone? Then salvation is to be obtained by simply confiding in Christ, by faithful obedience to his precepts, and not by a conformity with the commands of any body of men, whether it be a church of Christ, or only a corrupt assembly assuming the name!

What a sudden, what a mighty and glorious revolution would be witnessed, if even all the Christians in America could but be brought fully to the apprehension of this great truth, and under the living power of this cardinal principle, that SALVATION IS IN CHRIST ALONE! Despotisms would crumble—corruptions would

ish—the church would be emancipated—Christianity would be revived—the slaves would burst their shackles—anti-Christ would be confounded—and the whole earth, lightened by the Lord's glory, would hasten to be redeemed!

A BAD PICTURE, BUT A COMMON ONE. Here is a pious Christian, who for half a century or more, has been deploring the corruption of the Ministry—the declension of the church. His very life has been worn out in attending with them. But all this time, the corrupt church and ministry have had his support! His example, nay, his exertions, have won scores, and perhaps hundreds into the church, the very place where they have been trained to evil, rather than good. Had it not been for himself and a very few of his spirit, a most stupid could not have mistaken such a corrupt synagogue for a true Christian church. His piety, and the piety of a few like him, has been put down to the credit of the same church that, at the same time, has sipped, and gagged, and maimed him, so that he could but half do the work of his Master. Inquire diligently of him, and you shall always draw out of him the reluctant admission that out of the ten or twelve pastors of the successive ministry he has sustained, more than one or two of them should be suspected of piety; and that even of these he has more and more in doubt the longer he watches their movements. Of the two or three hundred members of the church to which he belongs, he can select, not more perhaps, than half a dozen, or a dozen, of whom he would say with a clear conscience, that they are any evidence of being Christians. The same tide of worldliness that rolls over the world, he sees rolling over the church—the same scramble for wealth—the same rage for a show. The church with its successive ministers, despise the cause of the poor, and care not for the crushed. Nay, more, they stop to visit their fotters, and continue to do so, in spite of all entreaty and warning. Such a sight pains him to the heart. He finds no sympathy in the church. He is compelled to admit that such churches form the chief bulwarks of American chattel slavery. He has no hope that he shall ever see the church reformed. But he is a member of the church still. Suggest to him the duty of leaving it—and with what wonder does he hear the suggestion? What? Leave his Church? To what other Church shall he resort? All others, near him, are of the same character. A few persons, if any, would be prepared to leave with him. And if they should, what would they do? They would not be numerous and wealthy enough to have a meeting-house—and a minister—and the “ordinances of the

gospel,” at hand “regularly ordained”? The “means of grace” could not thus be provided for his family, and the community around him! And so he must continue to support a corrupt church!

And yet this worthy man never suspects that in all this, and so far as his course in his church relations is concerned, he has almost utterly lost sight of the cardinal truths that SALVATION IS IN CHRIST ALONE! He would be shocked at the hint of such a suspicion!—And yet, what can be more manifest than that, in some way, unconsciously to himself—and who ever knew, at the time that he was departing from the faith? he is permitting the very pith and essence of that vital doctrine—“SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE,” to ooze out from between his fingers? If he could but receive into his inmost soul, the full and deep meaning of “Salvation by Christ alone”—if he could see and feel this as Luther sometimes saw and felt it—could he thus plainly set out the assumption, and give utterance from his lips to the implication, that Salvation is in “numbers?” that Salvation is in the “meeting house?” that Salvation is in the “minister?” that Salvation is in “the ordinances of the gospel?” dispensed from the hands of the “regularly ordained?”

The picture we have drawn belongs, in substance, to a large portion of the Christian Abolitionists still connected with the churches that stand aloof from the cause of the enslaved, except that the most of them have not, for so long a time, stood on that ground. We see no escape from this conclusion but by the very severe and uncharitable imputation of worldly and sinister motives, which we are unwilling to charge upon them. We should be very sorry to think that they remain in such churches on account of the worldly advantages—the fair show of the flesh—that their present church connexions hold out to them. We choose to take their own words as a fair statement of the reasons that still bind them to their churches. Not a few of them seem to quiet their consciences by keeping up bitter complaints of the deep corruption of the ministry and the churches they are upholding, and of which they are constituent parts—members! What prevents them from seeing that the louder are their complaints, the more inexcusable is their position?

The only reason we can suggest, is that they have almost wholly forgotten this first article of the Christian creed, that SALVATION IS BY CHRIST ALONE—and hence they are spiritually fettered and manacled by the superstitious delusion that salvation is in the “ecclesiastical ministry”—that salvation is in “the church!”—Yes!—and by their own testimony, they make this salvation to be

in a corrupt ministry (for such they often call it) and a corrupt church!

In all the history of the sixteenth century, where shall we look for a more dense darkness than this? We complete the parallel by remarking that many to whom this picture belongs, resemble that large body of men, in the time of Luther, who with Protestant consciences, remained in the *Romish church* all their lives; and that they resemble them very closely in this particular, that their serious deportment and apparent devotion give them a high reputation for sanctity, with both Reformers and Conservatists! “Wo unto you,” said the Savior, “when all men speak well of you!”—The “influence” that is “preserved” in this way, is lost to the true church, and thrown into the sero of Babylon—for “Salvation is by Christ alone”—and there is no holy influence but by fidelity to him.

THE WORLD'S ONLY HOPE.

The world is in fotters for want of knowing that SALVATION IS BY CHRIST ALONE! Civil and political despotisms could not live without spiritual despotisms. All these spring from the superstitions to which guilty man, (with an accusing conscience) will ever be subject, till he learns that salvation is in Jesus Christ. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. If the Son make ye free, ye shall be free indeed! Let the friends of freedom never dream of breaking the yoke of human bondage with meaner weapons than SALVATION BY CHRIST ALONE. Where that salvation restores men, they are freed from the domination of their own lusts, and fears, and cannot be subjugated by others.

Deliverance to an enslaved world must come out of Zion; but it cannot come while Zion herself is in fotters; and those fotters she can never break, till she learns that Salvation is in Christ alone, and not in the tyrants that enchain her. “Shake thyself from the dust; arise and sit down, O Jerusalem; loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion.” “Thy God reigneth.”—“Salvation belongeth unto God.” Salvation is in Christ alone.

“CONGREGATIONALISM AND CHURCH ACTION—with the principles of CHRISTIAN UNION, &c. By John Keep, pastor of a Congregational Church, Hartford, Trumbull Co., Ohio.—New York, S. W. Benedict & Co., 1845.—We have not yet obtained a copy of this new work, but from our knowledge of the author, and from the high recommendations of the work, by competent judges, we have no doubt that it is a highly valuable production and well adapted to the times. It is for sale, we understand, by S. D. POTTER, Rochester. Price, 37½ cents.”

FALSE SPIRITUALITY DETECTED.

That must be a false spirituality that gives to those who cherish it a distaste and disaffection, either for the study of the truths of the Bible, or for active labor in any department of God's vineyard where self-denying work is needed to be done. The truly spiritual man is earnestly intent on the investigation of Christian doctrine—and is ready to welcome, gratefully the most humble and homely post of duty and usefulness.

The man is most spiritual; is most under the influence of the Holy Spirit; who most readily apprehends and most cordially relishes the Christian doctrine, and who sees the spiritual beauty and glorious blessedness of duty doing, wherever the Providence of God places him.

The devout lady who thought herself wholly sanctified, and yet dared not attend a meeting where the claims of the enslaved were to be urged, lest she should lose her spirituality of mind, had yet to learn wherein true spirituality consists. And many who find fault with the self-denying pioneers of unpopular reforms that they are not sufficiently spiritually minded to be safe guides—betray their own standard of spirituality when they conveniently stand aloof from such labors, and select a less unpopular department of service, under the implied plea that they are too spiritual and heavenly minded to attend to such low matters. When men admit that a certain work of benevolence, or of reformation needs to be done, yet think themselves too holy to help do it, thus leaving the work in the hands of those whom they consider less spiritual than themselves—and then again adduce the low attainments of those who do enlist in the work as an additional reason why they do not co-operate, there is an evident injustice and inconsistency in their course. For seventeen years past, and in relation to the Temperance, Moral Reform, Anti-Slavery, and Church Reform enterprises, the developments just hinted at, have been continually witnessed. And it is quite remarkable that those who were too holy to do any thing for the inebriate and for the enslaved when the cause was most grievously suffering for want of laborers, find their scruples to give way, and their spirituality to permit their co-operation, just in proportion as the heavy work has been done up, the sea become smooth and the gale favorable. Just at the present time, it is held a sure symptom of a want of deep toned spirituality, for a person to be earnestly intent on the discussion of Church organization, Lay ordination, and Clerical caste. But there will be no want of spirituality in marching over the ground, and erecting triumphal arches, after the battle is all

have been fought, the victory won, the rubbish removed.

The spirituality that the cause of Christ needs, is that which can walk by *faith*, and not by *sight*; which can afford to suffer even the loss of a reputation for spiritual-mindedness, which can seize fast hold of divine truth, for its NUTRIMENT; and of self-denying service for its exercise;—which never needs to inquire whether a reformatory work will succeed after it has ascertained that it is a work that God approves and that man needs. To the truly spiritual man, the discovery of truth is the discovery of duty, and the discovery of success. To follow the right and to follow the Saviour are one and the same thing. To serve humanity is to glorify God. To obey is to enjoy—the task field is the temple—self-denial is the crown of glory, and the love and communion of God is the keeping of his commandment, without finding them grievous.

SECESSION—POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

It is remarkable that those who object to a secession from the ecclesiastical parties that form the bulwarks of American Slavery, in order to the organization of independent New Testament Churches in their stead—are met with the same objections that were urged against the abandonment of the old POLITICAL parties wedded to the slave power, and the organization of a distinct Liberty party on the opposite basis.

It cannot be denied in either case, that the old parties, ecclesiastical and political, are too roughly servile—nor can it be pretended that there is any rational hope of a radical change in their character. How then, can the friends of liberty support them without a dereliction of principle, and an abandonment of their enterprise?

"But we must stay in the old sects to reform them!" So it was said in regard to the political parties. And so it is now said of the ecclesiastical ones. The increased hostility of the old political leaders was apprehended, just as we are now told to beware of provoking the increased hostility of the Clergy. "If you carry it to the polls"—said they—"you will lose your hold on the moral and religious susceptibilities of the community." If you carry it into the Church, (it is now said) you will embarrass your political proceedings. "Abolitionize the popular mind"—it was said—"and the political parties will come right, of course." The same thing is now said of the Churches. Unfortunately for this theory, the supporters of servile parties, whether in religion or politics, do not, themselves, become thoroughly "abolitionized." The National Anti Slavery Standard, so intent upon keeping

abolitionists in their old political parties, had the sagacity to see that the movement, a new ecclesiastical organization, involved some principle, and has accordingly denounced it, as a part of the same policy. Let thorough friends of liberty ponder that fact.

PROGRESS AMONG MINISTERS.

While we feel it a duty to speak out fully, of the derelictions of a large majority of the ministers of religion, in the existing sects, and especially of the majority of those holding prominent stations, we have never intended to include ALL in the censure. Far otherwise. Our readers know through paper, and otherwise, that many, and an increasing number, of pious ministers, are beginning to look earnestly in the direction of thoughtful reform in the church. That, in every respect they should be agreed at once their views of church order, was not to be expected. But it is cheering to see indications of progress, and in a direction indicating growing unity of sentiment and feeling.

In conversation, recently, for a few hours in the rail-car, with a prominent minister residing in a distant state, whose name would be familiar to most readers, if we felt at liberty to mention it, we found him far in advance of what we had supposed to be his position, on the subject of church reform. Secession, re-organization, church independency and Christian union, had no terrors for him. The time for action, he thought, was about arrived. Another prominent minister, living as many hundred miles in the opposite direction, and venerable father in Israel, in his recent writes us, renewing his annual subscription for three copies of the Christian Investigator, and enclosing money, likewise, for above a hundred Reformation Tracts, on which he will pay the additional expense of postage, 700 miles, by mail. A sufficient indication of his views. And wherever we travel, we find warm friends of reform, scattered here and there, among ministers, both old and young. We gratefully attest this, and for the encouragement of the friends of the cause.

A CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION will be held at South Butler, Wayne Co., N. Y., on Wednesday and Thursday, April 16th and 17th, for the discussion of the subjects usually discussed at such Conventions. A general attendance is requested.

Exchange papers and Letters should be directed to HONEXORA, Ontario Co., (N. Y.)—the residence of the Editor—and not to Perry.

PARTIES—POLITICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL.

What men probably understand, ("Liberty" men, of course do,) the wide distinction between the civil government of the country, and the political parties that may happen to be under it. They never think that the employment of a political party is, of necessity, the abandonment of the Federal Government we live under—much less, an abandonment of the institution of civil government itself. Why should not their views be equal, clear and correct, in respect to the ecclesiastical parties, (or religious sects) of the country? Who cannot see that the now existing parties of religion, among us, are nothing more or less than so many religious or ecclesiastical parties in the church—that they are as distinct from the Christian Church itself, as the Grand democratic parties, so called, are distinct from the Federal Government—as distinct from the Christian religion, as those political parties are from the science of civil government, or from the institution of civil government?

But men talk and act, every day, as though they assault upon the sects, the parties, in the church, (that rend and devour her,) were an assault upon the Christian church itself—nay, an assault upon that Christian religion which Christian churches were intended to exemplify and teach! Just so an assault upon the Jewish church by the Reformers, and upon the church of England by dissenters was held to be an assault upon the institution of the Christian church, and upon Christianity itself. When will men learn to understand ecclesiastical parties as well as they do political parties?

DANGERS OF PROCRUSTINISM.

"Two years ago," said a pious and exemplary member and officer of a New England church, to us, recently, "two years ago the abolition members of our church might have seceded and re-organized, as we ought to have done, and we should have had strength enough, then, to have moved forward with courage and vigor. But I fear it is too late, now. Some have removed, to better their ecclesiastical condition. Some are disheartened, and we are comparatively weak."

What is true in that instance, is true in scores, if not in hundreds of others. The spiritual condition of the country is growing worse and worse, every day, and will continue to do so, till those who see, clearly enough, their high duty, determine to perform it, and arise and build.

And let none delay because they are weak,

or growing weaker. That circumstance should rouse them to action. Neglect of self-denying duty is not the remedy for spiritual debility.

LETTER FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

DEAR BROTHERS:—I enclose you my subscription for two copies of your Investigator for the ensuing year. I am endeavoring to get into an arrangement with a few friends for the purpose of raising funds for tracts. I am in favor of political action against slavery on the independent plan, to the fullest extent, but I feel that it is still more important that Church reform be made to move onward. Politics cannot be pushed ahead of morals. Whilst the mass of our professors of religion stand in a wrong attitude in reference to the great work of emancipation, we cannot reasonably hope that mere politicians will come up to the work, and fight the battle of liberty. The existing Church order, as it is called, is in my opinion very disorderly, and is the greatest bulwark in the way of the onward progress of the Liberty Party. Presbyterianism, Methodism, Baptistism, Wesleyanism, Quakerism, and all other *jams*, as such, must be dethroned, and Christianity take the sceptre. Much as we may lament the fact that the political rights of many of our countrymen are abridged, still I think we have more reason to mourn over the spiritual despotism of the prevailing religion of the country, and the desolations of Zion. It is far more important that we should have secession from the prevailing professed religion of the country, than from the Whig and Democratic politics. The last hope of slavery is in retaining in their present pro slavery ecclesiastical connexions, the professed abolition christians of the land. Unless these christians come out, liberty is doomed—slavery, ecclesiastical and political, will triumph.

Have Abolitionists any Rights in Bible Societies?

PROSCRIPTION OF PROF. CLEVELAND OF PHILADELPHIA.—While abolitionists, connected with churches and religious bodies that will not plead for the captives but continue their support of oppression, are supinely and criminally neglecting to come out from among them and be separate, lest they partake of their sins—and while even the proposal to obey God in this important particular is regarded with horror, and characterized as a wicked attempt at disorganization and schism, the work of proscribing active and faithful abolitionists, and shutting them out from any and every position of prominence in the churches or other religious and literary institutions is nevertheless going steadily forward, and one victim after another is deliberately singled out in the man-

ner best calculated to overthrow and cripple the rest! If a prominent post can be bestowed in such a manner as to operate as a quietus or a bribe, to an active friend of humanity, the expedient is resorted to, with all readiness. But let it be found that the incumbent stands firm against the seductive influences thus operating upon him, very rarely, if ever, have we known an exception to the rule of proscription and removal with which the obnoxious individual is visited. It was but a few days ago that we heard of the virtual removal of Mr. R. B. Hubbard, from the Superintendency of the High School in Worcester, Mass., on account of his abolitionism. And now we learn that Prof. C. D. Cleveland of Philadelphia has been impelled to resign the Presidency of the Philadelphia Bible Society on account of the opposition to his filling that post, for a similar reason.

The American and Foreign Anti Slavery Reporter for January, contains Prof. Cleveland's account of the matter, from which we extract a few paragraphs.

To the Editor of the Anti Slavery Reporter. Prof. Cleveland thus writes:

"Some things, unless recorded, our posterity will hardly believe. They will hardly believe that while, on the one hand, a man who allowed his name to be associated, on the same Presidential ticket with a slaveholder and a duellist (to say nothing more,) was not, thereby, deemed by christians of the present day, in the least degree disqualified for presiding over the deliberations of the largest Missionary Board in our land; on the other, that an individual, if he had not for the sake of peace and harmony resigned, would have been unceremoniously thrust out of the Presidency of a Bible Society, over which he had presided for nearly five years, because he opposed the election, for President of the United States, of a most wicked man, and advocated that of a pure and highminded christian Philanthropist. If such things, I say, are not recorded, posterity will hardly believe them.

Grateful to you, and thankful to God, for all that you have done for our persecuted but righteous cause, I remain, with great christian regard, your friend and brother,

C. D. CLEVELAND."

Philadelphia, Nov. 14, 1844.

Next follows a letter of Prof. Cleveland, dated January 3, 1844, and addressed "to the Managers of the Philadelphia Bible Society, resigning the Presidency of that institution, and assigning the reason. In this letter he says:

"On the 17th of last month, when calling on Mr. Booth,* to consult with him as one of

* One of the Vice Presidents. A few days after that date, he told me that there would doubtless be a majority opposed to my re-election; which the subsequent vote on the acceptance of my resignation (fourteen to seven) fully proved.

the committee, in relation to our Anniversary, he said, that he felt it to be his duty, as my friend, to say that a number of members of the Board, had, within a few days past, expressed opinions adverse to my being re-elected the President of the Society; and that there would doubtless be many votes given against me, at the next election; or words to that effect. The ground of the opposition, he said, was the charge of my being the author of "The Address of the Liberty Party of Pennsylvania to the People of the State." To that charge, with however much of odium it may be attended in this community, I would here plead guilty. But how it was, that my being the author of that "Address" conflicted with my duties as your President, did not, I confess, so readily appear. The thought immediately occurred to me, that the most prominent member of the member of the Pennsylvania Bible Society is, and has been for many years a SLAVEHOLDER. I say it not in the least spirit of unkindness to that gentleman, but morally state it as a fact, with which I know many of you are familiar. Yet I never heard it whispered even, that such a relation constituted any objection to his being, year after year, elected to the responsible office of Corresponding Secretary."

"How, then, my being the author of an Address to the People of Pennsylvania, advocating the eternal principles of truth and justice; an address, every moral sentiment of which is, I believe, in accordance with the truths of that Bible which we have been laboring to spread; an address which calls upon all good men to exert their influence to elect such rulers as have the fear of God before their eyes; an address which holds up one man, the idol of a great party, in the light in which every moral man, not to say Christian, should view him; an address which speaks of slavery, as Christian men, in growing numbers, all over the world, are speaking of it, whose moral vision is not obscured by the thousand selfish interests that ensnare the soul, and lead captive the understanding;—how, I say, my being the author of such an address disqualified me from being the President of a Bible Society, and not, I confess, appear so plain to me."

"It is enough for me, however, to have been assured that a considerable portion of the Board seem to think so; and therefore, agreeably to the resolution, always formed in my own mind, to preside over you no longer than it seemed to be desired by a wish unanimous or approximating to unanimity, I deem it best to retire from your body, that you may select some one to fill my place, on whom you can all harmoniously unite."

For the rest of this excellent letter, we have not room, but must add some additional statements and remarks from the Editor of the Reporter:

"After a debate of more than two hours, as Mr. Cleveland was informed by the Secretary, the above letter of resignation was accepted, fourteen to seven. Lest those who do not know Mr. Cleveland should entertain the suspicion that some dereliction of duty on his part entered into the reasons for accepting it,

it is due to him to state that the following resolution was passed "unanimously" at the same time:

"Resolved, That this Board are mainly indebted to Professor C. D. Cleveland for the prominent and influential position it has attained in the regard of this Christian community; and that they bear an earnest testimony to the sound judgment and unwearied zeal which have ever characterized the discharge of his duties in his responsible office."

"This settles the question. A gentleman, a scholar, and a Christian, to whom the Board of Managers of the Philadelphia Bible Society acknowledges itself to be "mainly indebted for the prominent and influential position it has obtained in the regards of the Christian community," and to whose "sound judgment and unwearied zeal" in the discharge of his duties, "they bear an earnest testimony"—such an one resigns his office, stating explicitly that he does it only because he learns that opposition will be made to his re-election on the ground of his having written an "Address" in opposition to slavery, and in behalf of honest and impartial freedom. Such a resignation, from such a man, and for such a reason, the Board, after long discussion, deliberately decide to accept. In so doing, they confess that the opposition supposed did exist. They confess that it existed for the reason supposed. Otherwise they would at once have said to Mr. Cleveland, "You are mistaken. There is no opposition, or if there be, it is not on that ground. We beg you, therefore, to recall your letter and retain your office; or if, because of opposition on other grounds, you still insist on your resignation being accepted, we accept it, thanking you for your past invaluable services, and assuring you most solemnly, that the free utterance of your views and feelings, as a citizen, in respect to slavery, is the last thing we should ever think of as disqualifying you, or any one, for the Presidency of the Philadelphia Bible Society." But the Philadelphia Managers do no such thing. They accept the resignation as above stated. They confess therein both to the fact of the opposition and the reason for it. In all this they deliberately proscribe free thought and free speech. They proclaim it to the world, that they and slavery are in such close and loving alliance, that he who touches it touches them; and is thereby an outlaw from favor and from office in the Philadelphia Bible Society! Christian men will by and by be sorry for such proceedings."

The closing remark of the Editor of the Reporter suggests to our minds the inquiry whether Christian men will not by and by, be sorry that they have so long co-operated and fraternized with wicked men and oppressors in their religious enterprises? "What communion hath light with darkness?"

THE CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION AT HONEOYE, owing to bad traveling, was not numerously attended, but those present were deeply interested, and we trust that the cause received permanent benefit from the discussions.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, MARCH, 1845.

THE CHURCH REFORM CONVENTION

West Bloomfield, Feb. 25th and 26th, pretty well attended, considering the late notice and the bad state of the roads. The earnest attention of the audience gave evidence of the deep interest felt in the questions discussed. The claims of the principal religious parties or sects of this country, in support of the friends of Christian freedom, were examined, in relation to their support of Slavery, and also in relation to the principles involved in their organic structure and ecclesiastical usages they maintain. The claims of the clerical caste—the necessity of lay ordination, &c. &c. came in their share of attention. On such points, of course, there was earnest debate, as also the great question whether, on the whole, church organizations of prominent sects should be abandoned by the friends of liberty and reform. A good spirit prevailed, and progress was doubtless made, but it was thought to adjourn without pressing a vote.

LECTURES ON CHURCH REFORM.—A friend in Massachusetts enquires why we do not publish our twelve lectures on Church Reform, in a book. In answer, we have the pecuniary means to do so at present, the friends of the cause who have money, to invest it in an enterprise of that kind, should be glad to hear from them.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to March, 1845.

J. Dewey, W. Leyden, \$0.50	N. Randall, Del. Ab.
O. Huchcock, Liberty, Ill. 0.50	J. H. Payne, Half Day.
C. Wilson, Farmington, 1.00	W. D. Babbitt, Livonia.
J. C. Le. Jewell, So. Butler, 0.50	H. Brewster, LeRoy.
C. O. Shepard, China, 1.00	S. Comstock, "
W. Twinnell, N. Y. Mills, 0.63	A. F. Bartow, "
J. Jerome, for C. Clark, 1.00	T. Beebe, Westmoreland.
A. Story, Cambridge, Vt. 0.40	D. D. Safford, Jeffersonville, Vt.
B. B. Weeber, Springfield, 50	E. N. Bartlett, Centre.
J. Winans, Garristville, O. 0.50	ington, O.
S. Paine, Lake Zurich, Ill. 1.25	
J. F. Clark, Sandwich, Mass.	
J. Van Alstine, Morriston, 1.00	P. Talbot, E. Machia.
D. Newcomb, Darton Cen. 75	Me.,
S. Hurl, Free-town, Mass. 50	J. Albany, Lockport.
B. Burt, "	50 T. Atwater, "
Miss A. Robinson, Chittenango,	

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale. Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. 1st and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.
No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian High Calling, (both on one sheet) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.
No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, 60, 62½ per hundred.
No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODEL, Editor and Publisher
HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y. Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills
Together with every description of Book & Job Press

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New York, Vol. 10, No. 4,
Whole Number 396.

MONROE, ONTARIO CO., N.Y. APRIL, 1915.

WILLIAM G. DUFF, Editor
AND PUBLISHER.

"Two streets shall be built upon, and two walls, even in troubled times."

DANIEL, ix, 10.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

TO BE FORWARDED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE,
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall
have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the set, (if desired), as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 6 50 Sixty papers, 33 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers, 4 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters en-
closing money for papers.

"NEW HAVEN THEOLOGY"

OR TAYLORISM.

It is with no invidious or partizan design that
we place the documents that follow, under the
above caption. Nor would we venture, with-
out good reason and strong necessity, to use
the severe language in contains. There are
times when, startling words are required by
fidelity to truth, and when nothing else will
convey the ideas that men must receive or suf-
fer the loss of their souls. When blank Athe-
ism, and in a practical form, successfully teach-
es rebellion against God, and the worship of
devils, from the Divinity chair, there is no
earthly language sufficiently bold and expres-
sive to convey the rebuke.

And especially in such rebuke needed when
an unutterable crime is committed by teach-
ers of religion who are extensively confided in
by the religious community as the promulga-
tors of a purer faith and a more correct theo-
logy than commonly prevails. When men
who have set up their "new Schools" of "Di-
vinity" can insidiously and covertly under-
mine the very foundation of morality and re-
ligion, until a great nation totters on the
verge of destruction, and then step eagerly
forward, throw off the mask, and openly and
explicitly exhort christians, in the name of the
Lord, to put themselves under the protection
of "a devil" and "choose" him for their lord-
er and ruler—when this can be done and pro-
duce no sudden shudder of horror among the
churches—no reproof from the pulpits—no
dissent from the religious press—then it is, if
ever, that things should be honestly called by
their appropriate names. And this can be no

matter of complaint, when the name of the net
is chosen by the actors themselves.

Meriden, Sept. 21, 1894.

Rev. Dr. Taylor.—Dear Sir: I trust that you will
not consider this an important or interesting to you the
following inquiry, viz. Can a Christian, consistently
with the word of God, cast his vote either for a duelist
or an oppressor of the poor, for Chief Magistrate of this
nation? There are truly conscientious friends that bring
their doubts upon this question. They wish to act in
view of the great and final day of accounts. Will you,
dear Sir, have the kindness to give what you conceive to
be the will of God upon this point. An answer at an
early day will be very acceptable.

I am, dear Sir, very respectfully yours,

EDMUND TURTLE.

YALE COLLEGE, Oct. 5, 1911.

My Dear Sir—I should have replied to yours of the
24th ult. before now, had I not been so occupied as to
find it inconvenient. And now I have not got time to go
into a full examination of the principles on which, in my
view, the true answer to your inquiry depends. A gen-
eral view of these principles, with a supposed case or two
of their application, may be satisfactory.

You inquire, "Can a Christian, consistently with the
word of God, cast his vote for either a duelist or an op-
pressor of the poor, for Chief Magistrate of this nation?"

I answer in the first place, that I know of no precept
in the word of God, which expressly forbids the act. In
the second place, in respect to all this class of actions,
viz. external actions, which are not expressly required
or forbidden by Divine precept—the scriptures in cessa-
rily leave them to be judged of by men on their individ-
ual responsibility; in other words, what might, and
what ought not to be done in this kind of action, is left
by the word of God to man's judgment. There are at
least three reasons for this. One is, that the right and
wrong of such actions change with circumstances; an-
other, that to give a particular precept for every particu-
lar action of this kind in every man, would have been
impossible, as the world could not contain the books;
and a third is, that to lay down certain principles for the
regulation of individual judgment in all such cases, is
not only the only practicable method, but the best fitted
to secure the greatest amount of right external action
among men.

Here, however, it is most carefully to be inquired,
what are these principles? One is, that in all cases, we
are to be governed by the right principle of all action,
or, that we are to be guided in all things, in all judgments, all
external actions, to intend, purpose, or aim, to do that
which will be for the glory of God, or, what is the same
thing, for the greatest good. The other is, that circum-
stances, in respect to such actions, alter cases; so that
the same action, which, in one set of circumstances,
would promote the general good, would, in another set
of circumstances, defeat the general good.

These principles, so obviously true and just in their
own nature, we find distinctly recognized in the Scrip-
tures—in respect to that class of actions under considera-
tion—and I might say also, are applied, in some cases,
even to external actions, which in words are forbidden
by formal precept. I refer you to the distinct recogni-
tion of them in the following passages: 1. Cor. 10, 31.
Matt. 6, 22, 23, and also 12, 3, 4, and 7. Here note, that
we are to aim in all things at the glory of God, or at the
greatest good; for God prefers doing good to sacrifice.
Remark, further, that in obvious cases in which the
greatest good requires the act which even the law in
words prohibits, the act is justified; as in the case of
David, the Priests, and the Saviour and his Disciples in
the corn-fields. And now, how are we to judge what is
for the best in these cases? By having the eye single,
by sincerely, honestly aiming to judge right; by judging
as well as we can. Thus there will be no mistake; none
for which we shall be blameworthy—"thy whole body
shall be full of light."

Let us now suppose a few cases, to which these prin-
ciples will apply, and see the results which they will
give.

It were easy then to suppose a case, in which a Chris-
tian, by right and wrong, of such actions, I do not mean
morally right and morally wrong, but right, as fitted to
good results, and wrong, as fitted to evil results. Moral
quality does not, strictly speaking, pertain to external
action, but only to the heart—the intention—the prin-
ciple of external action.

tion would be bound to vote for a pious or good man, in-
stead of a wicked man, to fill the supposed office.—
Were there such a man as well qualified for the office as
any other man, or even if not as well qualified in all
respects for the office, as some other, yet if there was
good reason to believe, that the general good would be
best promoted by his election, and if, also, there was a
reasonable hope of his election, or even if his election
were not hopeless, the Christian would be bound to vote
for him.

I can suppose another case in which a Christian shall
be bound to vote for a wicked man. If we suppose that
there is no good man to be voted for; or no good
man qualified in any degree for the office, or that if
there is a good man qualified for the office, there is no
hope of his election; and that by voting for him, his
vote will not only be lost, but one more wicked than the
first, even a traitor to his country will probably be elect-
ed: in such circumstances the Christian would be bound
to vote for a wicked man.

I can suppose yet another case in which the Christian
is bound to vote for the more wicked man of the two; viz.
when he has good reason to believe, that the former is a
friend to his country, and that the latter is not, or utterly
mistakes its true and essential interests; and that the
former, notwithstanding his greater wickedness, will, in
essential respects, better administer the Government
than the latter, as being both more competent and more
disposed to do so.

To put a stronger case. Suppose that there is no
reasonable doubt, that one of two devils, one of which is
less a devil than the other, will be actually elected, let
the Christian vote as he may; and that his vote will
therefore be utterly lost, if he does not vote for one of
them; I think that an enlightened Christian would vote
for the least devil of the two.

I know not that these views may be satisfactory to
you. They are those which I adopt. I wish to add that
the reason that good men are bound to vote for wicked
men, arises from the circumstances of the case—from
the necessity of so doing, or of throwing away their
votes, and thus occasioning a greater evil, than that con-
nected with the election of a wicked man. If the Chris-
tians of our country, would unite in a candidate of known
or acknowledged party, and well qualified for the office,
to such an extent as to afford a reasonable prospect of
his election, (and this I think might be done,) then I
should say, the duty of every Christian to vote for such
a man, would be undeniable. As things are, however,
Christians seem to be under the necessity of choosing
the least of two evils; and cannot, so far as I can see,
throw away their votes on a man of whose election there
is no hope, without also being responsible, even in their
own view, for neglecting to prevent, and therefore re-
sponsible for, producing the greater of two evils.

I am, dear Sir, very respectfully yours, &c.

NATHANIEL W. TAYLOR.

Mr. EDMUND TURTLE.

And Dr. Taylor stands not alone. Another
Doctor, of Divinity in the same State, and of
the same school, stands ready, though in less
bold and truthful language, to recommend the
same invocation of aid from the devil.

A letter was addressed to Dr. Hawes, con-
taining the following request:

"If Sir, on Christian or Bible principle you cannot ab-
stain a duelist or slaveholder, please communicate your
views to the Christian Freeman, or some other paper
next week, and you will oblige many enquirers after
truth and duty."

The following is the Doctor's reply:

Dear Sir—You will find an answer to yours of the
22nd instant, in the following statement. I have a much
loved child who is dangerously sick. Three physicians
are recommended to me. The one, whom I may ac-
count, I should greatly prefer, lives at so great a dis-
tance from me that I have no hope of being able to obtain
assistance, till it is too late, and my child is dead. In
one of the other two I have no confidence. His prin-
ciples and his practice as a physician are, in my opinion,
both wrong; and to call him to administer would be to
hasten the issue I dread, the death of my child. The other
is a man of great skill, especially in the disease and

which my child is ailing, and I have reason to believe that he will die, I will call on God, and save his life. But I have strong objections to his private character. He is an invalid, and is immoral, and other worse things, as perhaps he alleges to himself. I have thought, and have said, when my family was in health, that I never could employ him, but my weak stomachs are now changed, and I am greatly tried. What then shall I do? What would you advise me to do? My heart bleeds to think of leaving my child without the best possible medical aid. The physician whom I would prefer, I cannot obtain. One of the others is a quack, though his private character is good. Shall I call in the one who has skill, notwithstanding the objections I have to his character? Should I, by employing him, make myself responsible for his views, or should I in any manner favor or abet them? Will you give me your advice in the case, or much relieve the feelings of an anxious and afflicted father.

Yours truly, JOEL HAWES.

The "Liberty" papers, in which these documents have been published, have, sufficiently, perhaps, exposed the sophistries, the fallacies, and the false ethics they contain. These exposures we need not repeat in detail. But what a phenomenon have we here! The clergy who wrap themselves up in their spiritual dignity, and cannot preach the duty of "executing justice and judgment" lest their pure robes should be soiled by the "dirty waters of politics"—condescending, nevertheless, to descend into the very midst of those same "dirty waters" for the sake of making them more foul, and seducing, if it were possible, a professedly Christian and republican people into the sin and shame of elevating to the chief magistracy one of the most heartless oppressors, one of the most immoral and unprincipled aspirants, that the world ever saw! And so, the political presses are obliged to defend Christian morality, from the assault of grave divines!—What a picture of the condition of the ministry and of the church! Who can doubt the necessity of a radical church reform, after exhibitions like these? To say nothing of the interests of religion, technically so called—to say nothing of human salvation, in its highest sense, and of the future state—who does not see that the liberties of a people cannot long be preserved in the atmosphere of so putrid a religion as this!

That a master in Israel should have been ignorant that the Scriptures forbid the act of electing oppressive rulers who are not "just, ruling in the fear of God," may excite some surprise. Sabbath school children may wonder that any man in a land of Bibles should be ignorant that the flower of Egypt was smitten by the destroying angel and overthrown in the Red Sea, for a lighter type of the same sin—the sin of sustaining an oppressive monarch, whom their votes could not have peacefully displaced. They may wonder to be told that their ministers have not yet learned that "where the wicked bear rule, the people mourn." But this wonder will cease, when in riper years, they shall perceive, clearly that, so far from revering the Scriptures,

the prominent religious teachers of their country, did not, properly speaking, believe in a God—and when they read, in their own published writings, their own direct testimony to the fact, that they recommended the worship of the devil himself, ascribing to him a power to deliver the country out of its troubles, which they did not ascribe to their Maker—seeking advantages from their choice of a "DEVIL," which they dared not anticipate from the almighty, confiding pursuit and practice of that justice and mercy which they knew were in accordance with his will.

For, what is it to believe in Jehovah? To confide, to trust in Him, if it be not to commit our temporal and eternal interests to his keeping? To follow implicitly, the great principles of immutable right, that he reveals to us? To do this, fully believing that all our interests are safe in his hands?

And what is it to worship the devil, if it be not to ascribe worth to him? To look upon him as a being that can deliver us, or our country, (in our anxieties and afflictions,) out of the evils we suffer, or the dangers we fear? To seek—to "choose" him for that object?

If this be not it, worship of the devil, in what can it consist? Or how shall the act be described? In order to demon-worship, is it requisite that altars and temples should be erected, and that the worshippers should literally prostrate themselves at his shrine? Is there any worship of the devil beyond seeking the protection of the devil, and "choosing" him for a chief ruler?

What meant the prohibition, by Moses, to the ancient people of God—bidding them to continue their former sacrifices to devils?—[Lev. xvii, 17.—See also II. Kings, xvii, 33, and Deut. xxxii, 7.] If the prohibition ever were needed, is it not needed now? Why, else, was it recorded, but for our use?—Are the professed people of God, out of danger, under the teachings of the Connecticut divines? Are they guiltless, amid the practices in which they indulge, and guided by the maxims they repeat?

But why stigmatize, it may be asked, a particular school of Theology, with the error of these men? Is the "old School"—it may be demanded—less guilty of the support of the Slave system, than the "new?"

The "Old School"—in the Presbyterian Church,—we answer—is chiefly supported by the opponents of the Anti Slavery enterprise. Like the old Democratic party—falsely so called—it is the "natural ally"—the old partner, and conservator of the slave power. Amid the monuments of Southern despotism, it reigns undisturbed. It never claims to be the religion of progress—or to have any sympa-

ties for human freedom. It is emulous of nothing more than the reputation of being the perpetuation of past centuries stereotyped. It never accuses its rival of subservience to the slave holders. It never claims the support of Abolitionists, on Anti Slavery grounds—nor pretends to be the more favorable religion of the two—the real Anti Slavery religion of the country, on which the cause of crushed humanity may lean for support. Making no pretensions of this kind, it has none to expose.

Far otherwise is the case with the "New School" Theology, that claims this identical Dr. Taylor as its head! Like the Whig party, it becomes all things to all men, if by any means it may deceive some. At the South, it goes with the South, and models its "General Assembly" activities, so as may best secure Southern accessions. At the North, it promises all that abolitionists demand, and redeems its promises by defalcations, on its old paper, and by fresh issues of now! The confidence of abolitionists in such "schools" and "parties" needs, especially to be disturbed.

And we are doing the "New School" wrong. Dr. Taylor, more than any other man, has always been recognized as its head.—"New School" consents to be called after his name, and after the name of the city where he resides. The terms, "Taylorism"—"New Haven Theology" and "New School" are commonly used as synonymous terms. We have a right, then, to give the published sentiments of Dr. Taylor and his theological associates, their proper name.

More than this needs to be said. And we shall suffer no squeamish delicacy concerning the new current theology of the North—(confessedly "new theology," even at the north) to prevent us from declaring the whole truth.

Discriminating, then, between the common theology of New England, as it was before Dr. Taylor had written, and the peculiarities of the system now known by his name—(reminding the reader that *New England* theology never has been the theology of the Presbyterian "Old School") we affirm that the New Haven, or Dr. Taylor theology—distinctively so called—along with much important Christian truth, and many solid arguments against the Presbyterian "Old School"—has been deeply—fatally tinctured with the metaphysics and the ethics of atheism, and of demonolatry, from the first. This charge is not lightly made, and can abundantly be sustained. So that the open renunciation of God, as a law giver, and the consequent exaltation of human calculations of consequences, resulting in the "choice" of the "devil" for a ruler, to which Dr. Taylor has now arrived, should excite no surprise in any one, who has ever taken pains to study and understand his philosophical sys-

tem. Precisely the result now reached was anticipated and predicted by the venerable ministers of New England, more than twenty years ago, and the ground was then taken, that the system embodied the most subtil, insidiously in disguise.

For, what *are*, and *have been*, some of the most marked peculiarities of the system?

In the first place, a solicitous anxiety to account for the most astonishing phenomena of the moral world, the regeneration of the human soul, without the intervention of Omnipotent power! We say nothing now of the truly hurtful errors of the Presbyterian "Old School" which this "new" discovery was designed to displace. There was atheism in the speculative theory—nevertheless—however unintentionally it may have been imbibed.—Convince religionists that the spiritual new birth can take place without the exercise of omnipotent power, and they will not long retain any distinct or deep impressions of their need of the divine aid. And philosophers may well feel excused in their attempts to account for the phenomena of the inferior physical world without such divine power, if the moral world does not require it.

In the second place, the New Haven theology (or rather the anti-theology) in its attempts to account for the phenomena of regeneration, without the intervention of an Omnipotent energy, and by the sole power of the sinner himself, and even while remaining impenitent, has resort to the *utility* or *expediency* system of Dr. Paley, who teaches that virtue consists in *utility* and duty in an estimate of *consequences*—a system which (as Dr. Emmons has demonstrated, long ago) cannot fail, when carried out into its consequences, to confound moral distinctions, blot virtue and vice out of the universe, dethrone God, and install human prudence in its stead. The supreme authority of the god of this world follows of course—and to choose between the least of two evils would indeed be the sad alternative of an orphaned race! Yet this system of Dr. Paley, identical (as Emmons has shown) with the infidelity of Goodwin, of Hume, and of the disorganizers of revolutionary France,* was solemnly seated by "New Haven Theology" in the divinity chair, and set at work to explain the phenomenon of the spiritual new birth!

And how was the process made out? Easily enough, to be sure! The sinner, in a sup-

posed *neutral* state, with the selfish principle suspended, and yet without any *heavenly love* in his heart—was brought to make an estimate of *consequences*, in which the claims of God, on the one hand, and of the world on the other, were supposed to be compared together, in his mind, in their probable effects to secure "the greatest amount of good"—or of happiness to the sinner. And whenever, as a rational being, he could be persuaded that, on the whole, the service of God would be more *advantageous* to him than the service of the god of this world, why then, of course, (and without any divine efficiency, doubtless,) he made up his mind, that under all the "circumstances" of the case, it was best to serve God! And this was the "regeneration" of the "New School!" This, translated into plain Saxon English, was the sum total of the matter! Various and decorated and exhibited, this was the current theory of the "School!" These acquainted well with its features, could recognize it in much of the "revival preaching" of the times—could detect it in the inquiry room, and at the anxious seat, where considerations of interest were exclusively urged, and duty and right scarcely mentioned at all. To a great extent, the converts of this process, were counted, in the records of revivals. To a great extent, the now existing churches are composed of such converts, as ready now to "calculate consequences" and be governed by the "greatest estimated amount of good" as they ever were, and apparently incapable of conceiving of the right, *for its own sake*.

That such conversions can be philosophically accounted for, without the intervention of any Almighty power, we can readily conceive.—And quite as readily may we understand that when the converts of such a sort of experimental religion as this, are exhorted by the great founder of that religion to make their estimates of the "greatest amount of good," and worship the least of two rival devils, either at the ballot box, or any where else, they will be ready enough to comply! But that the Church or the world was ever the better, or ever can or will be, for the prevalence of such a religion, we must be permitted to question. It may become as *easy* to become religious, by this process, as it ever has been represented to be, (and the duty of striving, wrestling, and agonizing to enter in at the straight gate moved from the memory of the teachers of such a religion as is the duty of choosing just rulers) but the ease of ascending the hill of Zion, and dwelling in that holy place, by so cheap and convenient a method, we hold to be quite another affair.

We count it no signal disaster that a religion of such a type is coming to be considered

as worthless as it is cheap—that excitements for its propagation are gotten up with less facility than in times past. Before the true religion can find public favor, there must be thorough work made in exposing, and bringing into disrepute, the countless cheats and impostures of the *façade*. To this end was directed no small part of the public teaching of our Saviour himself. So it was again, with the pioneers of the Protestant reformation. And even when men of the world join in decrying the deception, the thoughtful Christian may see in it an omen for good. That the Connecticut "new theology" so extensively, and so successfully vended for a number of years past, should come to be regarded as a piece with the other reputed wooden spicery of the same region, and fit only to be peddled by quacks, should excite neither surprise nor dismay. And let not the "utility" religion shrink from a public scrutiny by its own standard—nor cry out against the profanity of the inquiry—*What is it worth?* If its current price in the money market should prove to be its full value, let it not refuse to be estimated as it deserves.

A Review of the New Haven Theology, in its bearing on ethics, may reveal to us the true source of the disappointments which these friends of christian morality have experienced, who have cherished high hopes of the achievements supposed to be in process of accomplishment, by the polemic chieftains and ecclesiastical instrumentalities identified with that school, Cox, Boman, Kirk, Duffield, Barnes, Hawes, the Beechers, and whose regiments of clergy marshalled in their ranks.—The New School General Assembly—the New York Evangelist, et cetera; what gigantic powers were supposed to be wielded by these! And did they not compose and direct the ecclesiastical "*party of progress*?" Before them, hoary oppressions and enthroned abominations were speedily to give way! What a sounding of trumpets! What a bluster of preparation! But where are they now?—Let the unprecedented rapidity of their downward and retrograde march, tell! Let their dead, dumb silence, in pulpit and in press—now that their recognized high champion and leader, the master of their "School," summons them, in print, in open daylight, and in unequivocal Saxon English, to the "choke" and worship of the "devil," tell the tale. More than this, let the latent atheism and demonolatry

How comes it to pass that none of the giants of the New School are heard to dissent, never so mildly, from the demonolatry of Dr. Taylor? Alas, for them! He has fortified his argument in favor of devil worship on deeply solid corner stones of their cherished system of theology (as his letter shows) that they cannot—should they desire to—avoid his conclusions without cutting the jugular vein of that system! As they understand theology, they would then have no defenses left against the absurdities of "Old School!"

*See Emmons's Works, Vol. IV. Sermon XII.—Gain not Godliness.—Any reflecting mind may readily see that all the fundamental elements of a practical atheism are involved in this corrupt system. If right and wrong change their nature with changeable "circumstances," then no immutable standard, as supposed to exist in the divine law, can be recognized or regarded. Men must do whatever they, for the time being, judge best! The "glory of God" is made to mean "the greatest good." The greatest good is made to mean the greatest amount of happiness, and of that happiness the individual is made to judge, as circumstances vary.

try, wrapped up in the very core of its philosophy, from the beginning, talk to all hearing ears why it is, that *New School* can neither shield brutal humanity nor serve God, unless the "circumstances" of the times favor it. What more could be expected of a theology that places utility, expediency, and a calculation of the "consequences" at the basis of experimental religion?

Our task is performed. Stupidity, if it please, may charge on us an affinity for the absurdities and crimes of the *Old School*, because, for once in twenty years, we have adventured to devote a few columns, to the needed exposures of the *New*. The opposite of a wrong party is not necessarily right. And opposition to one wrong party, in religion or politics, does by no means imply sympathy with its equally corrupt rival.

But if driven from both the *Old School* and the *New*, to what guides, pray, would you commend us?

To the *Old Testament* and to the *New*.—Study them, and let the *Old* and *New School* bury their dead, and strive together, like the other pois herds of the earth, till, of one another, they are consumed, and the churches rescued from their contamination. Posterity, and the millennial ages will know how to weigh and balance them both in the same scale. They should be buried side by side.—their epitaphs should both be written by one and the same pen. Of the *New School* it will be sufficient to record that in the midst of the nineteenth century she should hear her chosen leader openly recommend the worship of devils without a blush! Of the *Old School*, it were sufficient to say that with her argus eyes ever open for the detection of some foul heresy, or damning innovation in her hated rival, she could, nevertheless, in all the seats of her sacred learning and church power, listen to the rampant blasphemy of demon worship, without a murmur of disapprobation or a lip of dissent!

CHURCH FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE-HOLDERS.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW FOR OCTOBER, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE PRINCETON REVIEW, JAN., 31, 1845.

For three or four years past, the sentiment that Church fellowship ought not to be retained with incorrigible slave holders and their apologists, has been steadily making progress among members of churches and ministers in the non-slave holding states. Such a sentiment could not very widely prevail, nor assume, even in a few instances, a practical shape without greatly disturbing the churches and clerical bodies, as at present organized, at the north. Some resistance, in some form,

from their seats of biblical learning, and of Church power, the conservators of existing arrangements might have been expected to make. But, for the most part, an ominous silence has prevailed. And this silence has been most unbroken, in those sections where the new views are obtaining most favor. In New England, and especially in Central and Western New York, the sharp-sighted and far seeing portion of the anti-abolition clergy, have either been idle, or have put forth influence in secret, or have occasionally wielded ecclesiastical authority, or at most, expended their literary efforts in timely cautions, as in the case of the sermon of Dr. Wisner, taking special care not to grapple with the main question, but diverting attention from Church fellowship to the political duties of Christians. Even the anti-slavery portion of the clergy have continually preferred the political field. Among the smaller fry of clerical and editorial opposers, the cant phrases of "disorganization" and "come-outer-ism" have been busily shoght handled about, to be sure, taking care to confound, as far as possible, the advocates of a scriptural re-organization of the churches with those who desire no church organization at all. But the great men at Andover and at Newton—at Hamilton and at Auburn, have been commendably silent. And the higher classes of theological periodicals have been equally wary and prudent.

To the learned Doctors at Princeton, and their South-Western friends, in a region and in a communion where the power and pressure of a progressive, living, breathing, acting Christianity has been little felt, has been reserved the honor—as on a former occasion—of leading to the onset, in a struggle, the nature and weight of which the assailants have had little advantages to understand or appreciate, on account of their geographical and moral distance from the field of close conflict.

We are indebted to some unknown person—and we heartily thank him—for a copy of a "Supplement to the Princeton Whig for Jan. 31—1845" (very prudently withheld until after Election) making a pamphlet of 24 pages, copied from the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review for October, 1844. This article is headed—

"ABOLITIONISM"—"being a Review of the following works:

1. The integrity of our National Union, versus Abolitionism. An argument from the Bible, in proof of the position, that believing masters ought to be honored and obliged by their servants, and tolerated in, not excommunicated from, the Church of God; being a part of a speech delivered before the Synod of Cincinnati, on the subject of Slavery, Sept. 19 and 20, 1843. By Rev. George Junkin,

D. D., President of Miami University, Cincinnati; 1843, p. 70.

2. The Covenant, or the Bible vs. Abolitionism: an Exegetical Argument, by Rev. William Graham, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Oxford, Ohio. 1844.

3. A Review of the Rev. Dr. Junkin's Synodical Speech, in defense of American Slavery. Cincinnati, 1844—p. 136.

4. Line of Demarkation between the Secular and Spiritual Kingdoms. By the Rev. Wm. Wisner, D. D. Ithaca, p. 22.

On the margin of our copy of this Paraphlet, the kind donor has pencilled—"Mr. Goodell, will you read this attentively, especially the last two pages? Read without prejudice, as from a Christian brother?"

We have attentively read, and without prejudice, we would hope—unless it be accounted a prejudice to prefer righteousness and mercy to their opposites. The effect of the perusal, our readers will learn.

THE CHURCH NOT REASONABLE! Our first impression is the uniformity with which clerical opposition to "Abolitionism" and apologies and defenses of slave holding, have preceded and laid the foundation for the political ones—furnishing a sag comment upon the position of the Princeton Reviewer, that "the Church has no responsibility with respect to the slave laws of the South." The Vermont Chronicle, Boston Recorder, N. Y. Observer, &c, &c, were in advance of all the political pressers, in falsely charging upon the Abolitionists incendiary designs, and invoking popular indignation as the means of their suppression. The Literary and Theological Review led the way in recommending legislative action against them. Dr. Hodge of Princeton, through the Biblical Repertory, was the first to touch Southern slave holding statesmen the Bible warranty for slave holding, of which, (according to the testimony of Southern clergymen and religious Editors) they had never before heard! The similar arguments of Pres. Wilbur Fisk, and Prof. Moses Stewart furnished the text books ever since used, by the pro-slavery statesmen of the country, at the North and the South. The "Limitations" of Pres. Wayland have been again and again re-echoed, copied, and quoted, in political orations and legislative reports. Dr. Taylor and Dr. Hawes, with their demoralizing ethics, are in requisition to aid in the election to the Presidency, of the great defender of Slavery. Dr. Junkin defends the integrity of our National Union against the supposed dangers of Abolitionism—the Biblical Repertory prepares a convenient digest

*And all, by way of illustrating, we suppose, the stereotyped doctrine of the Anti Abolition clergy, that ministers, churches, and Christians must not intermeddle with such a secular affair as human legislation, because Christ's kingdom is not of this world!

doctrines, for the use of the Princeton Review? Yet the responsibility—says the Reviewer—does not rest on the

STEREOTYPED.

other remarkable feature of this article in the Biblical Repository, is the laborious repetition of all the old arguments of Prof. Stewart in favor of slave holding, drawn from the Testament and the New—repeated confidently as though those positions had been totally overthrown and demolished by Theodore D. Weld, in respect to the Testament, and by President Green, in respect to the New. To these hitherto unanswerable arguments, not a syllable is said in direct reply. The reader would be led to think the writer had never heard of existence—or else that he thought it sufficient to affect an ignorance of them, and not to concern portions of his readers that any such had been written.

REMARKABLY SPHERICAL.

more remarkable is, that the Princeton Reviewer should make the abolitionists responsible for doctrines which it has been the effort of their offending to repudiate. James explicitly taught—not by themselves, but by their learned theological opponents. Such doctrines, for example, as that God and his apostles never denounced slave holding as a crime—that they never urged emancipation as an immediate duty—that, as a matter of policy, slave holding was permitted to remain in the New Testament—by apostolical sanction, hostile to the civil authorities—should exasperate the civil authorities—change the churches!

Who does not know that these doctrines are of the clerical opponents of abolition in England and New York? Who does not know that these doctrines constitute the stronghold of Pres. Fisk, of Bishop Hedding, of President Wayland, and of Prof. Stewart? Who does not know how triumphantly this boast of anti-abolitionism was prostrated by the winds, long ago, by the blast of President Green, (at which not a dog ventured to peep, or a dog move an eye)—and that the wreck has been so great that no intelligent opponent of abolition in New York or New England has been caught attempting to collect the debris of the edifice since? Who does not know that abolitionists claim the injunction—“Masters, render unto your servants which is just and equal.”—and the denunciations of James against those whose har-

vests were reaped by unpaid laborers—and the still more terrible denunciations of Christ himself against those who devour widows' houses and bind heavy burdens on men's shoulders—as specimens of thorough abolition preaching, containing proof positive that all existing oppressions were reprov'd by them? Who does not know that abolitionists confidently appeal to the early records of christianity and demand proof that, from the days of Philomon and onwards, Christian converts ever held slaves, until their religion gave abolition laws to the Roman empire? And who has ever heard these claims fairly met by their opponents?

Yet the Princeton Reviewer has penned a number of his pages on the assumption that the position of abolitionists is precisely the reverse of all this! He speaks wisely of their inconsistency and self-contradiction! Of their disputing Old Testament slavery and its lawfulness, and yet “abandoning the whole question, when they come to the New Testament!” And after running over the whole category maintained nine years ago by Prof. Stewart, (of which the Professor and his friends are now so evidently ashamed) and assuming it all as the doctrine of abolitionists, the Reviewer exultingly exclaims,—"The concession of these facts is a concession that they differ from (Christ) and his inspired apostles!"

"FANATICISM" AT PRINCETON.

All this is, certainly, cool, and would be amusing enough, if we were in a mood to bandy light jests. But when the writer proceeds, gravely, to argue the matter with his imaginary opponents, he utters some instructive truths, which those who concede the sinfulness of slave holding would do well to ponder.—The Princeton Reviewer conclusively shows (in direct opposition to the ground now commonly taken in this State and in New England, by those who would parry off Church Action against slaveholders) that if slave holding be sinful, then no such toleration of the practice in the primitive churches, could have been consistent with fidelity to truth. Hear him:

"The solution which they give of the facts referred to, is altogether unsatisfactory. They say in substance that the apostles concealed the truth that they were afraid of consequences—that they acted from policy or motives of expediency."

All this (the precise doctrine of Prof. Stewart) the Princeton Reviewer repudiates, just as "the reckless and fanatical abolitionists" (Pres. Green for example)—have all along, done! Hear him, again.

"Our answer to this is. 1. That such conduct would be immoral. For men professing to be inspired teachers of truth and duty, to

appear among men living in the daily commission of a heinous crime in the sight of God, and never once tell them, that it was a crime, to allow them to go on in this course of iniquity to the ruin of their souls, is a supposition which shocks the moral sense."

After expanding this idea, in the very style of "ultra abolitionists," the Reviewer then adds:

2. But again, the course ascribed to the apostles in reference to slavery, is not only base in itself, but is contrary to their conduct in all analogous cases." "Slavery was a crime which was more prevalent than slave holding, more implicated in all the relations of life, in support of which, stronger passions were engaged, and in attacking which, they could not look for the support of one half or two thirds of the community. Yet, idolatry, they every where proclaimed to be a crime, inconsistent with Christianity and a bar to salvation. The consequence was, they were persecuted, even unto death. It is not true that they kept back the truth, for fear of suffering. They called God to witness that they declared the whole counsel of God, and were clear of every man's blood."

And again:

"The course ascribed to the apostles is not only inconsistent with fidelity, and contrary to their uniform practice, but it is moreover opposed to the conduct of the messengers of God, in all ages. The ancient prophets never failed to reprove the people of their sins, and to exhort them to repentance, no matter how strong the attachment of their hearers to their iniquity or how powerful the interests leagued in its support. Elijah did not fail to denounce the worship of Baal though Ahab and Jezebel were determined to kill the prophets of God; nor did John the Baptist hesitate to tell Herod that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife."

Words fully spoken, these! And well becoming the messengers of God's truth! They deserve a place in all the rational abolition periodicals in the land. Most undoubtedly, the Princeton Reviewer will go with us the full length of our Church action against slavery whenever he shall become convinced that slave holding is sinful. To all those who profess that belief, his argument should be effectual and conclusive. Most heartily do we thank the conductors of the Biblical Repository and Princeton Review for this noble testimony to the fundamental truth that lies at the basis of Anti-Slavery church re-organization and reform. Most sincerely do we thank the Reviewer for having so completely swept away their foundation from under the feet of those numerous professors and ministers of religion who at this hour profess to believe that slave-

* A fact, by the bye, that may account for the greater prominence given to the apostolic reproofs of it. Had they preached in Georgia, the first preachers would have probably said comparatively little against the worship of heathen deities and graven images.

† A flat contradiction of Dr. Wisner's doctrine that ministers must not reprove legalized sins, because Christ's kingdom is not of this world. Yet the Biblical Repository (page 21) endorses that doctrine!

Princeton Reviewer himself, with remarkable firmness, that the apostles could as well have said to them (masters) to set their servants free, as to render unto them what is just and so we suppose!

holding is sinful, and yet delay action on the low ground of prudence, which the Princeton writer has conclusively shown to be unsound—even in a far stronger case! Such a specimen of unbending and uncompromising Christian ethics, from the central seat of sacred literature, Episcopalian "Old School" we are right glad to present to our readers. And we hope it may bring the blush of honest shame into the cheeks of those colossal cowards of "New School" who profess to believe slaveholding sinful, but think it *expedient to treat it according to its true character!* Unless "New School" can separate itself from its favorite doctrines of utility—expediency—compromise—it might as well prepare to creep into its coffin, at once. "Old School" has one redeeming quality, at least. It has a *character*, of some sort, that it is able to avow, and maintain. There is stamina in it, however perverted it may be. There is enough of the pattern to make a man and a Christian out of—and that regenerating grace that it has not yet forgotten to talk of, may yet give it a place in the kingdom, before its pretentious rival.—A man of some *wrong* principles is a more hopeful subject than one of *no principle at all.**

SEMENTS OF COMPROMISE.

But, our readers, by this time, will be impatient to know how it could have happened that the Princeton Reviewer should have made such a mistake as to discharge his heaviest artillery upon the favorite doctrine of Stuart, Fisk, Hedding, Mayland, and nearly all the anti-abolition clergy of New England and New York; and do this, too, under the fond impression that he was overturning a prominent doctrine of the *abolitionists!*

Admitting the writer to have been honest and earnest in this matter—as we would trust he was—his blunder may be accounted for by the course of one of the authors he was reviewing, and whom (as the opponent of Dr. Junkin) he seems to have mistaken for a correct teacher of the current doctrines of abolitionists.—He seems to have forgotten or to have been unaware, that a majority of the anti-abolition clergy of the non-slaveholding states, dare not go so far, in defense of slave holding as Dr. Junkin and the writers at Princeton, and that many more, who call themselves abolitionists, are only beginning to learn the principles they profess to have espoused.

Who the Reviewer of Dr. Junkin is, we know not, and have seen no copy of his pamphlet. But the extracts made from him by

the Princeton writer shows plainly, that he is not a well-instructed and mature abolitionist of the thorough or "radical" stamp. Very likely he may be one of those very "mild and moderate" clerical abolitionists (claiming to be such) who so greatly abound, especially within the precincts of the "New School" and who, "prudently" bringing their favorite ethics of "compromise, utility, greatest amount of good, least of two evils," &c, &c, into the service, expect, by this means to "conciliate" and find favor, with men of all sorts. The success of the policy, in this instance is quite note-worthy, and we readily hand over to the merited castigation of the Princeton Doctors, (whom we will not charge with "maneuvering") all pseudo abolitionists of that stamp, till they can learn to use the language of Israel correctly without mingling it with the half speech of Asiodod.

"OLD SCHOOL" AND "DENUNCIATION."

To this Princeton writer, by the way, we must likewise volunteer a little piece of advice in this connection. The next time he has occasion to censure the "consortiousness" and denounce the "denunciation" of abolitionists, in the "coarse, authoritative" manner he has done, he should take care not to attribute these qualities to the "influence exerted by the New Divinity" and especially to the "opinion" that no great amount of striving and agonizing are necessary, in order to enter in at the strait gate! Why? who does not see that the affinities of "New School" as compared with "Old School," in all this matter of censure and denunciation, are altogether on the other side? Who does not know that "New School" of the New Haven or Dr. Taylor stamp, finds popular favor, every where, on the score of its being more compliant, more "mild," more "conciliatory," more "compromising"—less unbending, less rigid, less severe and "authoritative" than "Old School"? Let the Princeton writer study such models as Barnes (vide his discourse on conformity to the world,) Beman, Kirke, Hawes, and Taylor, if he would find specimens of that prudence and suavity that hesitates to call popular sins by their proper scripture names, that apologizes for a present continuance in sinful practices on the score of "porplexities"—"difficulties"—"sick children" and "other great interests"—winding up with advice not to endanger the "peace of the church" by reproving her sins, and to spare

"the ann of all villainies" in the state "choosing the least of two evils" to over the nation, rather than hazard the mated benefits of a protective tariff! certainly, the Princeton writer could not "New School" to keep at a farther distance than this, from the fanatical extravagances and denunciations of the reckless, and unpromizing abolitionists! The extracts already made from his pen are sufficient to show that wherever he considers sin, to be as "reckless," as "denunciatory," as uncompromising as they! His repudiation of the "prudence" that postpones the of fundamental morality are as scathing as unsparring as theirs. And whenever we wish to rebuke or confound the wavering heartless policy so unceasingly commended their attention by the temporizing Doctors of the New School, (bringing to that focal point the whole magazine of their wooden mythology, with the Jesuitical ethics derived from it,) abolitionists cannot have occurred stronger terms or harsher language than the Princeton writer has employed, (as quoted already,) in rebuking the same heresy, justly characterized by him as "immoral"—"unfaithful"—"irreconcilable with moral honesty"—"based in itself"—"most effectual method of teaching falsehood"—"inconsistent with fidelity"—and characteristic of "bad men!"

From the beginning of this contest, it has been seen that the struggle of abolition with both the Old School and the New turned precisely on these two points. Since an Old School man that slave holding is sinful; and he is obliged, by his Theology to go the full length of the ultra-abolition at once, "denunciation"—"secession"—"disunion"—and all.—For "Old School" knows how to "excise" what she deems heresy.—On the other hand, bring a New School Doctor to concede the sinfulness of slaveholding, you have still the task before you of persuading him to abandon and denounce it! must "calculate consequences," first, must estimate "the greatest amount of a rent good." When he finds it profitable to serve God and repent of sin—very well! Till then, he must not be "denounced"—"choosing the least of two evils," or "Taylor himself boldly expresses it—"the least of two evils."

* We resort to this mode of speech, for the purpose of conveying the views we hold concerning the prevailing characteristics of these rival "Schools" in a manner which, in our view, diverge widely, at some points, from the plain common sense evangelical theology of New and Old England—at least, engraft upon it mischievous subtleties of their own vain philosophy. We do not mean to deny that good men are found in both schools.

* The Princeton Reviewer ought likewise to understand that it was the still more loose and "liberal" theology and ethics of Dr. Channing—another opponent (not champion nor "ornament") of anti-slavery societies and measures—that led that eminent writer to censure as "fanaticism" and "abuse" the scriptural testimony of orthodox and evangelical abolitionists very much to the gratification of the Princeton Reviewer! How happens it that the ethics of Cambridge should find favor at Princeton?

* All these accumulated epithets are heaped upon the Princeton writer, within the compass of little more than a page. They are applied to the same doctrines, same characters, to which abolitionists apply themselves, the doctrines and the characters which inevitably compromise with acknowledged sin. [For, not an hundred of their opponents would endure, for the "slander" of being charged with holding, the Princeton doctors—the innocence of slave holding!—] Then, the writer of these epithets should justify himself by his own lecture against consortiousness and "denunciation." What marks of "exasperation" and "violence" have abolitionists exhibited, beyond the use of language?

hence, we constantly witness the effort of the Old School, to prove that slaveholding is sinful—and in the New School, to prove it is "ultra" and "imprudent" to treat slaveholding as sinful, under the "present circumstances of the case!"

What whole scope, drift, and shape of the Essay now under review, is a corroboration of this statement. It is an effort to prove that slaveholders ought not to be excluded from the churches. And on what? Does the writer plead the impolicy or imprudence, or danger of casting intransigent sinners out of the church?—No! That argument might suit the "calumniators" of New-Haven, or Middlebury, or Auburn, or Andover. But a heretic of that kind would probably cost a Princeton professor his seat! No! He must establish the innocence, if not the Bible warranty of slaveholding itself—or, he knows very well, that his argument against the "ultra" and "denunciatory" abolitionists is thus lost! It recoils upon him with a weight with which his high orthodoxy can load and propel it. He is ground under!

IS SLAVEHOLDING SINFUL?

Now, then, the main point of the Princeton writer, we now come. *Is slaveholding sinful?* Abolitionists say it is. This writer says it is not. The issue is thus lucidly stated

In our day, and in this country, you ask whether he is an abolitionist, he will reply answer, no,* though he may be with Jefferson, that slavery is the greatest evil that can be inflicted on a nation; or with Cyprian M. Clay, that it is destructive industry, the mother of ignorance, opposed to nature, antagonist to the fine arts, destroyer of mechanical excellence; that it retards the people, retards population and impoverishes the soil, destroys nation, and is incompatible with Constitutional liberty.† A man may believe and say as many of the wisest and best men in South believe and openly avow, and yet not be an abolitionist. If every man who regards slavery as an evil and wishes to see it abolished, were an abolitionist, then nine-tenths of the people of this country would be abolitionists. What then is an abolitionist? He is a

Princeton writer should be aware that abolition is becoming so popular now, that the class he here speaks of are commonly forward to claim that they are abolitionists. The distinction he has drawn is never a correct one—(and the Princeton testimony to this is valuable, at this crisis,) though many who regard slaveholding as sinful, betray their unbelief, by refusing to treat it as a sin. "Markable fruits thereof of an innocent tree—of an evil tree, as sanctioned by the Bible! "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt."—And if every man who regards it as "an evil" tree, to get rid of its consequences, were a true abolitionist, then nine-tenths of the people of this country would be true penitents!

man who holds that slaveholding is a great sin; and consequently that slaveholders should not be admitted to the communion of the church, and that slavery should immediately, under all circumstances, be abolished. "Slaveholding," says the second article of the American Anti-slavery Society, "is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and ought therefore to be immediately abolished." "The question," says the Reviewer of Dr. Junkin's pamphlet, "now in process of investigation among American churches is this, and no other:—Are the professed Christians in our respective connexions who hold their fellow men as slaves, thereby guilty of a sin which demands the cognizance of the church, and after due admonition, the application of discipline?" (p. 17.) This question, abolitionists answer in the affirmative. "All other men in the negative." (p. 1 and 2.)

Very good. One can hardly help remarking, in view of this statement, that "abolitionists," are distinguished from "all others" by their looking upon their acknowledged source of countless social and moral evils—the corruptor of the people—in the light of Christian principle, and dealing with it as *other* moral corruptors of the people are dealt with—while "all other men" content themselves with more worldly, economical, political views of the subject, deprecating the *effects* of the "evil," rather than detesting and condemning its *nature*, its *character*, as opposed to the benevolent will of the great Father of man.

(To be continued.)

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, APRIL, 1845.

THE FOUR ASTONISHMENTS!

Astonishment first.—The Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, along with Bishop Meade of Virginia, were exceedingly astonished that slave holding Presbyterians and Episcopalians could not be persuaded to take any hearty interest in the religious instruction of their slaves; nor adopt any efficient measures for that end.—[See the Synod's Report, and the Bishop's Pastoral Letter.]

Astonishment second.—The Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky were astonished that any one should expect Presbyterian slaveholders, (or any body else) to have benevolence enough to seek, earnestly, the religious instruction of slaves, until or unless they have benevolence enough to take measures toward securing their emancipation. They were astonished, too, that any one should suppose it practicable to give religious instruction to slaves, in the bosom of a community who had not determined upon their emancipation.—[See the Synod's Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky.]

Astonishment third.—Abolitionists, the world over, are astonished that the Presbyterians of S. Carolina and Georgia, and the Episcopalians of Virginia, should ever mistake themselves for Christians. They are astonished, too, that the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky should have so eloquently denounced the sin of slavery, till their slaveholding readers began to tremble, and then wind up by advising them to postpone the abandonment of that sin, till a more convenient season!

Astonishment fourth.—All professors of religion—(themselves only excepted,) pro-slavery and anti-slavery, are astonished that AMERICAN Abolitionists, with the views they constantly express, should continue to hold ecclesiastical connexions with the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Baptist and Methodist sects, which they consider "the bulwarks of American slavery." They are astonished that such abolitionists can think themselves guiltless in supporting what they think to be wicked—that they can hold a church to be anti-Christian, and not think themselves unchristian in sustaining it, or that they should expect to have any moral influence while remaining in their present position.—[See Christian Advent & Journal, Biblical Repository, Southern papers, and the writings of British abolitionists.]

OF LIBERTY—ACTIVE & PASSIVE.

The principles of Liberty that have been, to some extent, held in the Churches, have been held, apparently, under a kind of tacit understanding that they were not to be used except on some very extraordinary occasions.

The right of independent Congregational church action, for example, that has given name to a large sect, and has been worn by it as a jewel, an ornament of great value, has been carefully preserved, like other ornamental trinkets, from any of that sort of common use that could hazard its contact with the ordinary routine of homely, every day labor. Congregational church independency has not meant any thing like every day Congregational church activity and responsibility, from week to week, year in and year out, as though the church was composed of every member of it, and each had his share of devising and doing what needed to be devised and done. The Minister, the church Committee, the Deacons, the Association, the Consociation, (very much like the Minister, Church session and Presbytery in another sect) have been tacitly permitted to do the thinking and the directing, just as though the right of the common brotherhood were absent on a furlough, or on a visit

to distant friends. Ministerial control, either personal or associational, or both combined, have grown, by constant usage, into the general rule, of which church vigilance and activity have been only the occasional, or perhaps the rare, exceptions. The right of self-direction, in the church, has come to be regarded only as a sort of right of rebellion—a right to withstand abuses and despotisms when they shall have become, in some particular instance, too grievous to be borne longer. Once or twice in a generation of church members, the church is called, perhaps, by some great emergency to blast up and, by a gigantic effort, seize hold of rights grown rusty, by disuse, and wield them just long enough to throw off the incubus and prevent strangulation. Then, under a new dynasty, perhaps, the right of Congregational church action is put asleep again, and snores as sonorously as ever.

The right of lay exhortation and lay preaching, in like manner, grows almost obsolete, through disuse, inasmuch that when, as in some instances, in our country, that indisputable right of the brotherhood, so emphatically recognized by Paul, as well as by the early Puritans and Protestant Reformers, chances to be exercised with some unwonted perseverance and freedom, (as, for a time, by Gerrit Smith) the circumstance sets the country in a blaze of astonishment; and the clergy cry out as though their avocation were in danger.

Another illustration may be found in the case of the right of Congregational or lay ordination, in other words, the right of the common brotherhood to choose, elect, appoint or ordain, (convertible terms) their own church officers and teachers, like all other voluntary associations, & without any impertinent interference by any person or body distinct from themselves. This right too, has come to be regarded as a right very seldom to be exercised, as, for example, when a people without any of the clerical caste along with them, to take care of them, should chance to find themselves alone, on a desolate island! Then, we are graciously told, by the clergy, there would be a fair opportunity and occasion for the church to exercise its right of appointing its own officers, without clerical interference or direction. Except in some such remarkable exigency, it is expected that the churches will elect no pastors except from among such as have been duly authorized and set apart by the clerical body. And when they do make such a selection, the clergy must again be called in to ratify and assent, or else the ap-

pointment will be irregular, and improper, if not invalid.

Under usages like these, it is not marvel that Christian liberty in the churches is little understood and less valued. That which is not to be used more than once or twice in an age, will be little prized, and seldom looked after, and preserved from decay. Imagine a religious community constantly using those rights—doing so whenever the work appropriate to their exercise was to be performed—imagine a church whose activity was its own, and not another's—a church known as an acting body, and not an inert mass, to be acted upon, and you have then conceived of a church in which the liberty, the purity, and the efficiency of a New Testament church will have become possible in the nature of things.

PRAYER MEETING.

1

Pray, brethren, pray!
To God who heareth prayer,
And o'er us, night and day,
Extends his care;
Through all the earth he reigns,
With sovereign sway,
And truth and right maintains;
Pray, brethren, pray!

2

Pray, brethren, pray,
For powerful foes invade,
Temptations lure astray;
Pray—pray for aid;
The hosts of hell and sin
Beset our way;
Before—around—within—
Pray, brethren, pray!

3

Pray, brethren, pray,
In Zion's sorrowing hour;
While dangers strike dismay,
And tempests lower,
Her Savior's outstretched arm
Shall be her stay,
Shall shelter her from harm;
Pray, brethren, pray!

4

Pray, brethren, pray!
Pray for the poor, the oppress'd,
Whom Pride and Av'rice slay,
Despis'd—distress'd.
Immortal man, for gold,
Is stolen away!
Your Maker's image sold!
Pray, brethren, pray!

5

Pray, brethren, pray!
Pray for a world in chains;
Where Moloch holds his sway;
Where Mammon reigns;
Where Lust, Revenge and blood,
Bedim the day;
And Falsehood, like a flood—
Pray, brethren, pray!

6

Pray, brethren, pray!
See Anti-Christ enthron'd—

A priest-hood bearing away,
By heaven disown'd;
At Babylon they rail,
Yet through her way,
And God's own truth assail—
Pray, brethren, pray!

7

Pray, brethren, pray!
Pray, for ye needs must fight,
Must stand in firm array,
For God and right.
Messiah's matchless might
Must win the day;
Your Shield—your Life—your Life—
Pray, brethren, pray!

8

Pray, brethren, pray,
But pray in Jesus' name;
To-day as yesterday,
And still the same.
The glorious hosts of heav'n,
His will obey;
All power to him is given;
Pray, brethren, pray!

9

Pray, brethren, pray!
His promise seize, by faith
Whose word the winds obey!
Hear what he saith;
As surely as I live,
Unboured away,
To my own Son I give.
Pray, brethren, pray!

10

Pray, brethren, pray!
To God doth power belong;
That power must prayer convey,
Through weakness strong.
On him take hold afresh,
Make no delay!
Trust not on arm of flesh,
Pray, brethren, pray!

11

Pray, brethren, pray!
All hearts are in his hand;
As waters flow away,
At his command,
Ev'n so shall stubborn kings,
Subdu'd, obey,
And hide beneath his wings;
Pray, brethren, pray!

12

Pray, brethren, pray—
"I will not let thee go."
Till thou, at break of day,
Thou boon bestow.
Your lives beneath the Cross,
As off'rings lay,
And count them dung and dross;
Pray, brethren, pray!

13

Pray, brethren, pray!
Pray on, and never cease.
He comes, with dawning day!
The Prince of Peace!
Dominions! thrones and powers!
Give way! give way!
This conqu'ring King is ours,
Pray, brethren, pray!

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Proprietor,
Horseville, Ontario county, N. Y.
Printed at the Countryman Office; Perth.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. Vol. III.—No. 5. }
WHOLE NUMBER, 37.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MAY, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix. 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

A person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, he shall have two copies for his services;—Or,
if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Each of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Per dozen, \$0 50 Sixty papers, \$3 00
Per single paper, 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters en-
closed for papers.

CHURCH FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE- HOLDERS.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON RE-
VIEWER, OCTOBER, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE
PRINCETON WHIG, JAN., 31, 1845.

[Continued.]

CHURCH FELLOWSHIP WITH THE WICKED.

Another extract from this writer we will re-
ceive further testimony of the Biblical Re-
viewer to the truthfulness of the sentiment,
"If slaveholding be sinful, it is, of course,
wrong to retain religious fellowship with in-
corrigible slaveholders. So that, granting
the premises to be true, in their affirmation
that slaveholding is sinful, abolitionists are
not to be charged with fanaticism, intolerance
or proscription, for withholding fellowship
from slaveholders.

"But let a man adopt the opinion that 'slave-
holding is a heinous crime in the sight of
God, and what is the result? Then he must
brand every slaveholder as a criminal, to be
denounced and treated accordingly; no mat-
ter how humble, meek, holy, heavenly minded,
or benevolent, that slaveholder may be—no
matter how parental in the treatment of his
slaves, how assiduous in their religious im-
provement, how anxious to secure their prop-
erty for freedom, he is, by the mere fact
of holding slaves, proved to be a hypocrite, a
merciless and wicked man." p. 3.

Passing over the ludicrous self-contradic-
tions of this picture—the humility and the
weakness that lords it over an equal brother—
the justice that invades inalienable rights, the
mercilessness that forcibly holds a man in a
condition in which no conceivable circumstan-
ce would induce the aggressor to place him-
self—passing over, likewise, the gross absur-
dity (attested by the highest southern author-
ities, ecclesiastical and civil, to be such,) of
attempting to prepare a man for freedom,
while retaining him in bondage; we let the
paragraph stand as the writer's testimony, that

if slaveholding be sinful, we are obliged to
consider the unrepentant and incorrigible slave
holder an ungodly and wicked man! What
rules they have, either at Princeton or at An-
dover, to determine whether or no, men are
"humble, meek, holy, heavenly minded, just,
and benevolent," abolitionists need not stop
to inquire. It may be an assent to this
CREED, or to that. It may be the profession
or the exhibition of emotions of this descrip-
tion or that. It may be a submission to pro-
scribed rituals and the authority of "our
Church." It may be a sad countenance and
a disfigured face. It may be, compassing sea
and land to make one proselyte. It may be
one, or all of these combined. To an aboli-
tionist, with a Bible in his hand, it makes no
manner of difference what it is. It is suffi-
cient for him that the Savior has said, "*By
their fruits shall ye know them;*" and has
taught, likewise, that the neighbor to him who
fell among thieves was he who showed mercy
upon him.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH.

Another point upon which we wish to re-
cord the testimony (A. D. 1844) of the Bib-
lical Repertory and Princeton Reviewer is
that which relates to the present position of the
principal sects, in respect to this same practice
of Slave holding. That point is one of no
small importance, and is becoming the one
chiefly contested, in our recent Conventions,
on the subject of anti-slavery secessions and
re-organization in the Church. Not a few are
trying to persuade themselves that the sects to
which they adhere are substantially agreed
with abolitionists in the principles they hold,
however widely their measures may diverge
from them, or however lacking they may be in
any measures at all. What say the Doctors at
Princeton?

"No Church (i. e. denomination of Chris-
tians) of any consideration for members, has
adopted the principle that Slave holders, as
such, should be excluded from Christian com-
munion. The Congregationalists of New
England, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians,
the Baptists, the Methodists, have, one and all,
refused to sanction THE UNSCRIPTURAL DOC-
TRINE ON WHICH THE WHOLE STRUCTURE OF
MORAL ABOLITION RESTS." Now we con-

Just notice here that it is "MORAL" abolition (not
political merely) that these prominent sects have refused
to sanction. "Moral abolition" then—is all out of place.
And this is, of course, involved in the position that
Slavery does not present a proper subject of Church ac-
tion. The Church takes cognizance of the morals of its
members, without a question.

sider it little less than preposterous to assume
that a mere fraction of the great family of
Christians should, on a simple question of
morals be in the right, and the great mass of
their brethren, with the same advantages for
forming a correct judgment, in the wrong!"—
(page 7.) [The Methodist Advocate and Jour-
nal, by the by, has very recently affirmed the
same thing so far as that sect is concerned.]

We shall not stop to discuss with the Prin-
ceton Reviewer, the doctrine of deciding ques-
tions of simple morality by majorities, and
votes of the uplifted hand. On such a basis,
we would give up the controversy at once, to-
gether with our Protestant principles, our re-
ligion, and all pretensions of retaining a spir-
itual nature or a moral existence in any indi-
vidual capacity, or in opposition to the popular
voice, or the decision of the Church! We
confess ourselves "preposterous" enough to
avoid the thronged broad way, and prefer the
narrow gate of the few. But we call upon the
Princeton Reviewer to bear witness, as indeed
he has done, that while believing, as we do, in
the sinfulness of Slave holding, there is—by
his own showing, no proper foundation for our
continued church fellowship or communion
with the sects he enumerates. I am obliged
—as he had before shown—to cease holding
fellowship with Slave holders. And he now
adds that I cannot do this, while retaining a
connection with the Congregationalists, the
Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Baptists,
or the Methodists!—We ardently hope that all
the members of those sects who believe Slave
holding to be sinful, will be convinced by the
Princeton Reviewer, if they will not be con-
vinced by us, that they stand in an anomalous
and guilty position. They must give up the
distinctive "doctrine" of "moral abolitionism"
that slave holding is sinful, or cease holding
fellowship with slave holders, by remaining
in those sects!

But may we not have been mistaken, in our
fundamental principle, after all?—Are we
quite certain that slaveholding is sinful? Set-
tle that question, and no other ground of con-
troversy concerning our Church relations can
remain. Thus much, we think, the Princeton
Reviewer has conclusively proved. At any
rate, he perfectly agrees with us, on that point,

A NOVEL DISTINCTION.

We have said that the writer under review
has, in substance repeated the argument of
Prof. Hodge, in 1836. That pamphlet is now
before us. On one point, if we remove

ber correctly, there is, however, a note worthy difference between the present article and the former one. A distinction is now attempted to be set up that was not, perhaps, so clearly apprehended, if at all, when the first defence of Slaveholding was written. Be that as it may, we will state, briefly, the distinction which is made prominent in the present essay.

The writer distinguishes between slaveholders and the Slave laws. The former, he says, is not sinful. He nevertheless says—"we utterly repudiate the charge that we are the advocates of the Slave Laws of the South, because we hold that slaveholding itself is not a crime." (p. 21.) He repudiates too, the charge of sustaining "American Slavery" and complains of the very title page of one of the works, he reviews, because it reads thus—"A Review of Dr. Junkin's Synodical Speech, in defence of American Slavery," (page 21.)—And again, "The want (he says) of discrimination between these entirely distinct things, SLAVEHOLDING and the SLAVE LAWS, we firmly believe, is the cause of a great part of the difference of sentiment that exist on this subject," (pg. 20.)

IMPORTANT ADMISSION.

The writer admits, too, that "moral and intellectual culture should be extended to Slaves, and the road of improvement be left open to them." (pages 2-3.) He admits also that "the master is bound by the principle that the laborer is worthy of his hire," and that this principle includes "the right of the Slave to accumulate" and hold property! (page 23.) He denies also "that a master has a right, in virtue of his ownership, to prevent his Slaves marrying or to separate them when married, or to keep them in ignorance, or to debar them from the means of grace. He says again.

"It follows, necessarily, from what has been said, that all those laws which are designed to restrict the master from the discharge of the duties which flow from his relation to his slaves, which forbid his teaching them to read, or which prohibit marriage among them, or which allows the separation of those who are married, or which renders insecure the possession of their earnings, or otherwise conflict with the word of God, are wicked laws."

A PREPOSTEROUS ATTEMPT.

To make clean work of it, the writer labors hard to make it appear that the sanction of the principle of human chattelhood is not involved in the practice of Slave holding. And albeit, he had undertaken to draw a broad line of distinction between slaveholding (which he holds to be innocent) and the slave laws (many of which he admits to be wicked) he nevertheless seems to forget himself in this place, so far as to elaborate an earnest defence of the

Slave laws, just there, where their "cardinal principle" is involved! He says—

"Under no system of slave laws that ever existed is a Slave regarded otherwise than a person—that is, as an intelligent moral agent. Those very laws, atrocious as they often are, by holding the Slave responsible for his acts, suppose him to be a human being. (page 8.)

By the side of this adventurous statement, we will place the Slave laws.

"Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." Law of S. Carolina.

"A Slave is one who is in the power of a master, to whom he belongs." Louisiana code.

"THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLE of Slavery, that the Slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings but among things, as an article of property, a chattel, obtains is undoubted law, in all of these states."—Stroud.

"The dominion of the master is as unlimited as that which is tolerated, by the laws of any civilized community, in relation to brute animal, to quadrupeds, to use the words of the civil law."—Id.

"That is property which the law declares to be property. The moment the incontestible fact is admitted, that negro Slaves are property, the law of movable property attaches itself to them and secures the right of carrying them from one State to another, where they are recognized as property." Henry Clay [President of the Am. Colonization Society.]

It has been abundantly proved that none of the laws ostensibly protecting the Slaves are of any avail to them. And it is a poor plea that this general principle of their chattelhood is broken with the single exception of the enactment of laws to punish them!

And how are these laws understood, and carried out?

In the Legislature of Virginia, Mr. Gohlston said—"Why! I really have been under the impression that I owned my Slaves. I lately purchased four women and ten children, in whom I thought I had a great bargain, for I really supposed they were my property, as were my brood mares."

In the House of Representatives of the U. States—Mr. Wise said—The right of petition belongs to the people of the U. States, Slaves are not people, in the eye of the law. They have no personality.

Mr. Vanderpool of V. Y. said—"Slaves had no more human right to be heard than horses and dogs."

The argument of the Biblical Repository, to be available, must go to the extent of affirming that the laws subjecting the Slaves to punishment, as responsible persons amount to a nullification and repeal of the laws affirming them to be chattels—in other words, that they destroy the only tenure by which, in this country, Slaves are held, when he gains the assent of Slaveholding Presbyterians to this doctrine, we will admit the force of his argument, so far at least, as the Presbyterian Church is concerned.

Mr. Cushing of Mass. said—"Has any one before to-day, ever dreamed that the appellation 'the people' embraced 'Slaves?' As a northern man, I would not submit to it!

"Resolved 'That Slaves do not possess the right of petition secured to the people of the U. States, by the Constitution.'" Adopted 102-18. Feb. 11, 1837.

Who but the "fanatical abolitionists"—what other Churches—what other Ministers—their, have rebuked these blasphemers! And now, the Biblical Repository, with modest face, comes forward and denies that the infamous doctrine has been held, even in law! It does thus, while "repudiating the charge that he is the advocate of the Slave laws of the South!" To escape the infamy of their advocacy, he will even deny that they exist! Well! We are glad, in any way, to find evidence that such writers, have consciences, and are becoming susceptible of shame.

OF PROPERTY IN SLAVES.

On the strength of this convenient denial of the "cardinal features" of the Slave Code, the writer coolly undertakes to correct abolitionists in their statements concerning property in Slaves. He proceeds to say—

"Abolitionists impose upon themselves and others by not defining what they mean by property and by not determining the sense in which one man can be said to be the property of another man. Property is simply the right of possession and use—the right of having and using. From the necessity of the case, as we see from the laws of God, this right must vary according to the nature of the object. If a man has property in land, he must use it as land. If he has property in an animal, he can only use it as an animal; and if he has property in a man, he can only use him as a man. And as the use he may make of an animal is regulated by his nature and by the laws of God, so his property in a man gives him no right to treat him contrary to his nature or to act toward him with injustice. If one man has property in another, he may still treat him as a human being; if he kills him, he is guilty of murder; if he insults or wounds him, he is guilty of cruelty; if he shuts him out from the gospel, he will find the blood of souls on his hands; if he keep him in ignorance, he is guilty of gross injustice." page 24

After remarking upon the distinction between the power to do a thing, and the right to do it, the writer proceeds—

"The only right of property which a man has, or can have, in another, is a right to his services, just as his right of property in a horse, is a right to have and use him as a horse. And as the obligation arises out of ownership, in the latter case to provide for the wants of the horse as a sentient creature, the obligation arises out of the ownership, in the former case, to provide for the wants of the man not only as a sentient, but as rational, moral, social, and immortal being. And as the man who, on the plea of ownership, should neglect

wants of his horse would be self-condemning to the man who, on a similar plea, neglects infinitely more pressing wants of his slave, a rational creature, will be condemned by the united judgment of God and man. [page 9]

Mark that I reflecting reader! And notice the right of "ownership" even in this *her* view, includes the right of the master (included in his duty)—to provide such religious culture and instruction as he judges proper for his equal fellow man! Remarkable! the religious liberties of the christian slavehood must needs be, under the kind direction of a priesthood, educated at Princeton, under such "Biblical" teaching as these! King in Romanism certainly, can go beyond the spiritual despotism of the authority claimed to belong rightfully to each and every master of a Slave! Whatever his master or principles may be, he is an absolute Pope!

What if the wants of the man, as a "rational, moral and immortal being," should be to include the recognition of his inalienable rights to life, liberty, pursuit of happiness, right of investigation—*self-control*?—or if it should include his right to locomotion—choice of residence, employers, teachers, disposition of his own time, and the direction of his own faculties, instead of having his time and knowledge dealt out to him, at discretion of his "owner" as his horse receives his allowance of oats—with just as much self-direction of his powers as a horse of his? Should the Princeton Doctors be to admit the reality of spiritual necessities of this sort, by what new modification of right of property in man, would they meet the demand of public sentiment, then? Let us hear our oracle, as he proceeds—

If abolitionists could disabuse their minds of crude ideas on the subject of property, they might find they had almost lost their stock in trade, they would at least be satisfied of understanding what they were writing about, and might be induced to wiser measures for the accomplishment of their object."

By Slave holding, we understand one to have the right of property in another; and by the right of property we understand the right of having and using a thing, according to its nature; and consequently the right of property in man, can be nothing more than the right to use him as a man." (p. 21.)

CRUDE IDEAS OF PROPERTY.

We are inclined to think the Princeton writer would find his dear slaveholding brethren in the South quite as slow as the abolitionists to understand and admit his ideas of "proper man." It is a "right," in the first place, the services of the Slave. Of this right, the Slave master becomes possessed, by the fact of becoming a Slave holder. But

then the slave is entitled to wages, notwithstanding, for all his subsequent services, on the principle that "the laborer is worthy of his hire." So says the writer, and in saying it, concedes, evidently that wages are his *rightful due*,—that of course, he has a right to dispose of his labor—to make his own contracts for labor or refuse making them—and (as the writer expressly admits) a right to the accumulated avails of his labor—a right to hold property—as much as he can earn—a right which cannot be invaded, without criminality, by the master.

All this would be marvellous enough, truly, in the eyes of an American slaveholder!—And how is this right of the Slave to his earnings to be reconciled with the right of the person of whom he was purchased to dispose of him to the man for whom he now labors—and of whom he receives wages? What did he part with, when the "property" was "transferred?" For our oracle informs us that this "property" may be "transferred"—remarking sagely—"However, I can only give what I possess." And he goes on to argue that the title of the present race of Slave holders is not rendered invalid, on account of the felonious possession of the first holders! [Sad contrast between the ethics of Princeton Theology, and the ethics of the "Common Law!"] What then, by his showing is the "right" that was and that is, transferred with every sale of a Slave? Can it be any thing more than the right to employ the Slave at fair wages, in case he shall consent to the bargain? If he says the consent of the Slave is not necessary how does he retain for him the right to his wages? If he may not dispose of them, they cannot be his—and his right to wages and accumulation falls to the ground.

If this difficulty could be got over, then, along with the right to command the Slave's Services, by paying him wages—there might also be the right to "provide for him," at discretion, the supply of knowledge and religion, before stated. But this would be all. The man pays his money for a Slave—but then owes the Slave fair wages for all his labor, afterwards! Of their "crude ideas on the subject of property," community in general, (as well as abolitionists) will be in a fair way to be "disabused" by this luminous teaching! Whatever also the Princeton Doctors may successfully teach, the commercial world, and particularly slaveholders, will not be likely,

"In judging of customs, strength of reason is to be considered, and not length of time." "All customs or prescriptions which are against reason are void."—"Where the foundation is weak, the structure falls." "What is invalid from the beginning, cannot be made valid by length of time." (Littleton—Noyes—Coke, &c.) And this agrees with the Bible, which forbids us to follow a multitude, even though they be our ancestors, to do evil.

very soon, to take lessons from them "on the subject of property." Had bargains, too, the purchasers would make, at this rate, at the prices they commonly give.

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

Seriously—what are we to think of a writer who—for such a purpose—and in such a connection—discourses in this way? Is he in earnest, or in sport?—Is he true to his own convictions of right? Or does he labor artfully to mystify and mislead? He is writing against American Abolitionists, and ostensibly in favor of the Slave holding that they condemn? He brings heavy charges against them—he believes their "fundamental principles to be false; and their spirit fanatical"—and he does so on the ground that they believe and teach that "Slaveholding is a great sin, and consequently that Slaveholders should not be admitted to the Communion of the Church, and that slavery should immediately, under all circumstances, and regardless of all consequences, be abolished." He admits, nay he contends, that in case slaveholding is "a heinous crime" then no prudential considerations should stand in the way of its immediate abandonment—that to tarry otherwise "shocks the moral sense" is "unfaithful—base in itself"—and obviously characteristic of "BAD MEN!"—Nevertheless, he thinks it a sufficient evidence of the censoriousness—"denunciation—malevolence—complete moral derangement—exasperation" &c., of the abolitionists, and of the "fiery bitter, and abusive" spirit of their publications, that believing, (as they do) slave holding to be "a heinous crime"—they do accordingly call upon transgressors to repent of the crime, lest it prove the "ruin of their souls," and that they do, accordingly, refuse to hold religious fellowship with those who will not to repent of the "heinous crime" and refuse to acknowledge them as christian men.—

[For it is on this very point, that the writer labors through a number of pages, showing evidently enough where the sore place lies—the very spot where the arrow of divine truth has taken effect, producing an "exasperation" that is no fiction, just as divine truth always "exasperates" men, when it is not cordially received.]

Upon what ground, then, could such sweeping charges against abolitionists (expressed as they were, with such remarkable sweetness, such exemplary mildness) be sustained? On no other ground, certainly, than that Slave holding is not sinful. So the matter was understood by the writer himself. And, accordingly, he wades through a long Biblical argument, to prove that slave holding is heaven sanctioned, and not sinful. Having completed this task, to his own satisfaction at least, why

did not the writer lay down his pen? Why not leave the matter where the Biblical Repository left it, in 1836, giving the Southern law makers as well as the *Slave holders* the full benefit of the exposition, to be ground over, fresh from the Princeton mint, into Governor's Messages, and Legislative resolves? Why attempt to draw a line between *slave holding*, and the *slave laws* by which alone the practice is legalized, sanctioned, and defined—defending the former, but condemning the latter?—Why? Let the onward, resistless, dreaded, hated, yet reluctantly followed march of “modern abolitionism,” or rather, of *gospel truth*, reveal the ‘open secret!’ The bloody code of Slavery, through the labors of abolitionists, is too well understood, now to be defended, in the gross, even at Princeton; though the disposition to palliate, excuse, and explain away its “cardinal principle” of human chattelhood, is obvious enough, as already noticed!

A NEW SORT OF “SLAVE HOLDING.

The “slave holding,” then defended by the Biblical repositories at Princeton, is a slave holding *without* the principles of human chattelhood, a “slave holding” that “*treats no man contrary to his nature*”—a slave holding that does not annul marriage—a slave holding that does not “separate husbands and wives, children and parents”—a slave holding that carries with it the duty of providing for the instruction and religious wants of the Slave—a slaveholding by which “the road of improvement is left open” to the slave—a slaveholding that recognizes the slave’s right to wages and binds the master to the principle that “the laborer is worthy of his hire”—a slave holding that recognizes “the right to accumulate property,” as following necessarily from the “right to compensation.”

So says the writer, and he adds—“It follows necessarily, from what has been said, that all those laws which are designed to restrict the master in the discharge of the duties which flow from his relation to his Slaves; which forbid his teaching them to read, or which prohibit marriage among them, or which allows the separation of those who are married, or which render *insecure their earnings*, or otherwise conflict with the road of God, are wicked laws.”

So then, the “slave holding” that the Princeton expositors have discovered, to be sanctioned by the Scriptures is diametrically opposed, by their own showing, to the slave holding that is sanctioned by the *American Slave Code*, which is therefore a code of wicked laws!—So we supposed! Thus abolitionists have taught all along, and for the teaching have been proscribed as “moral maniacs.” All this the Princeton Doctors might have learned, years ago, from the Lectures of A. A. Phelps, or the Bible Argument of T. D. Weld. They have learned it from the rising abolitionism of

the country and cannot help themselves, nor prevent a supreme and all controlling Providence from using them as the unwitting instrument of propagating the truths they alternately decide and concede! On one page the abolitionists are represented by them as being in “conflict with the Bible” because they will not admit the Bible sanction of *slave holding*! On the next, we have a definition of what is claimed to be scriptural slave holding, presenting in every feature, the well known opposite characteristics of all the slave holding that exists in this country and which abolitionists oppose! For such reluctant yet decisive testimony to the correctness of their original position, abolitionists may well thank God and take courage! See a further illustration, to this point.

“When therefore—says the same writer, ‘we speak of *buying and selling men*, all that is or can be meant is the transfer of this *right of Service*, a right of necessity limited and defined by the nature of the being whose services are to be rendered.’ (p. 10.) That is the right, as before shown, or the transfer of the right, to employ a man on condition of paying to the man himself, his stipulated wages, to be secured to him,—the transfer being of course, made with his own free consent.

That this is the Bible sense of “buying and selling men”—(as well as the popular sense of “buying and selling” German redemptioners, so called, to pay their passage money, on emigration to Philadelphia,) abolitionists have all along taught, and have been defamed as “infidels” for their teaching! But the Biblical Repository attests the correctness of the exposition, after all! What the slave holders mean by “buying and selling men” women and children, the country understands, now, and no affirmation of the Princeton writer that *they can not mean any thing more than he has above described*, will avail to nullify facts.

Removing from the definition of “Slave holding” all that this writer admits to be *sinful*, what feature of American slave holding have we left? Aside from the impracticable and nugatory feature of having a claim by the purchase of a man, to *command* his services without his consent, while admitting *wages*, to be his *due*, there is not one distinctive shred nor particle of *practical* American slave holding left remaining—unless it be right (a practical nullity likewise, in a servant entitled to wages) of deciding for him what kind and amount of *religious instruction* he shall receive. It is quite evident that this writer does not admit the exercise of such a spiritual despotism to be sinful. But he concedes, in detail, all the other distinctive traits of the practice of slave holding to be sinful—to wit, its absolute human chattelhood—its annihilation of marriage, its withholding of wages, its denial of

the right of property, its surrendering of family ties!

SELF CONFUTATION.

Wherein then, have abolitionists so misrepresented? The slave holding that they have denounced is notoriously characterized by its features. Were they lacking in a due regard for the Bible, because they denied that it lent its sanction to practices which the Princeton writer himself admits to be sinful? They have always taken great pains, from the beginning to define the slave holding they opposed, by these characteristic features—by its own code. This, the writer well understands. And of this he complains. “What the abolitionists, for the most part, condemn”—he—“the true objects of their moral disapprobation, is not slave holding, but the slave laws, and what the other part vindicate as not necessarily inconsistent with the will of God, is slave holding and not the slave laws of any other country. It is the want of distinction between these entirely distinct SLAVE HOLDING AND the SLAVE LAWS, we believe, is the cause of the great part of the difference of sentiment which exists on the subject.” (p. 20.)

It is certainly unfortunate for the less clerical opponents of the fanatical and ignorant abolitionists that this important distinction, along with the discovery of their own misapprehension of the *wicked slave laws*, was not obtained an earlier and a more decided judgment upon their own consciousness, at an earlier date in the literature of their instructions to their less discriminating brethren. It might have given to the whole controversy, a widely different turn. But admitting the honest sincerity of the distinction now made; and admitting, for the moment and for the argument’s sake, all the correctness and all the value that can be claimed to that distinction, we put it to the common sense and candor of the writer to say whether, *his own showing*, there is any kindness, or justice, in connexion with the foregoing concession, to renew against the abolitionists wholesale and bitter charges that this article contains? If the writer’s statements of his own views and of the views of abolitionists are to be depended upon—what becomes of those charges and of the assumptions on which they are based?

If that which abolitionists oppose, be chattelizing of human beings, the annihilation of marriage, the severing of families, the withholding of wages, the denial of the right of property—the heathenizing of immortal souls—(and their troublesome declamations have been sufficiently explicit on these topics)—the Princeton Reviewer understands them,

factly, as he evidently does, in this matter—and if he too agrees with them, in condemning and denouncing what they condemn and denounce [and this is his profession] how comes it to pass that he is still displeased with their denunciations of those wicked practices! How can he say that he believes their “fundamental principles to be false” and their “spirit fanatical!” How is it made to appear that they do not bow to the authority of the Scriptures, if after all, as by the writers own showing, their denunciations are levelled against the things which the Bible condemns! Is it for mere verbal difference—a mere mistake in the use of technicalities that they are so frantically charged with “complete moral derangement?” Are they made offenders for a word! And is this the brotherly example of those who would win them from the error of undue severity and “course, authoritative dealing?”

Will it be said (recalling the condemnation of their principles) that abolitionists are to be severely condemned on account of their extreme “measures?” The Princeton Reviewer is not the man who stands in the position to say that! Most full and explicit testimony has he borne to the sentiment, that if those whom the abolitionists denounce are guilty of “a heinous crime” then the most severe “measures” of which he complains, are not only warranted but required by “moral honesty” by fidelity to God, and by faithfulness to immortal souls! On what grounds, then, we demand boldly, can the Reviewer justify the representations he has made of the abolitionists?

THE NEW DISTINCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS.

Can he do it on the ground that the specific sins which they reprove—admitted by the Reviewer, to be sins—are not sins that find a prominent place in the fixed records and current history of the age and nation in which they live? Aye and in the *Church and Ministry* they have undertaken to exhort to repentance?

No! He cannot! Admitting to him, for the present, all the benefit he can derive from his distinction between slave holding, and the slave laws—admitting, for the arguments sake, the innocency of the former and the wickedness of the latter, his argument cannot be made out. The distinction cannot avail him one whit. For it still remains true that the Churches and Ministry of the prominent sects do practice and do MAINTAIN or tolerate in their communions the very things that the writer himself admits to be sinful!

Be it so, if he pleases, that they do not sin in the act of slave holding—the act which he describes under that name. What then?

They do use their neighbour service without wages. They do fail to recognize their right of holding property—They do abrogate marriage. They do separate families. They do heathenize immortal souls. They do, by compulsion and intimidation, do all this. And in doing it, they do, as a matter of fact, use their fellow men, not “according to their nature” but as beasts—as “chattels, personal.” And if it were true, as the Reviewer will have it, that they could be slave holders, in this country, without doing these things, then it only makes their conduct the more inexcusable, and their characters the more abominable and odious. They have then, no cloak for their sins, if the slave laws do not compel them. Their grand plea, in times past, has been the necessity laid upon them by these laws. But that plea, according to the Princeton Reviewer, they can not rightfully make.—He says they *might* be slave holders without committing any of the sins he enumerates?—But, *do they not*, nevertheless, commit them? That is the question.—We affirm that they do: and in our next number the proof shall be produced. And this proof, when produced, (as the reader will perceive) will be a proof that Church fellowship ought to be withdrawn from incorrigible slave holders, and the Churches that tolerate their practices:—even upon the principles that the Biblical Repertory has laid down.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, MAY, 1846.

CONGREGATIONALISM AND CHURCH ACTION, with the PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN UNION, &c. By JOHN KEEP. Pastor of a Congregational Church in Hartford, Trumbull Co. (Ohio). N. York: S. W. Benedict & Co. 1845—pp. 143.

We have received and perused a Copy of this work. As a whole, it quite meets the expectations we had been led to entertain concerning it. That a work on Church organization &c. should have been written by a “regularly ordained” minister, of the age, reputation, and high standing of Mr. Keep—so nearly agreeing with the “ultraisms” we have so recently broached, and doing us the honor of extracting so copiously from our writings, is certainly more than we could have expected to witness, in our day. But great progress has been making, for two or three years past. The discussions between Presbyterians and Puseyists, together with the outrageous action of ecclesiastical bodies, affording timely illustrations of their despotic and aristocratical character, have done ten fold more than the friends of a thorough church reform could have done, to arouse and instruct the public

mind. These developments have not been lost upon Mr. Keep. The peculiar theological tenets he espouses have been authoritatively proscribed, and their promulgators, while acknowledged to be eminently pious men, have been subjected to the ostracism of a bigotted persecution from bodies of clergy who have lacked the ability or the courage to grapple with their supposed or real errors on the arena of a fair debate.* Mr. Keep has seen and felt too, the power of Presbyterian “accommodation” over the Congregational Churches that have been so unreasonably confiding as to take shelter under its wing. Of this he gives us, in this book, an instructive account. He has been compelled to discover the wide departures of Congregationalists, in and out of New England, from Congregationalism—the mortifying distinction between the sect, and the principles that gave the sect its name. Hence the radical features of the work he has now produced.

The grand outlines of local church independence, christian unity, and equal brotherhood, are distinctly traced in this work of Mr. Keep. The pastor, according to him, must be a member of the Church and subject to trial by his brethren of the laity. Of the clerical claim of being tried by their “peers” of the ministerial body, the writer speaks in terms of merited and caustic severity, contrasting that ecclesiastical usage with those that obtain in civil jurisprudence, and inquiring whether “the deacon, the merchant, the judge, the lawyer, the general, the rich, the scholar, the poor,” shall also be privileged to be tried by a jury of the same grade? Of Presbyteries, consociations, and associations (quoting the language of Dr. Emmons) Mr. Keep speaks in the same terms that we have often used, and he says—“The full practice of strict Congregational principles at the present day, would be regarded as the introduction of dangerous innovations.” To this he adds—“The Churches need to inquire whether it is best for them to act up to their principles, or permit them to be reduced to abstractions. The public mind is waking up to the belief that Christ has instituted Church government, and both described and defined it.” Mr. Keep, advocates likewise, the exercise of free speech in the Churches, in opposition to the monopoly of a clerical caste. The commanding influence and bearing of ecclesiastical polity upon civil as well as religious

*We say this without endorsing, in full, the Oberlin doctrine of perfection, which is the point in dispute. The statements of the late Dr. Emmons, we confess are more clear and satisfactory to our own mind. This may be because we have long been accustomed to them. But from this standpoint of observation, it seems to us that many who oppose the Oberlin doctrine are more erroneous than they. And those who agree with Emmons, have been placed under the same ecclesiastical ban, with the Oberlin brethren, thus excluding virtually, many old churches in New England.

freedom is not unobserved nor omitted by the author, who clearly shows the origin of democratic institutions in the usages of Congregational Church independency.

There are some minor points connected with Church order, in respect to which we might query or criticize the statements and views of Mr. Keep, but these points are fewer and of less prominence than we could have anticipated, before hand. That two persons of such different training should have arrived at so nearly the same conditions on so many topics included in this vast subject, at so early a stage of the investigating process upon which in common with many others, we have but just entered, is encouraging to ourselves, and a token, we think, of the clearness and unanimity with which the whole subject will, ere long, be viewed, by the great body of earnest and active believers. Perhaps it might not be amiss, in this connexion, to note the few points alluded to, as to matters requiring—it may be, some further explanation, or revision.

1. *Relations between Churches and Churches.* In our own view, we confess, this topic, so prominent with our fathers, has almost been lost sight of, in the principle that each individual, is to be received or rejected by other individual and by churches, not according to the ecclesiastical connexion they may have held, but according to the characters which, on the whole, they are found to exhibit. Mr. Keep says—

"The right of examination extends to persons coming from other Churches. This right is not always exercised, and persons are more generally received on the credit of their certificates of good and regular standing in the churches, they have left. This practice promotes confidence and harmony between Churches." (pp. 23.)

But has it not likewise promoted laxity and carelessness in the admission of members?—Is it always practicable to know the characters of Churches granting letters of recommendation? Ought the Letter, in any case, to be weighed for any thing more than one item in the evidence sought? Is not the essence of fellowship and reception of members wrapped up and comprized in the idea of Christian character perceived? Can the mere Letter, of itself constitute this, or ought it to supersede it? Or can strict local church independency consist with the practice that commonly prevails? A practice that suspends the constituent elements of one church upon the action of other churches and often distant and unknown ones?—Again.

"The mutual interests and relations between churches require that they watch over each other in the Spirit of fraternal counsel and admonition."

We may have been too jealous of this principle of church watch care over churches, from our acquaintance with the fact that conso-

lationism has grown out of the doctrine. It may have been by a perversion of the principle, nevertheless. We cannot doubt the original and inalienable right of every Christian and of every Christian assembly, to bear a faithful testimony against all that is wrong in other Christians and Christian assemblies, admonishing them, in love, to embrace fully, the true and the right. This must be all that Mr. Keep intends: For he says—

"It is no part of the design of Congregationalism that Churches shall be free from responsibility to each other, not indeed as Courts of review and control, but on the simple principle of brotherly love, ready at all times to give and to receive advice and condolence." (pp. 37.)

2. *Of Councils.*—"The advice of a mutual council, as it is the decision of the highest and ultimate ecclesiastical tribunal, cannot be disregarded and rejected without grief and injury to the whole body of Christians in fellowship, and a rejection should never occur, but on the most serious and conscientious grounds." (pp. 37.)

This is a true statement of the existing doctrine of Congregationalists—perhaps an extract from their Standards. But is an advisory Council an "ecclesiastical tribunal?" Is its advice to be regarded as a "decision?" If so, what becomes of the fundamental doctrine of Congregationalism that the church is, itself, "the highest (the only) the ultimate ecclesiastical tribunal?" Advice, especially when invited, should indeed have its just weight. But an independent Church, asking and receiving "advice," is only taking the requisite step towards its own "decision."

3. *Majorities.* Mr. Keep states, on page 27, the commonly received doctrine of church government by majorities. We are not prepared to say that it is not correct. We should not have questioned it, had not a remarkably able and lucid but antiquated English work, some time ago, fallen into our hands, in which the writer, an Independent Minister, describes and defends the doctrine of unanimity in Church action, as an essential attribute (however seemingly impracticable) of the church independency of his times. Much mischief is often done, by pressing church action on mere majorities. We note the topic here, only as deserving further inquiry.

4. *Deacons.* "The Deacon is the Pastor's assistant; and although in a subordinate office, he is expected to perform duties of a high religious nature, and not to be confined to the temporalities of the Church." "This office is distinct from that of Pastor or Teacher, and it is a mistake when the churches permit the Deacon to supersede the Minister." "Dr. Bellamy once remarked, I find that most of the difficulties among the churches are occasioned by the conduct of some wicked Deacon."

Mr. Keep here gives us the commonly received doctrine of Congregationalists, but it may need further inquiry. Were Stephen and Philip ordained Deacons? If so, to what work save that of distributing "the temporalities of the Church?" They preached and baptized:

but this was common to all disciples who had the requisite gifts, without any official stations at all. Their spiritual qualification, Paul specifies, but not their peculiar official work. If Deacons, are *ex officio*, the "assistants" the "subordinates" of the Pastoral office, semi-preachers, too and baptizers, in virtue of their office, and in distinction from the rest of the brotherhood, what hinders the Episcopal interference that they constitute an inferior order of Clergy? Are they not such in fact, though sadly curtailed by the ruling Bishop, under our present Congregational polity? And is not their natural restiveness, (in a position charged with indefinite religious functions which they can scarcely begin to exercise, without seeming to "supersede the Minister") the ground of the difficulties so troublesome to the good Dr. Bellamy? If the deacons should give their account of the matter we might find the charge running in a different direction.—That deacons must not be very active, in religious labors, if they would please the Ministry has grown into a common saying, in New England. What is the remedy? Dr. Miller conclusively proves that the first churches had a plurality of elders, on a perfect equality with each other, in official station, no one "subordinate" to the other, to exercise pastoral functions, whether all of them were stated preachers or not. This would be likely to work better, and leave the deacons to their original work. The elaborate author of "Anti Deacon" succeeded well in proving that there were no assistant or semi-pastors, like our Congregational deacons, in apostolic times, but fails to make out the annihilation of the office entirely, from which we infer its continuance for the great work of distributing to the poor, a work sadly forgotten in these times!

5. *Ministers.* "Intellectual gifts, qualifications, an inward call, and the voice of the people inviting a pastor to exercise these qualities, in their behalf, with his consent, constitute a gospel Minister"—pp. 31.

A true transcript of the current Congregational doctrine—and scripturally correct as describing a gospel minister who is also elected an elder—a pastor. But we hold that a man, called and qualified of God, may be a gospel minister, and do the work of an evangelist, without "the voice of the people"—and without waiting to "confer with flesh and blood"—though he may advise with his brethren, and take "letters of commendation" from them if there be occasion for it.

These, as we said, are smaller matters, but as the public mind is in a progressive forming state, we thought it might be well to notice them, holding ourselves open to conviction, if we are wrong. It is only by a constant and free interchange of thought that true harmony can be perfected.

Our author has clearly shown that Presbyteries, associations, and similar bodies are antirepublican and unscriptural. But after giving a remarkable account of their proscription towards the brethren holding "the Oberlin views" he seems to deprecate divisions, and says "there should exist some proper form of ecclesiastical connexion between them [the Oberlin Faculty] and the Congregational and New School Presbyterian bodies in the country." He adds—"Why should not such a connexion exist? Who will assume the responsibility of preventing it? Why should not the associations and Presbyteries recognize each other as Christian ministers, and share in each others counsels, and bless the churches by a hallowed and peaceful influence?" "Shall a class of men, eminent for their moral and religious worth, intellectual endowments, and literary acquirements, for their Christian character and enterprize and self denial in the cause of humanity, and Christian education, be denied Christian and Ministerial fellowship, by the ecclesiastical and organized religious bodies of the country?" pp. 77.

And on the next page, the writer throws upon those "bodies," the blame of a division, if it takes place. Now we admit that the theological speculations in question, furnish no ground for division. But is it right to sustain ecclesiastical bodies founded on usurpation? And constituting, by their attitude, the bulwarks of American Slavery? What "proper form of ecclesiastical connexion" can exist between Congregationalists and Presbyterians? Has not our Ohio brother been satisfied with "accommodations" of that description, already? These are matters for him and others to ponder. But our sheet is full, and we must abruptly close, by heartily and earnestly commending Mr. Keep's book to the patronage and perusal of our friends and the public.

THE MINISTRY—THE CHURCH.

The following letter is from an esteemed brother, who has been in the ministry, by "regular ordination," as commonly practiced, for a long time. Whether it was designed for publication, we are uncertain, and therefore do not feel at liberty to publish the date and name, as we should be glad to do. But we think it ought not to be lost to our readers, and trust the writer can have no objection to its publication, in this form.

Brother Goodell,
I have been a reader of your paper ever since its publication. Many subjects which you have introduced and discussed in its columns, have been clothed with interest to my mind. Ever since I have stood where I now do, as a teacher in Israel, and been enabled to form some definite and comprehensive views of Protestantism and religion, the notes of Christian Union and of Church reform have tuned to harmony the feelings of my bosom. Perhaps I have not been quite so ultra, or sanguine as others, yet in views and feelings, sufficiently radical to

comport with truth so far as understood by myself. It was on this account, that I thought the holy cause of Christian union endangered by the sentiments and movements of some who stood in the front ranks as its advocates. In the year 1840 I saw that some began to wage an unprofitable war against all visible church organization. God, (said they) is the sole Author of all scriptural organization of Christians by the act of regeneration, and every new born person in a member of Christ's church by virtue of conversion, and any attempt to organize the people of God in a given locality was new vamping the Church of God, and committing sacrilege. Among the prominent advocates of this view was Luther Myrick, who is now gone into eternity: at that time I raised my voice against this position, as the columns of a paper I then edited, will testify. I thought, that it was plain from the Bible that the Apostles secured not only by preaching the gospel but also by visible organization of a Christian brotherhood, as the principle of fundamental doctrine, local and independent Churches, that I was astonished that men like Myrick, Smith, and others should deny it. I thought and do still believe, that the doctrine, that there is one Church on earth, which comprises all the people of God, and the rejection of all local Church organization is opposed to the genius of primitive Christianity, dangerous to religion, and would foster, more or less, if it generally prevailed, an invisible, if not visible popery. I was greatly edified with your part of the discussion on church organization. You solved all mystery and dispelled all darkness, and taught the doctrine of the Bible plainly; so I judged, and I think that it was satisfactory to many readers.

There are a few things in your theory of Church Reform with which I can not agree. The most material is, that there is no appointment of the ministry of the word, separate and distinct among Christians—that one Christian has no more divine right to preach the gospel than his brother Christian. The point which I deem vital is not whether men should be selected and commissioned to preach the gospel, by the laying on of hands, by the grant of a license from an association in an ecclesiastical council, from a Synod, Conference, or Presbytery, or from a local and independent congregation of believers. The form and mode of inducing men into the ministry may be all non-essential to the sacredness and authority, and may not have any higher authority than expediency, order and convenience; yet after all, God in the economy of grace and the gospel Church, may select his own ambassadors and afford them the evidence by his spirit of such choice not granted to every Christian. From the order in the works of God, we are authorized to infer that some order and regularity would exist in his kingdom and church on earth. We find that the church of God is compared in its various departments to the physical form of man, adjusted and organized so that each part shall answer its specific duty and end. If the preaching of the gospel is any part of the church of God, then it is to be performed by a certain member and not by all.

It appears to me, that it is the province of God to call by his spirit, his followers into the ministry, such as are qualified for the station, and that he affords as clear an evidence of this intention and claim upon the Christian designed for this purpose, as the evidences of a man's conversion to God. An internal call to the ministry is not sentimentalism, nor mysticism, but rational, religious, and scriptural. Paul had such undeniable evidences that he was a "chosen vessel" to preach the gospel that he had no need of conferring with man on this subject; but we do not learn that all the Saints of Antioch had such a call, yet doubtless, they enjoyed the testimony of the spirit in their heart. We read in Eph. 4. 11, 12. "And he gave some, Apostles; and some Prophets; and some Evangelists; and some pastors, and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the Ministry; for the edifying of the body of Christ." All those orders and grades in the primitive Churches were essential to the perfecting of the saints and the edification of pious believers. Although supernatural gifts were only bestowed on men for peculiar objects and the peculiar age, yet it is not therefore inferable that the preaching and teaching of the word have become obsolete, together with its necessity. If ever it was necessary that the gospel should be preached, it is so now; and if there were grades in the brotherhood of the church for specific purposes we dare not assert these have ceased, without incontestable proof. With these few remarks, desultory and hasty, I close, by enclosing the \$1 for the payment of the paper.

Your brother for a free and full gospel.

EDITOR'S REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING.

The difference between our views, and those of our esteemed brother, is not probably as wide as he supposes, if indeed there be any difference at all. It may be that he will not hold to all our views, even after we explain

them. But we hardly know what point in his letter (if we understand him) is contrary to our views. Our brother mistakes us, entirely if he supposes that we hold all Christians to be equally qualified or equally called to preach the gospel. There are doubtless diversities of gifts, and men are responsible for the use of what they have, and not for the use of what they have not, and have not the means of possessing. God doubtless intends that some Christians should devote their lives mainly to the work of preaching the gospel—but he does not intend that all Christians should do so, which would be impracticable, and needless, even if all were equally well qualified, which they are not.

But all this does not, as we think, militate against our sentiment that all Christians, according to the measure of their gifts and attainments, and according to their opportunities, ability, and occasion, under the providence of God, should be teachers of divine truth, preachers of the word. It is only on this principle that "lay exhortation," Sabbath School instruction, or even parental instruction could be justified. And we know that some hold views of the ministry unfavorable to activities of this sort, though we are sure our excellent brother does not. On this principle Paul told the Hebrew converts in general that it was "time they ought to be teachers." On this principle the dispersed disciples "went every where preaching the word." On this principle, we insist upon it that there should be no authoritative restriction upon Christian preaching, no monopoly of the privilege, by a Clerical caste as we know there was none in the apostolic period nor for a long time afterwards.—Be it so that the apostles wished others appointed to dispense charities that they might give themselves wholly to prayer and not leave the word of God to serve tables; yet this fact does not contradict that other fact attested on the same high authority, that in the Christian assemblies, one had an interpretation, another a psalm, and all, in turn, were encouraged to prophecy—to preach according to their varied gifts, that all might profit. Even Paul and Apollos without doubt, were edified, and even instructed, as the wisest masters in Israel might now be, by the simple suggestions of their weaker and less extensively learned brethren.

One man's right and duty to devote himself wholly to the work of preaching, does not interfere with another man's right to preach occasionally as there may be opportunity, and need for his preaching—any more than the right and duty of some men to devote their

whole lives to school teaching interferes with another man's right and duty to keep school for a winter or two, or another person's right to teach a fugitive slave to read, by the way side, or his own children, or brothers and sisters by the family fire side.

Nor do we doubt the right and the duty of Churches selecting and employing teachers for their religious instruction, and there is time and opportunity enough for them to preach, without reading the lips of the brotherhood.—Most ministers see more work to be done than they can do themselves, or find others to help them do. Let all then, be encouraged to improve the gifts they have, and thus obtain more. There is work enough and room sufficient for them all. In no other way can one conceive of the world's being evangelized by human instrumentalities. Our missionary and Education societies, long ago, have furnished the data for these conclusions. And besides, some are capable of teaching some circles and not others. Some have a peculiar faculty of teaching Children—some can preach best in large assemblies—some best in private families. Destitute neighbors might be reached and benefited by those whose attainments might not qualify them to instruct their brethren in the Church. In a well educated Church, one member perhaps might be best qualified to instruct his brethren on Temperance—another on Human Rights—another on the evils of war—another on Church History, or some other branch of Christian knowledge or duty. Be it so that the stated Pastor and Teacher should be acquainted with all these subjects. One man cannot excel in every thing. And shall the rich gifts and varied information which God has distributed “as it hath pleased him” be lost to the Church, because only one man must be the teacher? Does our brother mean this? If he does, then indeed we must dissent from him on that point. The institution of the Christian Ministry was not designed to reach any such result. The primitive Churches had a number, a plurality of Elders, and none of them, no, nor any one of the brotherhood, was precluded from exercising his proper and appropriate gifts. The passage quoted by our brother, from Eph. 4. 11. 12 embodies the very principle for which we contend—the very principle upon which was based the practice of free preaching in the Churches, “one by one.” And doubtless, if one brother may speak on intemperance, and another on oppression, and another on war, then another and yet another may speak, upon any other doctrine or duty of the bible. It was a discovery of this consequence that led many ministers to oppose lay lectures on Temperance,

Peace, and Anti-Slavery at an early period. They saw where the principle would lead.

All these views we can hold and yet earnestly and cordially respond to what our brother has said, concerning the high and holy call to the ministry of the gospel. It is indeed an “internal call” and is neither “sentimentalism nor mysticism, but rational, religious, and scriptural.” Its evidence is found on the possession of the qualifications, gifts, graces, and aspirations that constitute and define a true minister of the gospel. The high and holy calling of the Christian includes some of these, even the more spiritual and essential, and these are the germ and nutriment of all the rest!—Just so far as he is qualified, and occasion offers, and opportunity opens, just so far, is the Christians high calling a call to preach—to testify—to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ. As he grows in grace, and knowledge and in a thirsting of soul to invite and allure sinners to Christ, he grows in the qualifications for that work. And whenever the time arrives, if ever it does, when he is qualified and inclined by the HOLY SPIRIT to devote himself wholly to the work, and DIVINE PROVIDENCE opens before him a field of usefulness, then it is that his ‘call’ is completed, is matured and like Paul, “he has no need to confer with men” (by way of obtaining authority) on the subject.

It is because we believe firmly on this high and holy calling of God, to the ministry of the gospel, that we set our faces, resolutely, against these human devices and anti-scriptural pretensions, and usurpations, by means of which the conception and even the remembrance of any such doctrine as that of a divine call to the ministry has almost faded from the Churches. Young men of characters unformed, are thoughtlessly designated by their parents or by themselves, for the ministry, as any other “learned profession” would be chosen. The customary education is gone through—they become members of some Church—the diplomas are presented to the “Association” or some similar body—a slight examination is enacted, and, (if nothing in particular is known against the applicant) the licence, and in due time, the ordination, follows of course! They are ministers of the gospel, duly inducted! As such the Churches are expected to regard them. And from among such, exclusively, the Churches are expected to select teachers! Is it strange that neither churches nor ministry, in general are found to retain any high sense of the importance, or even of the reality of any “internal call to the ministry?” How can they retain it, amid the usages that obtain, and that control the ministry? However truly a Christian

may be called of God to preach the gospel, he may not preach without the Clerical licence and ordination! This he cannot, ordinarily, have, without going through the prescribed routine—learning the requisite amount of Latin and of “classic” heathenism! The candidate must be a Church member, to be sure, at the time of being made a minister, though by the very process, he is commonly taken out of the Church into the Clerical body that ordains him! That some of these, surviving the process, give evidence of being God's ministers, we heartily rejoice. But that the state of the Church, the ministry and the community give evidence that many, that most of them are not, we deeply deplore and lament.

When we complain of a caste in the brotherhood of Christ, or over it, our trouble is not that holy men of God, whom He has called into the ministry, wield the influence to which their gifts and graces entitle them. We complain that artificial arrangements and usurped authorities that Christ never sanctioned, stand in the way of that holy order in the Churches that he has ordained, supersede the ministry of his appointment, and prophane the temple in the mire, till it has well nigh become extinct and yet is not missed!

Congregationalists and Church Action; with the principles of Christian Union, etc. By JOHN KEEPE, pastor of a Congregational Church in Hartford, Trumbull county, Ohio; pp. 143, 12mo. New York: S. W. Benedict & Co., 1845.

This is a choice little work—a book for thinkers—containing profound thoughts and striking illustrations adapted to the current topics of the day, moral, political and religious.

In no library will it be deemed an intruder or an incumbrance; and, far less, an injurious inmate. After being thoroughly read, the owner will look into it again and again as into a moral lexicon to see the definitions and analogies of things.

This may be thought superlative commendation, but the truth is, we have been delighted with the unpretending little volume, and disinterestedly wish that it may be read by tens of thousands, and not only read, but made the subject of thorough and continuous meditation. The intelligent reader will find it like apples of gold in pictures of silver. For sale at the bookstores. [Boston Evening Journal.]

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to May, 1845.

A. Gray, Ovid	0 50	J. Keep, Hartford Ohio,	0 50
D. Clark, do.	0 50	A. Griawold, Kinsman,	0 50
E. C. Winchester Bristol,	1 00	do.	0 50
A. Stewart, Canandaigua	0 50	T. J. Keep, do.	0 50
W. Lovejoy, Rose.	0 50	C. Lake, Ross.	0 50
C. Smith W. Butler.	0 50	R. Roberts Gustavus (O)	0 50
Dr. Campbell S. Butler.	0 50	G. N. Todd, Pheonix,	0 50
G. Candee do	0 50	J. Stoyell, Moravia,	0 50
C. Otis Leyden,	1 00	Z. W. Ballyn Perry	0 50
L. Batts, S. Butler.	0 50	C. O. Buddington Perry	0 50
D. Bailey, Darien Centre	0 50	W. Wagoner, Lebanon,	0 50
D. Newcomb, do.	0 50	Sarah Bowen, do	0 50
M. Wilcox, Andover, O.	50	S. Bishop, Honeyo,	0 50
A. North, Fly Creek,	1 00	S. H. Tait, Fulton,	0 50
G. Durant, Renasawville	50	J. Miller, Perryville,	0 50
A. Kingsbury, Cazenovia,	50	Z. M'Ewen, Lisbon, Ill.	0 50
G. S. Norton, Lisbon,	50	E. Baldwin, Nicholasville,	0 50
W. B. Stone, Gardner, Mass.	50	T. Gibson, do	0 50
D. Lewis, Prairieville, Ill.	by his sister,		

\$12 2

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.
HONORE, Ontario county, M. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office; Perry, N. Y.
Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills
Together with every description of Book & Job Printing

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. III.—No. 6. }
WHOLE NUMBER, 33.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N.Y. JUNE, 1845.

{ WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have five copies for his services:—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Each of any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

For per dozen, \$7 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 50
For eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
For Masters, if requested, will send letters enclosing for papers.

CHURCH FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE-HOLDERS.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW for OCTOBER, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE PRINCETON WHIG, JAN., 31, 1845.

[In continuance from the last number.]

PRACTICES OF RELIGIOUS SLAVE-HOLDERS.

We have promised to prove that the Southern Churches, in the persons of their members, *actually*, as a matter of attested fact, "use in neighbors service without wages"—deny the right of holding property—abrogate marriage—separate families—withhold education—and heathenize immortal souls:—all which practices the Biblical Repertory concedes to be wicked.

We are to substantiate these charges, on the simple ground of the *conduct and usages* of professors of religion in general who are slaveholders, which conduct and usages are not sustained or prevented by the churches to which they belong.

We undertake to prove this, because the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review *denies* too, that "Southern Christians defend the slave laws," which are admitted by the writer to be wicked, while he declares the slaveholder to be innocent. To meet this charge on his own ground, we are to concede for the time being, and for the argument's sake, the justness of the distinction he has made. Of course we shall not urge, now, that the members of Southern churches help to make and sustain the slave laws, opposing all efforts for their repeal. Nor do we now charge upon them as a fault the thing—whatsoever it may be—that the Repertory defines as *slave holding*. But we do charge upon them the admitted sins above specified, to wit:—robbery of wages—separation of families—abrogation of marriage—withholding of edu-

cation—heathenizing immortal souls. Here we join issue. But let the Biblical Repertory first speak for itself.

THE DENIAL.

"We deny that Southern Christians, even, defend the laws which are now in force, with regard to the slave. We know, for example, that the law which forbids slaves being taught to read, is, in a multitude of cases, openly disregarded. Within ten days, a gentleman from South Carolina told us that every slave he had could both read and write, and that he never gave himself the least concern about the law which forbids the education of the blacks." page 21.

"The right to accumulate property necessarily follows the right to compensation, for a man's hire is his own, and if it exceeds a necessary means of support, it is his own will. This is generally recognized. How else could slaves purchase their own liberty, as they are allowed to do under Spanish laws, and as they so often, in fact do, in this country."

WHAT A STATEMENT!

We need large measures of patience, we confess, to treat with decorum a writer who attempts to make the impression, nay, who even ventures the affirmation, THAT THE RIGHT OF A SLAVE TO HOLD PROPERTY IS GENERALLY RECOGNIZED—conveying the idea that it is generally recognized *in this country*, and in its connection, the additional idea that the right of the slave to "compensation" is also thus recognized! What a representation!—What shall we make of it? Was the writer so ignorant as to "impose upon himself" with such "crudities"? Or did he think to "impose upon others," by them? Then look at the remarkable effort to sustain the statement by a reference to "Spanish laws" and usages—so notoriously different, in these respects, from the laws and usages of this country! Not less remarkable is the allusion to what sometimes takes place "in this country." The number of instances of this kind as compared with the whole number of slaves held (whether by professors of religion or others) is hardly sufficient to constitute a note worthy or decent exception to a general rule. Yet it is exalted into that "generally recognized" rule, itself! Is it consistent with "moral honesty" for men to write thus? And then, when those instances do take place, can it be properly said that they furnish instances in which the *right of slaves in general*, to a "compensation" is recognized, and their consequent right to acquire and hold property? Out of a number of slaves, perhaps, held by the same person, a favorite servant, or one that has rendered signal services, is selected for the peculiar favor. As a special and extraordinary favor, it is conferred on this one, and the "NOBLE GENEROSITY" of the act is magnified and trumpeted through the country, (and through the churches, too, if the "extraordinary"

man be a minister or a church member) while the *other* slaves of the same "extraordinary" saint, toil on, without ever hearing or dreaming that "Massa" considers *them* entitled to "wages" and as having "a right to hold property"! When a northern man pays off his laborers—(the *whole* of them)—is the matter gazetted from Dan to Beersheba, and chronicled in Theological Reviews? But why not? Simply because it is understood, everywhere, that in the one case, the man only performs an act of common honesty and justice, for the neglect of which he would be drummed out of decent society—while, in the other case, he performs an act which *neither himself nor his admirers* consider him to have been under any obligation of justice, on the score of earned wages, to bestow! There is *no truth* in the pretence that even the few slave holders who allow a particular slave to purchase his freedom, while others are still held by them in bondage, ever think of recognizing, by the act, the *right* of the slave to compensation and his *right* to accumulate the avails of his labor. No such thing is intended. No such thing is understood, by the act. When a Birney or a Brisbane frees his slaves, *all of them*, and on the *principle*, openly avowed, that "the laborer is *lord* of his hire"—the very act marks and stigmatizes him, at the North and at the South—in the church and out of it—among ministers and laymen—as a "fanatic" a subject of "moral derangement"! Who more courted and admired than Birney and Brisbane, *before* they practically recognized the "right of the slave to his earnings"?—Who more maligned and belied, *now*? Even Biblical Repertories cannot well discharge the requisite amount of "meekness," "mildness," and "conciliatory" bile with which they are stored, without perpetrating "Roarbacks" upon one or both of them.

THEY DO WITHHOLD WAGES.

We deny that slaveholding Ministers and church members, in this country, while remaining slaveholders, commonly recognize, or intend to recognize the *right* of their slaves to "compensation" with the consequent right to "acquire and hold property." The statement is too ridiculous to be believed. It is truthless and false. By "figures that won't lie" we will prove this, and upon principles which the Princeton Reviewer has, himself, furnished. "A man's hire is his own, and if it exceeds

* These terms are liberally applied to abolitionists, in the Biblical Repertory.

the necessary means of support, it is his own still." This is the doctrine even at Princeton. Look then at the plantation slaves, with their "quart of corn per day"—or "peck of corn a week"—with their proportionate allowance of clothing to correspond, by merciful provision of the Statute, to prevent—(as the Proamble affirms) *worse fare!* [Sad comment on the notion that *slave holding* is BETTER than the *slave laws!*] We will say nothing, now, of the frequent and well attested substitution of *cotton seed* for corn, upon which, according to Reports of Southern Agricultural Societies, so many slaves have been experimented to death. In 1730 the celebrated Geo. Whitefield charged the American planters with "not feeding their slaves as well as their horses." For the bill of medical attendance, house rent and other accommodations, we will take the statements of Rev. T. S. Clay, a Presbyterian minister, in Georgia, in his "Detail of a Plan" &c. published by request of the Georgia Presbytery, in 1833.—[Orthodox testimony, at Princeton, we suppose!] After stating that the food of slaves is *often* not adequate to the support of a laboring man—that the "peck of corn per week" is "*often* defective in quality," so that the negroes are tempted to steal, to "supply a *craving appetite*"—that the legal supply of *clothes* was "*often neglected*" and that the slaves were "*often overworked*," Mr. Clay describes their dwellings as miserable, crowding too many into one apartment for lodging, without distinction of age or sex: and describes also the treatment or rather neglect of the sick, for whom the simplest and cheapest medicines, even "salts" are "too commonly neglected" to be provided. He does not state, and no respectable Southern authority intimates, that *ministers and professors of religion owning plantations of slaves, treat them better than the rest of the community treat them.* And pious fugitive slaves abundantly testify that they *do not*.

Here then, is our data, for a computation. Estimate the annual wages of a slave. From the amount deduct the estimated cost of his support. The balance, according to the Princeton Reviewer, belongs to the slave. The support of house servants is doubtless much more. But many of these, as well as mechanics, command high wages for their owners, and are accordingly held at a high price.

The question: how long would it take the slaves, on an average, to earn money enough to pay for themselves, at the market price? And how many slaves would there now be, in the hands of professors of religion, if they acted on the principle that the slave is entitled to his wages, or earnings, over and

above his support?

If the professedly Christian owners of slaves intended to recognize their right to wages—they would *tell them* so, and thus encourage them to earn and lay up money and become free. This they do not do, except in rare cases. We leave the *laws* out of the account, now. By *these*, the earnings and even the accumulations of the slave, always belong to the master. And this is what the masters always claim. Renouncing this claim, they are no longer slaveholders. With exception, we repeat it, of slaveholders who *cease* to be such, there is no recognition by them, of the right of the slave to wages. Who, that has ever been in the slave States, does not know that ministers and church members there who hold slaves, would scout the idea, in a moment? The suggestion would be a novelty, indeed, among slave holders, that a *slave*, while remaining such, is *entitled to wages!*

And it is not true that church members and ministers, at the North, *who are not abolitionists*, have ever held or advocated the doctrine that slaves are entitled to wages, and that slave holders are bound to pay them for their labor! After fourteen year's service as an editor and lecturer in the anti-slavery cause, we now, *for the first time*, in this article in the Biblical Repertory, meet with the doctrine from a person defending slaveholding! Even those who do not go far as to justify slaveholding in the abstract, with the Princeton Reviewer, are nevertheless ready to cry out against abolition, that it would "bankrupt the South"—that it would *rob* the slave holders of their "property," and reduce them to *poverty*. And all this, simply because the master would then have to pay the slave wages.

No *old* doctrine ever taught by the abolitionists has more enraged even *Northern* min-

*The reader can make his own estimate. But we will put one, as a specimen.

13 bushels corn per year, (the largest estimate) at 50 cents, \$6 50

Other articles of food (rarely furnished) say 2,50

GRATINGS.—Robert J. Turnbull, Esq. a planter of South Carolina, in his "*Refutation of Calumnies*," says—"It consists of a winter and summer suit—the former a jacket, waistcoat, and overalls, of Welsh plums—the latter of Osageburg or humpans, or other substitutes—They have hats, shoes and handkerchiefs." We will put this down at

20 00

Other possible expenses

11 00

We believe this, by far, an over estimate, but let it stand at

\$10 00

Then what does the slave earn? They are often hired out at \$10 per month, to be fed by the person hiring them. But we will make no account of the board. They earn, say per an. 120 00

The overplus "*is his own, still*,"

\$50 00

Eighty dollars per annum—or \$2000 in twelve years. This is about the price of a laboring slave. For an annual payment of \$100—for ten years, say \$1000—slaves have purchased themselves of their "owners." But the Biblical Repertory holds their ten or twelve years earnings to be their *just due*. They have a moral right to it. But how many church members or ministers, holding slaves, have *regarded* that right? The number of emancipations tells very nearly the story! even on its own principles.

istors and professors of religion, than the doctrine that it is *theft* and *robbery* for slave holders to use the slave's "services" out wages." As no professor of religion in the South would remain a slave holder a single day, were it not for his cherished doctrine on the unpaid labor of the slave, having occasion nor motive left for being a slave owner; so no professor of religion at the North would care to spend his breath in opposition to it, if, in his heart, he welcomed the doctrine that the slave is *entitled to wages*, and cannot, without robbery, be deprived of them.

Why! It was *just on this very point*, the controversy commenced, in the religious community at the North, before it was commenced by the politicians! Abolitionists claimed the immediate abolition of slavery, and they defined their meaning—they claimed that the slave should have *wages*—be treated as a *man* and not a chattel—permitted to *work*—to be taught—to hold property—like other men. For this they were opposed and opposed still. "The Rev." Joseph T. Editor of the Vermont Chronicle, a Congregational paper, led the way in this opposition. And it was *upon this very point*, viz.: the right of the slave to his earnings, that he took stand. Abolitionists affirmed this right. They used Bible language in doing so. They said "Woe unto him that useth his right service without wages, and giveth him his work." They used Bible language, the language of Edwards, Wesley, A. Clark, Hopkins, and Scott, in declaring "robbery and theft," to do so! "Then," retorted (in substance) the Vermont Chronicle "you make Washington a robber, do you? And so, by harping upon this string, the Editor of the Chronicle and his imitators set the country in a mob fever against the abolitionists, and with the burning of Lewis Tappan's furniture in New York city, the watchword of the Vermont Chronicle was repeated to the mob! The head and front of our case was that we claimed wages for the slave, and claimed it as his right—declaring it robbery to withhold it from him. And no Biblical Repertory at Princeton, came forward to vocate—or even to *concede*, the right of the slave, to wages, then."

The leading clergy of New York and vicinity brought forth their Colonizationists, their Frothinghuysens, and Walworts, and Ogdens, and Gurloys, and Finleys to pronounce us as "reckless incendiaries," "dreamy enthusiasts" for making the claim. To this hour, these denunciations are not recalled. The position of the Northern church and ministry is the same now that it was then, and is correctly described by the Biblical Re-

when it says, *unhappily quoted*, that the Congregationalists of New England, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists, have, one and all refused to sanction the doctrine up in which the whole structure of the whole structure of abolitionism rests. And in doing this, they have refused to sanction the "doctrine" that the slave is entitled to a "compensation" for his labor. They have shamelessly inverted the opposite doctrine that the master is entitled to a "compensation" if he ceases to perform labor! They have done this for the avowed object of opposing the "fanatical demand of abolitionists, which, by challenging, as a matter of right, brings the whole charge of "robbery and theft" against the wisest and best men of the country"—(as the Biblical Repository hath it) "the diligence and piety of the country"—"a portion" of which still subsists upon the backs of unpaid labor! Precisely here it is that the pinch of "church question" comes!

As the Northern churches and clergy (or a swelling majority of them) have knowingly condemned and derided the abolition "doctrine" of the slave's right to wages, so, with eyes equally open, they have hugged the slaveholding churches and ministry to their bosoms with the full knowledge that they claim to use the slave's labor without wages, and without the idea of his right to a "compensation." As early as 1830, if not earlier, "Rev. James Smylie, late stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Mississippi," wrote a book in defence of "slavery," (not merely of "slave holding," by the bye!) In this book he says:

"If slavery be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters, a direct violation of the divine law, and if the buying, selling, or holding of a slave, FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN, is a heinous and criminal, then, verily, TOLERANCE OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS AND PRESBYTERIANS, IN SEVERAL STATES OF THE UNION, are of the devil. They 'hold' if they do not buy and sell slaves, and with few exceptions, they hesitate not to 'apprehend and restore' runaway slaves, when in their power."

"For the sake of GAIN"—in other words, "for the sake of using their service WITHOUT WAGES"—for herein—as every man knows—the whole "gain" of slaveholding lies. Take away this, and the price of the slave too, may be expressed by a cypher; there are no owners to sell, and no purchasers to buy.

The above declaration of Mr. Smylie has been extensively published and circulated at the North, for eight or nine years. No ministers and few church members not wilfully ignorant, have not met with this paragraph.—On the face of it lies the affirmation, that the members of churches at the South who hold slaves—(three fourths of the sects he enumer-

ates,) do so for the sake of the gains of unpaid labor! And who but abolitionists have expressed either grief or rebuke at the impudent tone of triumph with which such a fact is announced?

The Biblical Repository, therefore, must either unsway what it has said of the sin of extorting unpaid labor; or it must unsway what it has said of the apostolic and morally best method of treating *known sin*—or else it must admit that Christian abolitionists are bound to come out, and have no fellowship with the churches of the South, who extort unpaid labor, and also from the sects and "denominations" at the North who sustain them in their course. And especially must the writer in the Biblical Repository, himself, be included in this excommunication. With a full knowledge of the facts, or at least, enjoying one of the highest posts of observation for ascertaining them, and affecting ability to teach them to others, he has been guilty of an evident attempt to cover up, and even to *drag the existence* of any such sin in the American churches, polluting them with this guilt—charges more deeply and more palpably implicated in the sin of extorting unpaid labor, than any other churches, professedly Christian or Hebrew, of which the inspired or uninspired writers of church history have ever penned for us the record!

All this is proved without charging upon the churches (as we might do) the responsibility of the slave laws. All this is proved without charging upon the churches any sin, on account of what the Biblical Repository calls "slave holding." Whether responsible or not responsible for the "wicked slave laws"—whether guilty or not guilty for the act of slave holding—they are guilty of withholding the hire of the laborers who reap down their fields, of robbing the poor because they are poor—guilty, from Maine to Georgia of strengthening each other's hands, and upholding each other, in this bad work, laying "snare for those who reprove in the gate."

In the same manner, we will now prove that the American churches, Northern and Southern, are guilty of the other practices which the Biblical Repository acknowledges to be sins. We will do this, waiving the question of innocent or guilty "slave holding" and without charging upon the churches the "slave laws."

THEY DO ANNUL MARRIAGE.

The Southern churches do annul marriages;

Is further testimony needed? Are the Presbyterians of Kentucky credulous witnesses? They affirm, in their "Address to the Presbytery of Kentucky," that "as a neighbor a severe, without regard to 'practiced daily, hourly, towards them—and'—systematically practiced." And the connection and scope of the "Address" shows that the *Synod mean to say* that this is the common practice of "the Presbyterians of Kentucky."

they do sunder the nearest family bond, and Northern churches, knowing the fact, do fraternize with them, without repressing them, or remonstrating against the sin. And they do oppose and vilify the reprovers of those sins, and charge them with "disturbing the peace of the churches"! Sufficient proof of this, shall be forth coming.

"In 1833, the following query, referring to slaves, was presented to the Savannah River Baptist Association of Ministers:

"What, in case of involuntary separation of such a character as to preclude all prospect of future intercourse, the parties ought to be allowed to marry again? Answer:—That such a separation among persons married as free slaves, even, civilly, a separation by death, and they believe that, in the sight of God, it would be no view. To forbid second marriages, in such cases, would be to expose the parties, not only to stronger temptations and strong temptations, but to church censures, for acting in obedience to their masters, who cannot be expected to acquiesce in a regulation at variance with justice to the slaves, and to the 'rule of that command which regulates marriage among mankind. The slaves are not free moral agents, and a dissolution by death is not more strictly without their consent, and beyond their control, than by such separation."

What have we here? An ecclesiastical act, amounting to an indulgence, allowing slaves who are church members to marry again, while their first husbands or wives are still living—an ecclesiastical sanction for putting asunder those whom God has joined together, in open contempt of the divine institution of marriage! And this indulgence to commit adultery is granted to the slaves for the accommodation of their "masters"—many of whom are church members—and who may require them to form new connexions. For, let it be noticed, the apprehension expressed, is—that the slaves may otherwise be subject to church censure, for acting in obedience to their masters!

Will it be said, in palliation of this ecclesiastical abrogation of marriage, that this sad necessity was imposed upon the Association by the "slave laws"? It will not do for the writer in the Biblical Repository to say that. For that would be an admission of what he denies—viz: that the practice of "slave holding" must correspond, of necessity, with the "slave laws," and of course, be as "wicked" as they are! It would be admitting, too, that the "wicked slave laws" control the decisions of the church! And so, according to his theory, he must let the whole undivided infamy of the act rest upon the church!

THEY DO SEPARATE FAMILIES.

We will now prove that the church, in her members, is guilty of the sin of thus separating husbands and wives, in the first place, before she finds herself in a position to annul heaven's own institution of marriage, in order to accommodate herself, with impunity, to the cruel and licentious practice. We will quote again from the "Address" of the Synod of Kentucky, to the Presbyterians of that State, in 1831:

"An Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, p. 11.

"Brothers and sisters, parents and children, *have men and wives are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us. The stripes and thong are often witnessed on such occasions, proclaiming with a trumpet tongue, the iniquity and cruelty of our system. The cry of these sufferers goes up to the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.—There is not a neighborhood, where these heart rending scenes are not displayed. There is not a still poor road that does not behold the sad procession of manacle outcasts, wailing and moaning in supplication to be that they are exiled, by force, from all that their hearts hold dear. Our church, years ago, raised its voice of solemn warning against this flagrant violation of every principle of mercy, justice, and humanity. Yet we dash to unheeded to you and to the world that this warning has been often disregarded, even by those who hold to our communion. Cruelty has occurred in our own denomination, where professors of the religion of mercy have torn the mother from the children, and have sent her a homeless and returnless exile. Yet let us or ourselves have rarely (NEVER!) followed such conduct."*

For the graphic picture of licentiousness among slaves, drawn by the Synod of Kentucky, in this address, we have not room. It shows that marriage is effectually abrogated, among slaves. By what means, and, by whose agency, the reader has seen.

In the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in 1835, it was stated by a ruling elder, Mr. Stewart, of Illinois (and without contradiction, we believe) that "even ministers of the gospel, and Doctors of Divinity, may engage in this unholy traffic (slave-trading) and yet sustain their high and holy calling." "Elders" said he, "and Doctors of Divinity, are, with both hands, engaged in the practice."

Yet—who would have believed it?—the Synod of Kentucky, in this same address, recommend, from prudential considerations, a future, in preference to an immediate abolition of slavery, though their "Address" shows that they held it to be sinful, and that they did not expect the wicked practices they described, including the heathenizing of the slaves, to be rooted out of the church while the system continues! Could the Biblical Repertory call us "denunciatory," "malevolent" and "abusive," if we should say such advice "shocks the moral sense"—is "irreconcilable with moral honesty"—"unfaithful"—"base in itself"—tends to "ruin souls"—affording grounds for the fear that the advisers were "bad men"? Quite as much as all that, we might hesitate to say—we never have said it—and know not that any abolitionists have said it—but the language, the logic, and the ethics of the "Biblical Repertory" would, most evidently, bear us out in saying it, if we chose to do so.

posing a plan for the instruction and emancipation of their slaves. By a Committee of the Synod of Kentucky.

The Committee consisted of the following persons—viz: John Brown, Esq., Thomas P. Smith, Esq., Charles Cunningham, Esq., James K. Burch, Nathan J. Hall, John Green, Esq., J. H. Alexander, Esq., Rev. Wm. L. Breckenridge, Robert Stewart, John C. Young.

The last named gentleman is the well known President Young. We have never heard that any thing has been done towards carrying the "plan of instruction &c." into effect.

*This emendation is made by James G. Birney, for many years a Presbyterian (and, we believe, an Elder) in Kentucky.

Thus much for the sins of abrogating marriage, and divorcing wives and husbands, in the Southern church. And in the Northern church clean? With whom does she fraternize? Where are her rebukes for this iniquity? What is her treatment of those who do rebuke it? Let her press—let her "Biblical Repertory" and "Christian Spectator," and "Literary and Theological Reviews," testify. Let her pulpit, closed against the reprovers of these abominations, and open to the apologists, and perpetrators of them, tell! And what marvel? We have good grounds for saying that seventy years have scarcely gone by, since a Congregational minister in Connecticut was known to annul the marriage bond, by the sale of a wife from her husband—both of them members of his own church—both of them claimed as his property—and united in marriage by his own hands—that the husband died of a broken heart—yet neither the church nor the Ministerial Association, nor yet the Consociation, reproved him for the deed!

(To be Continued.)

THE MARRIAGE QUESTION, IN AMERICA!

It is, perhaps, commonly known, to our intelligent readers, that the marriage question in England, which has been a disputed question, there, for more than two hundred years, is earnestly contested there still. For although the church and state laws of that country are still in full force, and none but clergymen of the established church can legally solemnize marriages, yet different bodies of dissenters, from time to time, and up to the present hour, are earnestly demanding their rights.

The story, briefly is this. The doctrine of the English clergy that none can officiate as ministers of religion, except those who are ordained by ministers in office before them—(a doctrine requiring, of course, an uninterrupted succession of ordinations from the apostles) is a doctrine which denies the validity of marriages, as well as of baptism and other sacraments, unless duly solemnized by clergymen ordained in the regular apostolic succession. Well.—When, at length, the Non-Confessionists and Dissenters made their appearance, in England, the controversy in most cases, turned vitally upon these exclusive prerogatives of the clergy of the established church. With the Puritan Independents, the predecessors of our present Congregational and Baptist sects, this ordination question was one of the chief grounds of dissent. The Independents claimed that the power of ordination belonged solely to the lay brotherhood. The church of England persisted, that it belonged exclusively to the clergy. Here, the

parties joined issue. The church was the standard. The Independents organized a ministry for themselves by lay ordination, among their descendants in England the practice is not yet laid aside. But the ministers, ordained by the lay brotherhood were forbidden by law, to preach—forbidden to baptize—bidden to solemnize marriages—and their "non-conformity" were imposed, and some of them put to death. John Pym, who, by lay ordination, became pastor of a self-organized independent church, Bedford, was imprisoned for twelve years. Some of the Independent Parity Bedford, for the privilege of retaining their ordained ministry. After a while, they fled to Holland, came to America, and, landing at Plymouth rock, laid the foundation of the New England colonies. In process of time the ceremony of ordaining ministers fell from the hands of ministers, who did this in their own and on behalf of the brotherhood, who claimed that the power and authority resided rightfully, in them. And the Congregational and Baptist ministers in this country and England derive all the validity of their commission from lay ordinations.*

The New England colonies, of course, legalized the marriages solemnized by their ordained ministers. But in England no marriages are legal, to this hour, unless solemnized by an Episcopal clergyman. And the church-men in this country, consistently claim that no ministerial acts are valid, unless in line of the "apostolic succession." Ministers of the Presbyterian and Congregational sects in this country, have, of late years, imbibed the same spirit, and forgetting the origin of their own ministerial commissions, as well as the known landmarks and Shibboleths of their sects, as dissenters, have turned up their noses at lay ordinations, as contemptuously as their brethren of the Episcopal High church!

And hence, THE MARRIAGE QUESTION IN AMERICA! Will it be believed that such a question has been mooted? The following circumstances have recently taken place, in Western New York. A pastor of an independent church, regularly appointed by lay ordination, was, not long after, requested to attend and solemnize a marriage, to which, of course, he assented. Arrived at the place, with the guests, it appeared that some one had hinted a doubt of the legality of the marriage! The Statute, to be sure, said, "ministers of the gospel." But could there be a minister of the gospel, without a clerical

*The same is true, with a few exceptions, of the Presbyterian ministers. Not one in an hundred of them can trace back their ordination to any other than the laymen.

ordination? The doubt could not be shed, and to make sure work, a messenger was dispatched for a Presbyterian minister, who, in due season arrived, and the ceremony was performed. A neighborhood discussion followed, of course, and opposite parties were formed. The zealous gentleman is reported to have said that if the pastor of the Independent Church should venture to perform the marriage ceremony, in any future case, where the parties were agreed in desiring it—he will have him indicted at law! High treason would be imputed to any Presbyterian and Congregationalists taking such a ground! A ground that questions the validity of their own marriages, of course! On obtaining a judicial decision that lay ordinations are not valid, nor marriages solemnized by laymen valid, unless they are clerically ordained, and Episcopacy becomes the established religion of New York, as well as of England! What next?

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF MINISTERS.

“Is your minister a professor of religion? A member of the visible church of Christ?”

A strange question some of our readers will ask. It is nevertheless, a question, that is beginning to have pertinency and meaning, as we go; and will acquire additional significance, before long. In a few brief paragraphs we will explain.

To be “a professor of religion”—“a member of the visible church of Christ”—the common meaning of those phrases (when used in convertible terms) is to be a member in some local visible church. A church is a “congregation of worshipping Christians, assembling weekly on the Sabbath, for the purposes of religious instruction, the enjoyment of Christian ordinances and the maintenance of church order and discipline.” Something like this is held to be the meaning of a visible church. Thus, our ministers themselves teach. And they exhort young men and all others whom they consider persons, to “make and to maintain a public profession of religion, by membership in the visible church of Christ,” as thus described. This is our first proposition.

Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, Conferences, Consociations and Associations—these, and the like of them are not churches of Christ, either in the Bible sense, or in the ordinary meaning of the word “churches.” They do not answer the definition commonly given, as above. This is our second proposition.

Ministers of the Presbyterian sect, and the proportion of ministers in the Congre-

gational sect, (we are not so well informed concerning Baptist ministers) are not members of any visible church, as above defined.—When they become ordained ministers and pastors, their relation to the churches to which, while they were “laymen” they belonged, commonly terminates, of course. Nor is this because their relation is transferred, as in the case of laymen, to the churches where they have removed to reside. They do not become members, or do not hold membership, in the churches over which they are pastors! They are officers over (and not in) the churches to which they do not belong, and are not subject, as members! [An anomaly in the history of voluntarily formed associations.]—They cannot be reached by the discipline of the church! If charged with misdemeanors, they must be tried, forsooth, by their peers, their equals, and not by the inferior caste, the common brotherhood in Christ—the church! They belong to the Association, to the Consociation, to the Presbytery, to the Conference or something of that sort. They are not members of any visible church of Christ.—This is our third proposition. And all such ministers, we say, ought to be seriously admonished, in the use of their own language, to “honor the institutions of Christ, by making and maintaining a public profession of religion, and connecting themselves with some visible church of Christ.” When they do this, and not until then, will they place themselves in a position to exhort others to the same duty.

An association of ministers, (as among the Congregationalists) is no more a “visible church of Christ” than a Lyceum or literary club, composed of the same members, would be. The members, in either case, might be Christians, but the organizations, in both cases fail of being Christians churches. The “institutions of Christ” do not include Associations, Consociations, Presbyteries (of the modern kind) Synods, General Assemblies, or Conferences, any more than they do Lyceums. Christ never instituted any thing of the kind, and his apostles never heard of them. And when Congregational ministers would defend their “Associations” from the charge of the suspicion of lording it over the churches, they commonly repel the charge or allay the suspicion, by describing their Associations as mere Lyceums or clubs for mutual improvement, having no connection with the churches, and having nothing to do with church matters, so that the churches have no more grounds of objection against them, than against any other Lyceums for mutual improvement. How well this defence agrees with the practices and

usage of these associations—with their “Pastoral Letters to the Churches” and their “licensing” of candidates for the ministry, we stop not, now, to inquire. But the plea justifies our statement that such Associations are not churches—and that the majority of Congregational Ministers (in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York, at least) are not members of the visible church of Christ. And how is it with the Baptist ministers?

In the Methodist Episcopal polity (slightly modified in other Methodist or Wesleyan bodies) the ministers in general, though they may indeed claim membership in “the church,” meaning the entire denominational connection in this country, (not the New Testament idea of a church) are amenable to bodies controlled chiefly or wholly by ministers, and are not subject to the discipline of the local “societies” over which they preside. When shall our ministers become church members, as other Christians commonly are—or are admonished to be?

*There are exceptions to this general statement.—In parts of Massachusetts where the late Dr. Estlin once held an influence, the Pastors are expected to be church members. And there is some other churches in New England and New York. But the general fact is nevertheless, as above stated.

Christian Investigator.

BOSTON, MAY, 1845.

SYMPTOMS OF PROGRESS.—It will be remembered that when the Christian Investigator and the “Christian Anti-Slavery Conventions” in this State first raised the standard of Anti-Slavery secession and re-organization of churches—and especially when the Secession church in Utica was gathered, on that basis—the National Anti-Slavery Standard derided and denounced the measure, as a part and parcel of Liberty Party ethics. Instead of organizing new parties, either political or religious, the “Standard,” at that time, insisted strenuously on the policy of remaining with the old sects and parties to purify them; and even went so far as to call in question, if not deny, the anti-slavery integrity of those who thought otherwise! But the National Anti-Slavery Standard of March 13th contains a commendatory notice of a sermon of Philo C. Pettibone of Fitchburg, Mass., (formerly of Oneida Institute,) pastor of a secession church, and advocating the necessity of that measure. And the “Standard” claims this to have been the true anti-slavery doctrine, all along! The “Standard,” then, must have been off the track, or napping, under its former editors, as the political and ecclesiasti-

ent seceders of central and western New York always insisted it was. As to political secession, the "Standard" has now belted even beyond the requisite mark, advocating a secession—not from the pro-slavery parties, exactly—but from the National Government itself, on the plea that the Constitution is essentially pro-slavery! But all the credit of an anomalous and inconsistent position, was not to be monopolized, by the Standard. Though the measure of organizing anti-slavery churches commenced with members of the Liberty party and has been chiefly confined to them, there have not been wanting Liberty orators and editors, earnestly bent on political "come-out-erism" who could flippantly deride religious "come-out-erism" to curry favor with the pro-slavery sects—making no discrimination between the "come-out-erism" of NO church, and that of a reformed church!—A fair parallel with those opponents of political secession, who (unlike the "Standard") were incessantly demanding secession from the old churches (though not the re-organizing of new ones.) It is to be hoped that Liberty editors will not be behind the "Standard" in recognizing the fundamental principle upon which the Liberty party is founded! This degree of "progress" they will soon make, or be left astern of the movement they have undertaken to lead. "Revolutions do not go backward." Eddies there be—but the main current is onward. Discrepancies—anomalies—inconsistencies—may be found here, and there—in "old organization" and in "new." Whatever of rancor, either class of abolitionists may have been so much to advocate, will stand—all the rest must be blown away as chaff. Those who expect the favor of a corrupt church while they labor to purify a corrupt state, will find themselves with O'Connell before they have done. And those who consent to go along with corrupt political parties, while they demand a purified church, will leave the church in its filthiness, still.

ANOTHER SIGN OF PROGRESS—in the Church Reform enterprise, is, that many who "did run well" are inclined to go back, rather than encounter the self denial which, they see, are awaiting them, if they continue to go forward. This brings us to the same point, in this enterprise, that the enterprise of political abolition arrived at in 1840—when it was seen that the faithful must abandon their old parties. Up to that hour, the argument was applauded and no condemnation of pro-slavery legislators could be too severe. But when the question came, of withholding our support of those same corrupt statesmen, and of organizing anew—Oh! that was quite another matter! The member of Congress ought to

make all conceivable sacrifices, to be sure, rather than do wrong! Who could doubt that! But when it came to be hinted that the voter, too, might have some political sacrifices to make, the case was far enough from being clear—and "stop my paper" was the best argument at hand!

Just so, in the enterprise of church reform. So long as the argument only went to prove that the ministry and churches, mainly, and in their leading influences, were corrupt, they were far enough from finding fault with the doctrine. We only told them what, for the most part, they well knew before—what they know still—and will continue to know so long as they continue to have moral faults—and facts remain as they are. They were well enough pleased to have their own views expressed, and they thought such ministers and churches deserved and needed sharp rebukes. But when they came to see that they themselves were guilty of upholding those same corrupt ministers and churches—and that there was no prospect of their reform—that they must either "belong no-where" or come into small groups—bear the reproach of "come-out-ers"—leave their refined friends and cushioned seats and carpeted aisles—and (worse than all) have no "regularly ordained" ministers to preach to them—unless they continued where they were—all these images presented quite another picture of contemplation—and, what shall they do? An army of old school temperance men on the brink of te-totalism could not have stood more aghast, when a full view of the "cold water" Jordan first broke on their vision! If the Christian Investigator would only content itself with pouring broadsides of hot metal into a pro-slavery church and ministry in such a manner as not to hit their guilty supporters, all would be well! It would ease their consciences, greatly, to find ammunition, in such a warfare—To continue denouncing their "corrupt ministry" and continue supporting them, would be having a timber-head in both ships, and who can tell which will sink, or which swim, while the battle is raging? But when the Christian Investigator, taking for granted that corrupt churches and ministers are to be discarded, makes a settled business of exploring the bible grounds of "Church organization," just as though it were intended to do something as well as talk, what can the editor be thinking of? Who can wade through such a programme of projected WORK? And then, there is no earthly end to the work of churches constructed on that model! That ministers have no right to dodge duty, to save their salaries, is, indeed, a clear point. But that laymen should be called to any sacrifices, hazard any reputation, any custom, any cushioned

pews, splendid assemblages, or dip any deep into their pockets, (being few in number,) to sustain a faithful preacher than to sustain an unfaithful one, this is not quite so clear. These discussions of church organization are growing quite tiresome. "Stop my paper, Mr. Editor, if you please." Certainly, friends, if you say so. We have "stopped" hands upon hundreds of temperance subscribers—and many anti-slavery ones—and should also suspect that the laws of the moral world were getting out of fashion, or our editorial tail out of gear and inefficient, if—on the eve of great moral conflict and triumph—there were no murmurs of "stop my paper" to give the wanted notice of it.

CREEDS AND DEEDS.—Creed-wise, the Romish church herself, affirms the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. This is admitted commonly, by her protestant opposers, and a writer in one of our prominent religious papers has recently admitted it. The being perfect of God—the creation of man in his full—the giving of the law—the promise of a Saviour—his appearance in the flesh—united divinity and manhood—his atoning sacrifice on the cross—his resurrection and ascension into heaven—repentance—justification by faith—the Trinity—the resurrection of the dead—the final separation of the righteous and the wicked—the day of judgment—heaven—hell—these are topics by no means omitted in the creeds of the Catholic church, nor are the statements there made on these points so much at variance with the Protestant Evangelical doctrine, commonly taught to us, as to call for any secession from the Romish communion on that account. It is indeed, that Luther and other Reformers placed themselves upon the doctrine of justification by faith, and made it the foundation of their attacks upon those practices of the Romish church that did not accord with it. The fact proves that the doctrine of justification by faith, though opposed by some, is commonly held in the church. If it had been so, his appeals and arguments, for that doctrine, would have produced no effects as were witnessed. He was recondemned for the heresy of preaching that doctrine. It was eloquently preached by Spitz and others, (who did not assail the Romish usages) without giving any great effect. And in teaching it Luther could confidently appeal to the creeds of his church and from his most illustrious "fathers." Augustine, who held that doctrine, was among canonized saints, while Pelagius who denied it, was on her catalogue of heretics.

But the orthodoxy of the Romish church was neutralized, covered over, polluted

considered powerless, by the mass of errors and superstitions that were mingled-up with it—by idolatries, clerical usurpations, immorality, and despotisms, that feel twisted and wielded. It was her CORRUPT PRACTICE, that proved the Ransom to be anti-Christian. It was her intolerance and LIES OF GROSS IMMORALITY that first arrested the attention of Luther—and it was her persisting in her opposition to the reprovers of that immorality, that convinced her of her apostasy.

We commend these facts to the consideration of those, in our own day, who think it blasphemous to abandon a church that retains a catholic creed. Is it the CREED, on paper, or the PRACTICE, in active development, that is most to be regarded? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

A SOLEMN THOUGHT.

Extract of a letter from an aged Christian, Ohio:

"How limited are the good effects of the influence exerted over the great mass of mankind by the noblest and most god-like labors and efforts! With what gigantic sway does the tyranny of our country continue its ruinous influence over all our national interests, besides outraging the personal rights of millions! Facts or arguments, of whatever force or power, are of little avail, in demolishing popular errors and sins, or in correcting a corrupt public sentiment. Help, if it comes at all, must come from God. All hearts are in His hands. But as it accords with infinite wisdom that sin and misery are permitted to exist in some portion of His dominions, and the extent is not known to us, I have been led to think that Christian philanthropists are pre-empting on victories over the sins and woes of mankind, beyond and in a different manner from what God designs. While Christian labors should be unremitting, God's people should be submissive and humble, and learn to fear and adore, and to feel that God's ways are a great deep, and his footsteps not known. It is more than we know, and even possible that the faithful servants of God (see Ezek. 14.) will do little more than deliver their own souls, while the present generation, for the most part, including the so-called church with its Hydra-head of sectarianism, will sink to hell, and God's wisdom, power, truth and love stand eternally unimpeached."

So writes our venerable friend. With the general sentiment—except what seems its self-deny, and its doubt of the final

result—we cordially sympathize. Little, indeed, can man do—nothing in his own strength. Help must come from God, and men Christians must fully learn this, they will labor to little purpose. But help will come from God; and the signs of the times, dark as they are—and because they are dark—indicate the approach of the morning. This nation may be shipwrecked, and its churches blotted out, or live only as moral pests. The dawn of a brighter day, may nevertheless, be at hand—may have already become visible. The day of Pentecost did not save the Jewish church and nation from the catastrophe that awaited them. Not less labor but abundantly more labor is required by the possibility—the probability, if you please—of another similar overthrow. The "foundations of many generations" are commonly laid amid the crumbling fragments of falling hierarchies and empires. These are the hieroglyphics with which God impresses truths, not to be comprehended otherwise. Was a Paul, a John, or a Peter the less needed, because the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple worship, were awaiting their fulfilment? The very reverse of a I this is most evident. At such a crisis, every blow wisely struck, for God and humanity, tells with thousand fold strength. Every nerve of holy activity is to be strained, to meet the exigencies, and the destinies of such an age—the sepulchre of an old world—the cradle of a new era. As for expecting "beyond" what God designs—the sure word of prophecy may guide us. Times and seasons are not revealed to us. But, "as surely as I live, saith the Lord, the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the whole earth, as the waters cover the sea." We cannot expect too much unless we expect more than this. "Expect great things—attempt great things," should still be our motto, and the more so, as we adore and obey him, "whose footsteps are not known" and who holds "all hearts in his hands." What can be too hard for Him?

WHAT GOOD WILL IT DO?

We constantly encounter a large class of persons, and many of them professing to be Christians and ministers of the gospel, whose only reply to any appeals, urging to the performance of a self-denying and unpopular duty is—"What good will it do?" We may have shown them that the duty is required by the plainest dictates of common honesty—by the first principles which they regard as self-evident—by the explicit requisitions of God,

in the Bible. And in direct reply to all this, they have nothing to say. But the sole answer is—"what good will it do?" Unless, by an estimate of consequences, they can make out almost the certainty of some beneficial result, they feel under no obligation to go forward, a single step! The work of governing the world, they cannot entrust to their Maker. They had rather trust to their own sagacity, than to the faithfulness and wisdom of Him by whom the duty is commanded. Instead of obeying, they take it upon themselves to legislate—and to legislate, too, not upon any scientific principles of legislation—not by the right and the true, but according to the apparent expediences of the case! Wherein does the position of such, differ, at all, from that of those who are without Bibles, and without God in the world? They evidently act upon the same maxim by which all worldly and ungodly men are known to act—the maxim of doing as *they* think best, instead of doing what their MAKER commands—the maxim of those, of olden time, who enquired—"What profit shall we have, if we pray unto him?" They could not understand what good it would do to pray. They had never seen any great results arising from the practice. And they chose to act the part of "practical men" and turn their time and attention to the best possible account. "Fanaticism" they particularly despised, and would, by all means, avoid.

Not a single effective measure in the Temperance or Anti-slavery enterprise, for the last seventeen years, has failed to elicit the skeptical inquiry—"What good will it do?" And one might have thought that "practical men" would at least have learned, by this time to "calculate consequences," better than they have been wont to do. But this is precisely what they never can do, until they leave off "calculating consequences" and simply obey God. This is what the Bible means, when it speaks of men's "becoming fools that they may be wise." There is no wisdom in any created being that has not its foundation and definition in this one thing needful—viz: simple, confiding obedience to God.—This confiding reliance upon God is the "faith without which it is impossible to please Him." And here, too, lies the philosophy of that divine maxim—"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

But we took up our pen, now—not to write, for the fiftieth time—an expose of the folly and blank Atheism of this inquiry—but to re-

cord some of the more recent instances of its development and application, in some directions that are not quite so familiar and stale, perhaps, to some of our readers.

1. We urge our brethren, who are abolitionists, to come out of a corrupt church.—They do not pretend to deny that the liberties, civil and religious, of any people, can be preserved in no other way than by the presence and the influence of a liberty-loving religion. This position they admit to be self-evident—so obviously so, that they would think it a waste of time to dwell upon the proposition, for a moment, and frivolous to vote an “aye” upon it, in a public convention. Nor do they deny that the command “Come out of her, my people” was given in respect to a corrupt church. And as to the character of the church or denomination to which they belong, no one could go farther than they do, in affirming its rottenness. Ask them, then, to come out of it—and the response is—“What good will it do?” “On the whole, we think, we can do more good, by staying where we are, for the present.” It may have been expedient (say some of them) that some of our brethren should have left. But it is more expedient for us to remain.

2. “What good will it do for you to organize a church composed only of those who give Bible evidence of being Christians? It will become as corrupt as other churches, by and by. Did not even the seven churches in Asia become corrupt? And the church of Rome, too?”

Marvellous questions, these! And so it did no good for the first Christians to organize Christian churches, because they afterwards apostatized! (How evidently *such* objectors would not have acted with the first Christians!) It will do no good to persuade communities to leave off drinking—or to abolish slavery—or to repent of any of their sins—because they may afterwards return to their wicked practices!

3. “What good will it do to expose, or even dethrone, a hierarchy in the church? You can’t change human nature, and they will spring up again as they did before.” Somebody will “lord it over God’s heritage” and “you can’t help it!” And so, it will “do no good for us” to “stand fast in the liberty” of the gospel, because others, peradventure, will not!

4. “What good will it do to restore New Testament church organization—church independency—Christian union—an equal brotherhood—a gospel ministry—a gospel discipline?” “What good will it do to obey Jesus Christ in these ‘minor matters?’ Have not thousands got to heaven without ‘all this fuss about church organization?’ And why should we burden ourselves with any labor

not necessary to our own Salvation?” “What profit shall we have?” And besides “What good will it do to perform all the duties that we can think of, when, likely enough, after all, we shall forget or neglect something else, and not do much better than those who give themselves less trouble?”

SPURIOUS SPIRITUALISM.—We seem never to have done with this subject. A volume is needed to ferret out all its intricate and deceptive windings. It meets us at every turn.—It comes up into every thing, and pollutes every clean place, like the frogs that infested Egypt. Some men are so spiritual that if they drink any deadly thing, including alcohol, they think it will not hurt them. Some are too spiritual to plead for the enslaved; or to care for the poor. Some are too spiritual to go to the polls, to teach or practice the duties they owe to the State, or to wield civil government for its high ends. Some are so spiritual that they cannot stop to admire the beauty of the Lord as imprinted by his own fingers on the workmanship of his hands. The Psalms of David must be spiritualized and improved by some of their own sort, before they can become spiritual enough for their use. Some are so spiritual that they can hold communion with God much better, in their own judgment, by neglecting his commands, than they could by obeying them. Their duties they seem to regard as great obstacles in the way of their spiritual progress. Some are too spiritual to study or practice the duties connected with the divine institutions provided for their benefit. Church order and discipline are quite beneath the elevated atmosphere they breathe in. They can nurse their spirituality quite as well, in the bosom of a corrupt church, and under a corrupt ministry, as any where else. They are too spiritual to be in any danger from the evil communications that corrupt good manners—too spiritual to heed the command “Come out of her my people that ye partake not her sins and receive not of her plagues”—too spiritual to care whether or no they endorse a slave-holding religion, support a proslavery church, or hold religious fellowship with oppressors. It is but a step from the position of these, to that of those who need no churches, no preaching, no sabbath, no bible! For why should any one need a bible who has become too spiritual to obey it? Or a church, who has become too spiritual to enquire after its character? Then again, we have spiritualists, who, in their eagerness to preach repentance cannot bear to have us specify the sins to be repented of—who would have us labor to “save souls” without instructing them in the doctrines and duties by which salvation is defined, or even emancipate souls from the forced heathenism of chattelhood. There are spiritualists, too, who are in a panic, lest legalism and morality should be promoted by insisting upon the prohibitions of the decalogue—that “Christ crucified” will be forgotten, if we repeat earnestly those reproofs of spiritual usurpation and oppression which brought Jesus Christ to the cross. Some (of whom the Apostle wrote) are so spiritual that they think the resurrection is past already. Some are so spiritual that a millenium in which Christ should reign only spiritually, and not

visibly, has no attractions for them, and they cannot bear to anticipate such an event, and must twist scripture into every shape to get rid of it. Some are too spiritual to believe that Jesus Christ was truly a man—and others are too spiritual to believe that the God-head ever became incarnate in the man Christ Jesus. From the days of the Apostle John to the present hour, there have been such. Hays Berkley, whose generation seems not yet quite extinct, became too spiritual to believe that there was any material universe, at all. Another branch of the same sort of spiritualism have discovered—not merely that the Father of spirits pervades and sustains all things—but that all the things that exist are actually a part of Him—so that, after all, there is no distinction to be recognized, say they, between the Creator and the creation. In other words, the universe either created itself or uncreated! And so we have blank Atheism itself, as the bottom line of the hyper spiritualism of Spinoza who was celebrated as a devout man!

But we must stop. We have only sketched the commencement of a “Table of Contents” or “Index” to the heresies and vagaries of the last sixteen centuries, many of them new and fresh in the midst of our boasted nineteenth—and almost all of them traceable to the root of a spurious spirituality in some form. In our own day, we have seen the most zealous religionists, for a long time recognized as most superhuman saints, plunging into the grossest sensualities and justifying themselves on the ground that they were too holy or spiritual to be contaminated by such practices—or to be controlled or guided by the rigid requirements of authoritative law. Why not, if a spirituality is to be recognized that does not consist in conformity to God’s requirements? If the fruit of the tree is corrupt, is it not time to dig up and destroy the roots?

There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet are not cleansed from the filthiness.

Spirituality is a term on every one’s lips but would it not be well to enquire after meaning? What progress can the church in the world make, until taught to distinguish between the false spirituality and the true?

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to June, 1855.

B. Stewart, Honeoye, 50, 50	T. Stringham, Canton, Pa., 50
J. Ide, Medway, Mass., 2, 00	W. A. Crocker, Marlborough, 1
J. Mosher, Canandaigua, 15, 00	C. Whiting, Kingston, R. I., 1
J. Nixon, Springwater, 50	Ann Henne t, do, 1
by H. Blackmar, do, 50	Elvira Loring, do, 1
P. B. Ripley, Detroit, by do, 50	J. Watson, do, 1
H. Hough, Martinsburg, 1, 00	Jeremiah Rich, do, 1
J. Mayell, Albany, 1, 00	J. C. Roberts, do, 1
J. J. Tucker, Buel, 50	Wm. Padley, do, 1
J. McCollum, N. Y. Mills, 50	J. Lightbody, do, 1
Sarah A. Tule, do, 50	Mrs. Dwight, Clinton, do, 1
Sally R. Ca e, do, 50	Prof. C. Avery, do, 1
Wm. Silk, do, 50	D. Thompson, Bay vert, do, 1

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Log and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, 50, 00 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Series. Vol. III—No. 7. }
Whole Number, 39.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JULY, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IV, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PRINTED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
months, always in advance, and free of postage.
Persons who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive for his services:—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have five copies for his services:—Or,
if procuring eight subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from
the volume, as follows, viz:
Single copies, 50 50 | Sixty papers, 82 50
Half a paper for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
any papers.

IN FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE- HOLDERS.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON RE-
PORT, OCTOBER, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY, JAN., 31, 1845.

(A continuance from the last number.)

VICES OF RELIGIOUS SLAVE- HOLDERS.

THEY DO HEATHENIZE THE SLAVES!

Let us proceed to prove that the churches and
ministers, Southern and Northern, are deeply
guilty in another practice, which the Bib-
lical Repertory admits to be a heaven-daring

sin. Southern churches do, in their mem-
bership of their ministers, HEATHENIZE
THE MASS of the slaves held and con-
trolled by them; and the Northern churches
do, in their ministry, well knowing the fact, fraternize
with them, and, for the most part, instead
of opposing them for the practice, frame
excuses for them.

And this statement is equally true, if it be
not that they are "not responsi-
ble for the slave laws"—and if it be true (as it
is) that the Biblical Repertory is correct
in affirming that there is no sin, in the simple
fact of "slave holding."

The proof is at hand. A sufficient proof is
afforded before the reader in the fact, already
established, that these churches do annul mar-
riage, without which the Christian religion
is the first rudiments of religious education
and moral culture cannot be successfully ex-
tended to any people—cannot be extended to
slaves. But other evidence shall be fur-
nished.

Let us quote again from the "Address of the
Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky." They
say of the practice, as existing among them,
"its most striking effect is to deprave and
degrade its subjects, by removing from them
the strongest natural checks to human cor-

ruption"—(page 7.)—that "it dooms thou-
sands of human beings to *hopeless ignorance*."

(page 8) They go on to observe that "If
the slaves are educated, it must involve some
outlay on the part of the master." "It is in-
consistent with our knowledge of human na-
ture to expect he will do it for them." They
then add.

"The present state of instruction among this race an-
swers exactly to what we might thus naturally anti-
cipate. Throughout our whole land, so far as we can learn,
there is but one school, in which, during the week, slaves
can be taught. The light of three or four Sabbath
schools is seen, glimmering through the darkness that
covers the black population of an entire State. Here
and there a family is found, where humanity and religion
impel the master, mistress or children, to the laborious
task of private instruction." "But, after all, what is
the utmost amount of instruction given to slaves?—
Those who enjoy most of it, are fed with but the crumbs
that fall from their master's table—they are clothed with
the mere shreds and tatters of learning." page 9.

"Nor is it to be expected that this state of things will
become better, unless it shall be determined that slavery
shall cease. The impression is almost universal that
intellectual elevation unfits men for servitude, and ren-
ders it impossible to retain them in this condition. This
impression is unquestionably correct. The weakness
and ignorance of their victims, is the only safe founda-
tion on which injustice and oppression can rest." pg. 9.

This testimony might be cited to prove the
criminality of *slave holding* and the corres-
pondency of slave holding with the "wicked
slave laws" commonly prevailing. But we
use it here merely to show the actual condition
of the slaves, and in that part of the country
where their condition is comparatively tolera-
ble. Kentucky and Maryland are the only
slave States where the education of slaves is
not prohibited by law. But public sentiment,
it seems, make such enactments needless.—
The ministers and church members in Ken-
tucky cannot plead, in excuse, the existence
of laws forbidding education. But the "Syn-
od" do not intimate that there is any general
and marked distinction between the practice
of the church and the world, in this respect.—
The whole tenor of this "Address to the
Presbyterians of Kentucky" implies that, in
this and in other respects, no very marked dis-
tinction exists. Such a remonstrance would
otherwise have been a *slander* that the church-
es would not have failed to regard as an in-
sult, and a grievous wrong. Hear what they
say, further, to "the Presbyterians of Ken-
tucky:—"

"It (slavery) deprives its subjects, in a great measure,
of the privileges of the gospel. You may be startled at
this statement, and feel disposed to exclaim—'Slaves
are always permitted and even encouraged to at-
tend upon the ordinances of worship.' But a candid
and close examination will show the correctness of the
charge." [The "charge" against "the Presbyterians
of Kentucky"—the reader will notice.] "The privi-
leges of the gospel, as enjoyed by the white population in
this land, consist in free access to the scriptures, a regu-
lar gospel ministry, and domestic means of grace.—
Neither of these is, to any extent worth naming,
enjoyed by slaves, as a moment's consideration will
show. The law, as it is here, does not prevent free ac-

cess to the scriptures, but ignorance, the natural result
of their condition, does. The Bible is before them, but
to them it is a sealed book." "Very few of them enjoy
the advantages of a regular gospel ministry. They are,
it is true, permitted, generally, and often encouraged, to
attend upon the ministrations specially designed for their
masters. But the instructions communicated on such
occasions, are above the level of their capacities. They
listen as to the prophecies in an unknown tongue.—
The preachers of their own color are still further from
ministering to their spiritual wants, for these impart to
them, not of their knowledge, but of their ignorance."—
page 10.

The Synod then speaks of a plan, "pro-
posed by some zealous and devoted friends of
the colored race," to employ suitable mission-
aries for their benefit. And they say—"Such
a spirit of kindness towards this unfortunate
race, as this scheme pre-supposes, can never
exist with a determination to keep them in
hopeless bondage." They then add,

"Further—there are no houses of worship exclusi-
vely devoted to the colored population. The galleries of
our own churches, which are set apart for their use,
would not hold the tenth part of their numbers—and
even these few seats, in general, thinly occupied. So that,
as a body, it is evident that our slaves do not enjoy the
public ordinances of religion. Domestic means of grace
are still more rare among them. Here and there a
family is found, whose servants are taught to bow, with
their masters, around the fire-side altar. But their pecu-
liarly adverse circumstances, combined with the natu-
ral alienation of their hearts from God, render abortive
the slight efforts of most masters to induce their atten-
dance on the domestic services of religion. And if we
visit the cottages of those slaves who live apart from
their masters, where do we find them reading their Bi-
bles, and kneeling together before a throne of mercy?—
Family ordinances of religion are almost unknown
among the blacks." page 11.

And what ideas of religion could the slaves
gather from any instructions that they could
receive from those who "use their services
without wages," and who, for the sake of gain,
deprive them of the institution of marriage?

Is it marvellous that such professors of re-
ligion are backward to instruct their depend-
ents, fully, in the precepts of the religion they
profess—but do not practice?

We have further testimony to produce.—
We have a pamphlet before us, with this title:

"Report of the Committee to whom was referred the
subject of the religious instruction of the colored popu-
lation, of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, at
its late session in Columbia, South Carolina, Dec. 5,
1843. Published by order of Synod. Charleston Oh-
sewer Office Press, 1844.

The Committee on this Report consisted of
the following persons, viz: Ministers, Moses
Waddel, D. D., B. M. Palmer, D. D., Robert
Means, S. S. Davis, S. J. Cassels, C. C.
Jones. Elders, Jas. English, R. Cunning-
ham, John C. Jeter, Samuel Clark. Commit-
tee of publication, R. Quartorman, J. C. Stiles,
C. C. Jones, T. S. Clay.

We hope the testimony of such witnesses
will be satisfactory to the Presbyterian Doctors
and Editors at Princeton. We hope they will
not be so "bitter and denunciatory" as to
charge us with a "flagrant falsehood," or with
"perversions of facts which shock the con-

and moral feelings of the community," because we give it a place in our columns. We proceed to give extracts.

After having quoted the words of our Saviour—"The field is the world," and "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"—the Committee proceed.

"In casting our eyes over the field of our labors, we see that we have not acted according to this rule. We feel wounded by it. There is a numerous and important class of persons, we may say—a distinct people—without our faith, in perishing need of the gospel—accessible and wholly dependent upon us, to whom we have not yet ministered, at least in such measure as their necessities and our duty demand. Our very knowledge of the moral degradation in which we have sunk, has not fully inquired into it, and consequently, our consciences are not yet awakened in their behalf. To extend our view beyond our bounds—who would credit it, that, in these years of revival and benevolent effort, in this Christian Republic, there are over five millions of human beings, in this continent of freedom, and, in some respects, in a worse condition, than the whole population, almost wholly destitute of the gospel? These are astounding facts—and truths which we confess with fear and contrition."

"From long continued and close observation, we believe that the moral and religious condition is such as to render it justly to be considered the heathen of this continent, and will bear comparison with heathen, in any country in the world." page 4.

"We attempt to set forth the truth, it will be shown, that the negroes are destitute of the substance of the gospel, and even with us, under the present state of things."

"We do not deny that many enjoy the means of grace—that there is a large number of professing Christians amongst them; and that, in a few churches, and on a few plantations, some attention is paid to their religious instruction. We rejoice in all this. But it is, at best, a day of small things, and although our assertion is bold, we believe that, in general, it will be found to be correct."

"A people may be said to enjoy the privileges of the gospel, when they have free access to the scriptures, a regular gospel ministry, houses for public worship, and the means of grace in their own dwellings."

"In relation to the first of these, free access to the scriptures, it is universally the fact, throughout the slave holding states, that either custom or law prohibits the acquisition of letters, and consequently they cannot have access to the scriptures. THE PROPOSITION THAT CAN READ IS INFINITELY SMALL, and the Bible, so far as they can read it for the purpose, is, to all intents, a sealed book, so that they are ignorant of their knowledge of Christianity, upon oral instruction—as much as on the unlettered heathen, when first visited by our Missionaries."

"Have they, then, that amount of oral instruction which in their circumstances, is necessary to their enjoyment of the gospel? In other words have they a regular and efficient ministry? They have not. In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac, to the Sabine River, and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not twenty men, exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes. What effects will the labors of these few individuals produce on a mass of one or two millions of souls, and more? The number divided between them would give to each a charge of near 170,000! page 5."

"As to ministers of their own color they are destitute, totally, both in point of numbers and qualifications; to say nothing of the fact that such a ministry is looked upon with distrust, and is discountenanced. In the present state of policy in the South, such a ministry could neither be obtained, nor tolerated."

"But do not the negroes have access to the gospel, through the stated ministry of the whites? We answer, NO. The white population itself is but partially supplied with ministers. Such being the fact, what becomes of the colored? And the question may be asked with all greater emphasis, when we know it has not been necessary for our ministers, when they accept calls for certification, to consider servants as a regular part of their charge. "They are called to preach to masters, and to masters they preach." "To a limited extent, in some parts of the vast field, the ministers devote the afternoon or evening of the Sabbath day, to the religious instruction of the negroes, and they succeed in establishing a Sabbath school or two. But we venture the assertion, that if we take the whole number of ministers in the slave holding States, but a very small portion pay any attention to them. But justice obliges us to say that, in ordinary cases, much cannot be expected from men sent to the whites; far when they faithfully discharge their duties to their own congregations they

find it impossible to do much for the negroes." page 6.

The Synod then proceed to say that the style of preaching adapted to the whites is not adapted to the "ignorant colored people, who do not understand it, and cannot be interested in it. They then add:

"The negroes have no efficient ministry, as a matter of course, no churches, neither is there sufficient room in the white churches for their accommodation. We know but FIVE churches in the slave holding States, built for their use. These are all in the State of Georgia—all under colored pastors, in connection with Baptist Associations, excepting one, which has been erected within the past year, by a Presbyterian clergyman, a member of the Synod, at his own expense—an expense of three or four hundred dollars, and he supplies the pulpit himself, gratuitously—an example which we should follow to the extent of our ability."

"The galleries or back seats on the lower floor of white churches are generally appropriated to the negroes, when it can be done with convenience to the whites. Where it cannot be done, conveniently, the negroes who attend must reach the gospel, as it escapes by the doors and windows." page 8.

The Synod make an estimate that less than one twentieth part attend the preaching of the gospel. They proceed:

"We may now inquire if they enjoy its privileges in private, in their own houses, and on their plantations?—Again we return a negative answer. They have no Bibles to read at their own firesides—they have no family altars—and when in affliction, sickness, or death, they have no minister to address them with the consolations of the gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services. Sometimes a kind master will perform these offices, but for the most part, they depend on their own color, who perform them as well as they know how, if they happen to be at hand. If the master is pious, the house servants alone attend family worship, and frequently few or none of these."

"Here and there a master feels interested for the salvation of his servants, and is attempting something towards it in assembling them at evening for reading the scriptures and prayer, in admitting and inviting qualified persons to preach to them, in establishing a daily and weekly school for the children, and in conducting the labor and discipline of the plantation on gospel principles. We rejoice that there are such and that the number is increasing. In general, we may, however, remark, that it does not enter into the arrangements of plantations to make provision for their religious instruction, and so far as masters are engaged in this work, an almost unbroken silence reigns over the vast field. From what we have now said, we feel warranted in the conclusion that the negroes are destitute of the privileges of the gospel, and must continue to be so, if nothing more is done for them." page 9.

And what has been since "done for them?"

Nothing, we believe, that the Synod has thought fit to publish. The Editor of the Southern Religious Telegraph, at a later period, speaks of the servants in Christian families as being "altogether neglected." And in 1838 "a portion of the citizens of Abbeville and Edgefield" addressed a communication "to the Rev. Mr. Turpin"—who had been "nominated a missionary by the S. C. A. Conference, to preach to the black population especially," urging him to desist from the enterprise which he accordingly did. The Greenwich (S. C.) Mountaineer of Nov. 2, 1833, which contained this address, remarked that, "the opposition to the late Home Mission among us composed the great body of the people." The address treated the project as a dangerous innovation, and a "novelty" declaring that "intelligence and slavery have no affinity for

*Whether these (as understood at the south) include teaching to read, or payment of just wages, we need not stop to inquire. We know they do not!—Editor.

each other." And it said, with evident— "We know of upwards of a dozen in the neighborhood of Cambridge, read!"

And yet, we cannot find, from any amount within our reach that any of the of Missions intended to teach the colored people to read. The Report of the Presbyterian Synod from which we have quoted contains no intimation of the kind, and our readers doubtless know that a "Sunday School for colored people only means the recollect portions of the Scriptures to the interspersed with remarks. Of the kind quality of religious instruction inter have been communicated, the reader judge by what follows.

The Presbyterian Synod in the same from which we have quoted, labor to that "the religious instruction of the will contribute to safety." "No mean compete with that of religious instruction. It would imply "no reckless efforts to apart human society." The slave was taught to obey his master. Their tendency would have no "tendency to emancipation. In answer to the objection that "the instruction of the slaves will lead to insurrection," the Synod say:

"This might be the effect of injudicious instruction that did not recognize the in society, and inculcate the duties appropriate page 27.

Then follows a repetition of the "Moses and Philemon" argument, as of Prof. Stuart and others. And in all the danger that other teaching might reach the slaves, the "Report" says:

"The most effectual method to preclude the instruction of such persons, is for us to take the instruction of the negroes into our own hands, and commend it, ourselves. We shall then know what they are, and what they are taught." page 28.

And so, a pro-slavery gospel, was all the Synod intended to communicate, after all. But this is not all. Hear them again.

"Our view is that religious instruction should be accompanied with proper and efficient discipline. The master relax his discipline, whether he gives instruction or not, his servants would be disorderly and unprofitable." page 29.

Our intelligent readers, doubtless, what "efficient discipline" on a slave plantation means! We have the fact, that the proposed religious instruction was to be in aid of that discipline, and both were intended together, in the Report of the Synod. "Servants obey your masters," was the text; and the exposition and application to come from the lush of the task master. Further light on this part of the Presbyterian plan of educating slaves, may be gathered from another pamphlet before us, published the same office, by many of the same persons the same year; (viz.)

"Annual Report of the Missionary to the Negroes."

county, Georgia, presented to the Association, 1833. Published by order of the Association. Observer Office press, 1834.
Officers for 1833 of this "Association" were
President—Rev. Robert Quarlesman.
—Rev. Samuel H. Law. Secretary and
—Mr. James B. Bullock. Executive Com-
—James Bacon, Thomas Mullan, John O. Ba-
—Dunwoody, Oliver Stevens, Burlington King,
—Rev. Charles C. Jones.

In this authentic document we extract
following:

enter takes into his own hands, the arrange-
ment, confining it or not, as he pleases,
on his own place. The Missionary has
nothing to do with making arrangements for plantation
work, but does he give any notice, whatever, to the
other plantations, or on the Sabbath, that
will be held on such and such plantations.—

Other place the "Missionary" says:

"I suggest again, that the discipline of planta-
tions be continued and perfected. There are
many who relax discipline, as soon as they begin to give
instruction. Others suppose, that the fact of
giving instruction, obliges a relaxation of dis-
cipline, knowing that all success in planting would
be destroyed, if discipline were altogether
relaxed. You do not relax discipline of your families because you train
your children. No more should you relax the
discipline of your servants. By discipline we do
not mean severity. Severity is not discipline, though
discipline is not without some severity. The
discipline to be infixed is subordination. That,
in general, discipline is easy, that is, as easy
as to train a people in their condition. In con-
sidering the proper discipline on plantations, the
difficulty, for the helping of your efforts
must. The patrol should be real, not nomi-
nal. It should be as not to harass and vex the people,
but to put them in fear and order. During the last
year there were twelve or fifteen runaways in the
county. page 13—14.

Here, the benevolent "Missionary," dis-
cusses the evil of having the people of his
plantation at liberty, as to find opportu-
nity for loco-motion. If such a practice
prevail among them, they might find
their way to regions where they could obtain
for their labor which the Biblical
law has discovered to be their due!—
ought to be public spirit in the coun-
tries. The "Missionary," "sufficient
in its police"! "I submit it to the
Association [i. e. the
Society] and all of our citizens."

remarkable missionary measures, it
confessed, and very nearly akin to
the same sort of Apostles, in their
establishment at Liberia, where
powder, muskets, and cutlasses, have
been so useful, as auxiliaries in the work
civilizing the natives. The pious slaves,
suppose, could not have been very im-
portant in their prayers, for the success of
missions, among them. We cannot mar-
vel at their failure, especially when we con-
sider the little hold upon the consciences or
violence of church members such ap-
pearances would be likely to have. We cannot
wonder that this "year of experiment
and error," as the Missionary Jones calls
it (page 11)—should have made no more
impression than it seems to have done, upon

the white Presbyterians. On this point, the
"Report" of the Synod, before quoted from,
says:

"There are but few masters who have given them-
selves the trouble of solemn, prayerful inquiry into the
number and nature of their duties, which they owe to
their servants, and are, in reason and conscience, bound
to perform; and but few servants who have been in-
structed upon the number and nature of their duties to
masters. Great ignorance and indifference exist, both
on one hand and on the other. CONSCIENCE SLEEPS.—
And though the reciprocal duties of master and servant
are so important, and are so particularly defined in the
Scriptures, we do not recollect to have heard a sermon
from the pulpit concerning them. The reason of this
neglect on the part of the ministry, we cannot assign,
unless it be, that they have partaken of the spirit of in-
differency and forgetfulness, prevalent in our country, on the
general subject. It is a glaring and culpable neglect of
duty, and we take occasion here, to urge on ourselves,
and upon every minister, connected with this Synod,
repentance and reformation." page 14.

But have they repented and reformed?—
Where is the record? This remarkable para-
graph furnishes us with a striking commenta-
ry upon the pretension that the Southern min-
istry and churches, taking an intelligent view
of the whole matter, and being fully informed
and alive to their duties to the enslaved, need
no admonitions on the subject! By the con-
fession of the Synod, they are "culpably
negligent." "Conscience sleeps." The mas-
ter is represented as being as ignorant of his
duties, as the slave is of his—and consequent-
ly in as much need of a missionary to instruct
him! Quite remarkable is it, that the date of
these, and of all kindred documents in our
possession (1833 and 1834) should indicate
that these efforts were elicited by the begin-
ning of the Anti-Slavery excitement, but be-
ing found incompatible with slavery, have been
relinquished!

Corroborative testimony, to any amount,
might be easily introduced. We have before
us a pamphlet of 35 pages, entitled:

"Pastoral Letters of the Right Rev. WILLIAM MEADE,
assistant Bishop of Virginia, to the ministers, members
and friends of the Protestant Episcopal church, in the
diocese of Virginia, on the duty of affording religious in-
struction to those in bondage. Alexandria, D. C. Print-
ed at the Gazette Office, 1831."

This pamphlet, like the preceding ones
(two from South Carolina and one from Ken-
tucky) was evidently elicited by the earnest
reproofs of abolitionists, then recently sent
forth, and rousing the whole country with the
charge that the slaves were held in a condi-
tion of heathenism. The charge was loudly
condemned, as slanderous, by the leading
clergy and religious editors of the North!—
But the responses drawn forth from the South
attested that the allegations were true,

Bishop Meade does not enter into the par-
ticulars of Southern heathenism so minutely
as the Presbyterian Synods of Kentucky, and
of South Carolina and Georgia had done be-
fore him. There was a good reason for this.
Bishop Meade wrote later than they. He had
seen the use that abolitionists were making of

their statements.* He had been supplied (as
we happen to know) with the Anti-Slavery
publications containing extracts and comments
upon them. His publication is, therefore,
more guarded and wary. It is, nevertheless,
based upon the assumption of similar facts.—
If the slaves of Virginia were not, for the
most part, in the same condition of heathen-
ism as in Kentucky, in South Carolina and
in Georgia, then has Bishop Meade perpetrat-
ed a slander—in the very fact of writing such
an "address"—more flagrant than any thing
ever written by abolitionists, and the "Pro-
testant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of
Virginia" should repel it. He speaks of the
slaves as "a large and destitute portion of our
fellow creatures." (page 3.) He says to
his brethren—"We are guilty of the most
criminal neglect, by withholding that spiritual
instruction and discipline which would infinite-
ly outweigh every temporal blessing," &c.—
(page 5.) He speaks of "thousands among
us who cannot read the word of God, and but
seldom hear it, and whose instruction in the
truth is so little the object of concern to their
owners, to God's ministers, or to any other
persons, whatsoever." (page 8.) "It is
deeply affecting to think, how few of our ser-
vants attend any religious meeting whatever."
(page 8—9.) "Until more attention is paid
to this subject, we cannot expect any material
improvement in the moral and religious con-
dition of our servants." (page 9.)

"Can we wonder that an enemy should say—In this
fair, lovely, and of good report, to take the proceeds of
the toil of the slave, to send the light of truth to the Hin-
doo, or the Sami, Sea Islander, and have him in dark-
ness. Or is it to provide for our own household, to go,
as many pious Sunday School teachers have done, many
miles, on a Sunday morning, to teach a few children,
chiefly perhaps, of wealthy and pious parents, leaving
behind, a far greater number of poor ignorant slaves, of
every age, who might be taught, if not to read, still to
understand the blessed bible, as read and expounded to
them, by one who is competent to the task. Would to
God these charges were but too true!" (page 10)

We regret that Bishop Meade should have
counted us enemies because we told him the
truth." But when northern ministers and ed-
itors lead the way in misrepresenting and ma-
ligning us, we can the better excuse those of
the South, who perhaps believe them. We
know, as in the case of a Birney and a Bris-
bane, that our work is half done, with the
Southern conscience, when these Northern as-
persions can be dislodged.

Again, Bishop Meade speaks of "two millions of a
neglected race in our land," and says that little is done
for them. And he adds—"Must not judgment begin at
the house of God, EVEN WITH HIS MINISTERS,
for the next?" "I am utterly amazed, and ask, CAN
the pure love of God, and of lost souls of men, animate
the Christian ministers of our land?" (page 11.)

*It is true, too, that President Young, Mr. Bracken-
ridge and other members of the Synod of Kentucky—
together with Dr. Palmer, C. C. Jones, and others of
the Synod of South Carolina, and Georgia, had been
deeply impressed and painfully excited by the Anti-Slavery
publications of the North, before their appeals in fa-
vor of slave education, were elicited.

And so the same portentous inquiry that has agitated the bosoms of the "fanatical come-out-ers" in Central and Western New York, found a lodgment too, in the breast of Bishop Meade! He too, was "amazed" and had his doubts, to say the least, concerning the Christian character of such ministers and churches!

And he might well doubt again, now, could he see a Biblical Repertory, endeavoring to cover up the fact, and turn away the attention of the churches from "two millions" of destitute heathen, because it has been told by one slave holder, that all his slaves can both read and write!

Our charge against the Southern churches, we have sustained by their own witnesses. They DO HEATHENIZE THEIR SLAVES AND WITHHOLD FROM THEM RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

And what relation do the Northern churches and ministry hold to this heathenism, and to the authors of it? Let the Biblical Repertory stand for a witness and for a specimen of their course. Denying or palliating the sin—holding fellowship with it—refusing to reprove it—deriding and defaming those who do reprove it—and when obliged, after a twelve year's contest, to admit that such conduct is sinful, penning deceptive paragraphs to convey the impression that the sin rarely exists in the churches of the South!

At an early stage of the present anti-slavery movement, this matter of forced heathenism came under earnest debate, in the religious periodicals of the North. Abolitionists were distinguished from all others by claiming that the slaves should have bibles and be taught to read. On the side of their opponents, it was contended—and is still—that "oral instruction" is sufficient for them. Abolitionists "disturb the peace of the churches," by calling this a Popish and anti-Protestant doctrine. They say that if the Romish is anti-Christian, because she forbids the Bible—the Southern churches are anti-Christian for the same reason. The Northern churches and ministry exclaim against this—shut out the discussion of the subject, and cling to the South. Hence, secessions, and re-organizations, in our midst.

This same slaveholding Missionary, C. C. Jones, of the South Carolina and Georgia Presbytery defended the sufficiency of "oral instruction" and the right of withholding the Bible. He did so in the Christian Mirror, a Congregational paper, edited by a Congregational Minister, at Portland, Maine. The Editor apparently sympathized with his side of the question. The articles were eagerly copied into most of the religious presses of the North, and extolled as conclusive against the "fanatics" who had claimed Bibles for slaves.

We have now before us a pamphlet "Sermon before the Vermont Colonization Society, October 1833. By Joseph Tracy. Chronicle Press, Windsor, Vermont." In this sermon, Mr. Tracy significantly advocates this doctrine—"It is not true that all children, throughout the whole earth, have a claim for the same laws, and the same instruction."—This doctrine, he afterwards applies to the slaves, and says:

"Can you not understand a book, unless you read it, yourself; or a conversation, unless it be written down and put into your hands, on paper? The art of reading, we know, wonderfully increases the faculty with which we may fit ourselves for the performance of duty, but it is possible to become safe citizens without it. We therefore pass no sentence, either of condemnation or approval, on those who withhold this art from their slaves.—We only say, they must be educated. You must educate them. Take your own way to do it. If you find it safe to put books into their hands, it will diminish your labor, immensely. (page 15)

We give this, only as a specimen of the Romish logic by which abolitionists have been met, when they have claimed Bibles, and the art of reading, for the slaves. The Biblical Repertory testifies truly when it says that "no church, i. e. denomination, of any consideration for numbers"—that neither "Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians or Baptists," have yet "sanctioned the doctrine on which moral abolitionism rests." They have not sanctioned the doctrine that it is anti-Christian to withhold Bibles and the art of reading from the laboring population, in one half the States of this Union!

Bible Societies have repeatedly declined distributing Bibles to slaves, (or even free people of color in some of the States) declaring it was no part of their object to do so—while, at the same time, they have reported that every family in the United States have been supplied by them. This is evidently ranking the colored people among cattle! Abolitionists have given them mortal offence, by offering to replenish their treasuries, on condition that they would give Bibles to slaves.

This crime, then, of withholding Bibles and education from the slave, we fasten upon the principal religious denominations, Northern and Southern. The negro pew of the North is an imitation, not to say a refinement upon the system of heathen-making in the South. In one and the same condemnation, they unitedly and fraternally share.

THE RECAPITULATION.

Our pledge is redeemed. Our positions are proved. Allowing the Repertory all the benefits of its boasted distinction between slave holding and the slave laws, the practices which it admits to be wicked are fastened upon the churches, Northern and Southern. They are wedded to them, and wallow in them. They rob the laborer of his hire—they sever the babe from its mother—the husband from the

wife—they annul marriage—they heathenize immortal souls. They do this, and will not repent. They do this, and either justify or deny the doing. They do this, and harden themselves against reproof. They do this, and malign their reprovers. They do this, and in doing it, rebel against God, insult humanity, and disgrace the religion they profess.

How such transgressors ought to be treated the Repertory has itself told us, by the example of Paul and his fellow Apostles who treated men living in scandalous and daring crimes. By its own showing, we should be "unfaithful"—we should be "lax"—and should take a course "irreconcilable with moral honesty"—a course "base in its tendency to the 'ruin of their souls'—and not solemnly bear testimony against them to warn them to repent, and bring forth much fruit to the glory of the Father."—

CRUELTY IN THE CHURCHES.

But other specifications might be made. The same sort of testimony we might give upon the Southern churches, barbarous cruelties, that would indeed be increased, not proved to be true. We might bear solemn testimony that "cruelty is the rule among religious slave holders"—and "is the exception." The cruelties mentioned in the Address of the Synod of Kentucky, already quoted, are sufficient to settle this.

THEY CHATTLEIZE HUMAN BEINGS.

The fact of practical chattelhood of human beings, by the Southern churches, is proved by the testimony already given. We are not speaking of the "wicked laws" but of the fact that the churches and ministry treat their slaves "according to their natures, as men and brute beasts. They brutalize them, deny their common humanity by using them for labor as they do that of brutes, without giving them the right to hold property—by separating them, in sale, like brute beasts—by herding them together like cattle, out the sanctities of marriage—by denying them the right to have Bibles. This is acting out the principle of Mr. Gholson of Virginia: It is that they hold them as much their own and brute property, too, as they do the mares." It is not for the Presbyterians of South Carolina and Georgia to deny or slip a syllable of censure of the language of Mr. Gholson. Providential proof is on our table. While writing these strictures, the mails bring us the "ment" of their infamy.

The following was cut from the Savannah Republican, of March 3d, 1845.

McINTOSH SHERIFF SALE.

Will be sold on the first Tuesday in March next, in front of the Court House, within the city of Darien, between the legal hours of sale, all that Plantation, situated, lying, and being in McIntosh county, known as the "Thicket," bounded on the south by Bowman's land, on the west by lands belonging to the estate of John Hutton, and vacant lands, on the north by lands belonging to the estate of John G. Bell, and N. P. Gignillat's, and on the east by the river and salt marsh, containing twelve hundred and fifty acres, more or less, levied on as the property of Henry T. Hall, to satisfy a mortgage \$1. fa. issued out of McIntosh Superior Court, in favor of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia vs. Henry T. Hall. Also, at the same time and place, the following negro slaves, to wit: Charles, Peggy, Antoinette, Davy, September, Maria, Jenny, and Isaac—levied on as the property of Henry T. Hall, to satisfy a mortgage \$1. fa. issued out of McIntosh Superior Court, in favor of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina, vs. said Henry T. Hall. Conditions, cash.

O. O'NEAL,
Deputy Sheriff, &c.

So, here we have the bottom line of the Synod's missionary efforts among the negroes! How long will it take to Christianize them, by agencies like these?

THE "WICKED SLAVE LAWS!"

Tell us no more, after this, of the distinction between slave holding, and "the wicked slave laws"! The very worst that can possibly be said of those laws is, that they legalize the practices of slave holders—that they shield from the penitentiary, and from the State prison the prominent church members, (three fourths of them, according to Mr. Smylie) of the Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian sects, at the South, with their ministers and Doctors of Divinity, including the "Synod of South Carolina and Georgia," and the Faculty and Trustees of their "Theological Seminary" along with them! Only repeal the slave laws, and they become felons of the deepest dye. Let the members of the Synod go to the coast of Africa, and indulge in the same practice of buying and selling human beings there—let them be caught in the act, and brought home and tried under the laws of the United States, for such cases made and provided, and if the facts were legally proved, and righteous judgment rendered, according to law, they would be swung up, as pirates, every man of them, at the yard arm.—

"The wicked slave laws" are kept in being for the sole object of legalizing the atrocities which churches, ministers, and church members constantly and greedily practice and pertinaciously tolerate—the practices of enforcing unpaid labor—separating families—breaking up the family state—annulling marriage—forbidding to read the bible—forbidding divine worship and religious instruction when, where and how the worshippers choose! Only repeal the "wicked slave laws" and enforce the common law of all civilized and Christian nations, and "three fourths of" all the church members and ministers of "eleven States in

this Union" would have to quit their knavish pursuits, their horrible barbarities, their abominable practices, or be shut up in jail, or executed for their crimes. Yet the only reason, forsooth, why they do not oppose these "wicked slave laws" is because "Christ's kingdom is not of this world" and they are too holy to pollute themselves with "secular" affairs.—With these creatures, the northern churches and ministry are in full fellowship! And stranger still!—Abolitionists are members of these churches—and supporters of their ministry!

ABOLITION A TEST QUESTION IN THE CHURCHES.

SENTIMENTS OF SAMUEL H. COX, IN 1838.

—It suits the convenience of some, now-a-days, to treat the doctrine of anti-slavery church discipline, non-fellowship and secession as a mischievous innovation, of recent date, in the anti-slavery movement. But facts are against them. All earnest and consistent abolitionists from the days of Scott, Hopkins, Edwards, and Wesley, to the present day, have held one uniform language on the subject. The old Methodist Episcopal Discipline is scarcely less explicit than that of the modern Wesleyans who have seceded from the old church. And nearly all the active abolitionists in the ministry, eight years ago, were evidently looking to church action as the appropriate remedy for the evil, so far as the church was concerned. It was only when they found the majority and the leading influences ranged on the other side, that they receded from that ground, protesting, even then (as in the case of the abolitionists in the New School Presbyterian General Assembly) that it was only a temporary delay that would be amply atoned for at the "next session."—But finding the position of the churches a permanent one, they gave over the struggle entirely, both in and out of the church, and ceased to identify themselves with the anti-slavery movement, in any shape. Cox, Beman, Kirke, Ludlow, Duffield, to which we may now add Edward Beecher and J. Hawes, are instances in point, and their whole course shows that they themselves understand that in giving up the question as a church question, a test of church-membership, religious fellowship and Christian co-operation, they give up the anti-slavery enterprise altogether. No one understands them as agitating the subject, in any way, morally, religiously or politically.

We have made these remarks, as introductory to an extract from a Letter written by SAMUEL H. COX, D. D. to Dr. Jonathan A. Allen, Middlebury, Vermont, and dated Auburn, N. Y. Feb. 10, 1838. [Vide Christian

Freeman, Feb. 27, 1855, copied from Emancipator, 1838.]

In reference to the speculative slave, or the pro-slavery advocate, in church and state, especially among us here at the North, I think, on the principle that light graduates light, our church discipline must probably begin with them. We must not be partakers of other men's sins. We must have no fellowship with evil works, but rather reprove them. Now, our old maxim is a sound one: "The partaker is as bad as the thief." I say it is sound; for so says God himself. When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentest with him, declares the Holy Ghost, in the fifth Psalm: where the day of judgment is described in its principles, and anticipated in its decisions; and where God condemns the east-aways, on the principle that they approved the evil that others did.

As to the principle, as related to the moral code of God, I hesitate not a moment to say that, other things being equal, a slave of any description ought to be excluded from the communion of the church; and that, by consequence, the members of the church, individually, ought to withdraw communion from slave-holders and slave-dealers universally. Whatever in the system, or in our support of it, is morally wrong, is no small criminality. Its peculiar, rather than venial. It is the moral annihilation and perdition of our fellow creatures—each one of them a brother of the species—an immortal—a man, in body, soul and spirit. And is our Judge Eternal, who condescends to wear our common nature, in the person of Jesus Christ, on his throne? and to call every man his brother—such emphatically if he loves the Savior? and to be represented on the earth, by the poor and the oppressed? And the King shall answer, and say unto them, Verily, I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Such was the language of Samuel H. Cox, while he was an abolitionist. Let all abolitionists ask themselves whether they can long retain an anti-slavery profession with credit among the community, or with satisfaction to themselves, if they take lower grounds, or fail to honor their convictions by their practices.

CLASSES OF FACTS, TO BE PONDERED, AND ACCOUNTED FOR.

FIRST CLASS.—Persons distinguished for serious, stable, unostentatious piety and retiring modesty, in the churches of the existing sects, who have arrived at the painful conclusion that there is very little vital godliness in those churches, and that the vast majority, both of church members and ministers know nothing of experimental religion. The persons holding these views, comprize, probably, the bulk of those who would, by common consent, in the church, and out of it, be regarded as the very salt of those churches.—They are not forward to state these views and seldom do so, except to select friends, and among themselves, in private conversation.—And the ground of the judgment thus formed, in many instances, is not exclusively or mainly, the backwardness of ministers and church members to enlist, heartily, in the temperance and anti-slavery enterprises, and other similar works of reform. The complaint is of a more general character, and touches the unchristian deportment and worldly and selfish spirit of both ministers and church members, not excepting very many of them who, by fits and starts, are active and noisy in religious

revivals. Not one in a dozen of those who are burdened with a contemplation of this state of things have ever thought of seceding from the churches and denominations to which they belong—have ever been troubled, particularly, with their sectarian arrangements—have ever questioned the scriptural character of existing ecclesiastical arrangements—have ever suspected any mischief from the maintenance of a clerical caste. And a large portion of them would not even think of tracing the common degeneracy which they witness and deplore, to the connexion of our churches and ministry with those of the slave holding States. It is not so much the *philosophy* as the *fact* of deterioration, that has arrested their attention. So that there is no opportunity to charge upon them a morose spirit toward their brethren and their ministers on account of any difficulty with them on these points—no chance to charge them with being monomaniacs, or men of one idea—no room to allege that their *spirituality* has suffered and their vision become beclouded, by their attention to “mere morality,” or to outward organizations and forms. What are we to infer from this class of facts?

SECOND CLASS.—A large number of churches of a given sect, and extending over a considerable extent of territory, from which, if you were to remove the abolitionists, (though a minority, and not commonly wealthy) it would be difficult or impracticable to sustain a minister and altogether out of the question to attempt keeping up a weekly prayer meeting, a monthly concert, or even a Sabbath school. Yet these abolitionists cannot have the use of the meeting house for an anti-slavery lecture—they cannot have a notice of any anti-slavery meeting read from the pulpit—no active abolitionist is invited or even permitted to preach there—a prayer for the slave cannot be uttered in a prayer meeting without giving offence; and a minister’s using a slave holder would not be thought an objection to his occupying the pulpit. Yet these churches and their ministers will confidently tell you that “the piety” of the churches is decidedly against the anti-slavery measures—while, at the same time, they propose no measures of their own.—They complain of the abolitionists as disturbers of their peace, allow them no exercise of their rights, as church members, to present the subject to their brethren in church meeting, and yet complain of them as “schismatics” if they peacefully withdraw! How long will such a state of things continue?

THIRD CLASS.—Ministers, Editors and others (including not a few prominent abolitionists) who are forward to complain of the denun-

ciations of active abolitionists, but are nevertheless guilty of the very worst sort of denunciation themselves, to wit, the denunciation that authoritatively and imperatively condemns, without giving either reason or scripture to sustain their accusations. Men of this stamp will visit, with their sweeping denunciations, the sentiments that have been patiently and argumentatively put forth by seceding abolitionists, without even making a show of attempt to prove, in a candid, scriptural argument, that those sentiments are incorrect. As for example: It has been shown, by statistical facts, never disputed, that the churches of the existing sects, with few exceptions, are the bulwarks of American slavery:—it has been shown, by arguments drawn from scripture and from common sense, that such churches are anti-Christian, and that God commands his people “to come out of them, lest they partake of their sins and receive of their plagues.” It is not known that any person who believes slave-holding to be sinful, has ever yet attempted a fair and candid reply to these arguments. Yet the opprobrious names of “schismatics”—“fanatics” and “come-out-ers” are liberally bestowed upon those who hold these sentiments, and they are denounced for their bitter and denunciatory spirit. Here, then, is a remarkable class of facts to be accounted for. We can hardly suppose that our brethren who are so strongly opposed to denunciation should so extensively resort to the very worst form of it, themselves, if they felt themselves able to confute, by a fair and candid argument, the sentiments they so loudly condemn.

DIALOGUE ABOUT DENUNCIATION.

A. No! I want none of your papers—none of your pamphlets—none of your tracts!—Your writers manifest such a bad spirit—they are so vituperative—so denunciatory—so unchristian. I will have nothing to do with them.

B. Ought you not to take care, brother, lest you become a denouncer, yourself—and an unreasonable one, too? Did you ever read the publications you condemn? Can you say that they are not written in a candid spirit? Are you able to disprove their statements, or answer their arguments, or show that they are not according to scripture?

A. I never read them, and I never want to read them. Their very titles tell me all I want to know about them.

B. Ah! what are they?

A. There is one entitled “American Churches the bulwarks of American Slavery.” Do you think I would read such a pamphlet?

B. How, then, do you know that the assertions it contains are not such as

to warrant the conclusion contained in the title?

A. I don’t care what the facts are! I never read any thing that is got up to slander the church. It manifests such a *bad spirit*! It is so *denunciatory*! It is so *vituperative*!—It is so *unchristian*! You are all a set of infidels and disorganizers and fanatics, that want to overthrow the church. Your being so denunciatory is a sufficient proof of this!

B. But what other document of our circulation can you mention that is denunciatory and unchristian?

A. Why! There’s the paper that’s headed “Pro-slavery or apparently neutral Churches are Anti-Christian!”

B. Did you ever read, attentively and prayerfully, that paper? And if so, will you give your reasons for thinking that the argument is unsound, or the sentiment not according to scripture?

A. Read it! No! I told you I never read infidel writings! I tell you that any thing so denunciatory *must* be unchristian and infidel, of course! My minister says so, and a more godly minister never lived!

B. Do you deny, then, that churches may apostatize and become anti-Christian? Is there not danger of their doing so, without knowing it? What do you say of the seven churches of Asia, and the church of Rome? And has not God commanded his servants to “show his people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins?” What do you say to *that*?

A. Say! Why! I say ‘tis vituperation, denunciatory, and unchristian! All the ministers say so, except a few of your hair-brained fanatics! They ought to be tarred and feathered, and rid on a rail! They are so “vituperative and unchristian”!

B. But what other publication that we circulate, do you consider objectionable?

A. Why all of them. Particularly Wesley’s thoughts on Slavery, and Edward’s Sermon. *Them*, I read, before I knew what denunciatory stuff they contained. And then, there’s another one, headed “Duty of Secession from a corrupt Church.” That, I had no occasion to read, for the very title told me that it was infidel and disorganizing. Otherwise, it would not have so denunciatory a title.

B. Why, truly, friend, you surprise me, though I do not often suffer myself to be surprised, at any thing. But I thought every body would admit the duty of seceding from a corrupt church. Do you really think the sentiment an unsound one?

A. To be sure I do! ‘Tis “schismatic”!

"The 'disorganizing'! 'The denunciatory! 'The vituperative! 'The unchristian!

Christian Investigator.

HONEYB, JULY, 1845.

PORTER ON COME-OUT-ISM.—A second edition has been published, of this able tract, by White, Peirce & Co., 1 Cornhill. The language of Christianity is come out. It says, "Come thou, with all thy house, into the ark." "Come into me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Come into the fold, under the good shepherd. Come into the family, under Christ the head. The language of a certain class of reckless revolutionists is to "come out." No matter what you do, you must come out. The way to heaven is to come out. No other excellence is of any avail; ye do not come out. No other qualifications are needed, if you only come out. You may ask them where you are to go for shelter, for sympathy, for help in the journey heaven-ward. They tell you nothing, only "come out." We believe the bewilderment is nearly exhausted by an evil effort on the community; but still the publication will do good.—[Emancipator and Chronicle.

We would respectfully suggest to Anti-Slavery Editors who have occasion to speak against "come-out-ism," that it might assist to a better understanding of their position and meaning if they would tell us whether they mean the "come-out-ism" that is opposed to all church institutions, or that which only invites to a separation from pro-slavery ecclesiastical connexions, for the sake of re-organizing again on free principles. It suits the policy of pro-slavery ministers and editors to cast both these classes into the same heap, and the same opprobrious epithets are bestowed upon both. The Wesleyans, in this State, and farther west, are stigmatized as "come-out-ers." So are the independent churches that are gathered and gathering, all over the country. Our friend, of the Emancipator, may find one at Fitchburg, in his own state, and perhaps others, nearer home. It was intended, if we mistake not, to establish such a church at Cambridgeport, though we know not its precise shape.

If Liberty editors who raise the standard of political "come-out-ism," think it is wrong to come out of pro-slavery churches, we hope they will give us their reasons. Such a "come-out-ism" as the Emancipator describes, we would not encourage, and we do not like to have all who "come out" from pro-slavery churches ranked under that description.

Christianity does indeed say—"Come in." But not into a pro-slavery church! Her language in respect to corrupt and apostate churches is "Come out of her, my people that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues"! From this language the term "Come-outer" is derived and has been applied to all the Protestant sects.

Mr. Porter's tract we have not seen. Who is Mr. Porter? Is he an abolitionist? And what is his doctrine? Does he denounce so

cession from pro-slavery sects? Will not some one send us a copy?

NEW ENGLAND CONGREGATIONALISM—PRESENT POSITION.—It may be well to record, occasionally, a few specimens of the current religion of the existing sects. There is an over-charitable expectation, among abolitionists in general, that these sects will gradually assume an aspect less decidedly anti-Christian. Let us see what progress they are making, now-a-days.

"If God had not interposed his special agency in sending his angel to shut the mouths of the lions, and if Daniel had been destroyed by them, there would have been no evidence that God justified his conduct, or viewed the law unjust."

"Nothing of this kind is found in the case of Mr. Torrey. When God sends his angel to take him out of prison, or in any way interposes by a special providence, to effect his liberation, then will we believe the case to be analogous, and God justifies his conduct, and not till then!"—[Senex in the Congregational Journal.

Some of the papers have characterized this argument as "decidedly unique." For our own part, we regard it as one of the most ardent plagiarisms extant. Eighteen hundred years ago, the same logic was used, and the record is in every one's hand.

"And they that passed by, reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, 'Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it, in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.' Likewise also the chief priests, mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, 'He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.' He trusted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him." Math. xxvii. 39-43.

And this is the voice, and this the spirit of the "chief priests, and the scribes and elders" of New England Congregationalism, now!—So it would seem! One of their principal "scribes" publishes it to the winds, and who except the hunted and hated abolitionists are seen or heard to rebuke the sentiment, or even dissent from it? Do such papers as the Boston Recorder, Christian Mirror, Vermont Chronicle, or N. Y. Observer utter a syllable against it?

The position of the Congregational sect will be better appreciated when it is remembered that Charles T. Torrey is a regularly educated and clerically ordained minister of that connection—that his wife is daughter of Jacob Ide, D. D. and grand-daughter of the late Nathaniel Emmons, D. D. of the same denomination—and that, aside from the heresy of opposing human chattelhood, no ministers of the sect enjoy a more spotless and unsullied reputation than they! Yet this is the temper and the language of the sect, (through its accredited and unrebuked journals,) in respect to them! And we are told that it would be unkind and schismatic for the abolitionists in that sect to secede from their "brethren" who "wag their heads," when the most honored and beloved among them are, for righteous-

ness, made thrust into prison! Can it need the gift of prophetic inspiration to predict the fatal effects of the infatuation that, with an open eye, clings to such a sect?

"RESPECT FOR GOSPEL INSTITUTIONS."—Most marvellous is it, that the attempt to inquire after and restore New Testament church order should be stigmatized as betraying "a want of respect for gospel institutions!"

Professors of religion are divided into two classes, in respect to this subject. The one insist that all existing usages in the churches which are manifestly of human invention, additions to, or amendments of, the simple institution of the New Testament, should be laid aside, and accordingly they test every question concerning church order, the ministry, &c. by a direct appeal to the divine testimony. They seek the honor of Christian institutions, by conforming them to the divine model, and by the maintenance of that strict church discipline which shall keep the churches free from the contaminating and controlling influence of wicked men. The other class are ardently attached to usages and institutions in the church for which they do not pretend to find any New Testament precedent, divine model, or warrant. They deny that the scriptures furnish any divine directory of church order and discipline, and say that Christians have a right to shape them according to their own views of propriety and convenience.—They cling to arrangements which divide the people of God asunder, and allow wicked men a place in the church. Now we put it to the piety and common sense of all who possess these qualifications, to determine, which of the two classes of religionists betray the greatest want of respect for the institutions of the gospel. And we ask whether those are not wanting in respect for divine institutions, who stigmatize as mere outward formalists, devoid of spiritual life, all who are earnestly inquiring after the institutions of Christ.

"UNTIL THE SPIRIT BE Poured UPON US FROM ON HIGH."—It is not for the want of a rational conviction, in the minds of thousands and tens of thousands, that the work of Church reformation does not move rapidly forward. It is not for the want of men who are thoroughly convinced that the existing sects are radically wrong in their structure, and incurably corrupt in their character. It is not because church organization, Christian union, church independency, equal brotherhood, lay ordination, &c. &c. are not (in the minds of multitudes) settled questions—so much so that the discussion of them has become stale. The amount of correct information

on these subjects has, from a variety of causes, vastly increased, within two or three years past, inasmuch that ministers and church members of ordinary intelligence and candor, will commonly admit, in the abstract, nearly all that we could desire them to admit, in respect to them. But the *self-denial* that is required to carry out these convictions into PRACTICE, presents the grand difficulty in the case. How can we afford to lose caste with our old associates and friends? How can we bear to be made of "no reputation" and become "the filth and off scouring of all things?" How can we find the means of sustaining a minister? And how (in case we cannot) can we find time to study the bible and its truths sufficiently to hold religious meetings to edification and profit, among ourselves?—Is there spirituality, intelligence, piety, consistency, brotherly love, and holy fidelity enough, among Christians (crippled and maimed as they have been, in their training) to maintain and wield the simple institutions of the New Testament? And, if not, had we not better continue in our old bondage to human inventions until, in that school, we have become sufficiently prepared for gospel activity and freedom? This is the question upon which—in reality, the Christian brotherhood, now linger, and will continue to stumble, "until the spirit be poured upon us from on high."

BENEVOLENCE OF THE RICH.—John J. Astor, the New York millionaire, has given \$500 to the Pittsburgh sufferers. A servant girl in Pittsburgh gave about the same amount. \$500 set down for a single individual appears rather benevolent, but had an influential business man, with a capital of \$50,000, given only a dollar for such an object, he would have been despised for his meanness. But Astor gave just in that proportion. The sums which such men give for benevolent objects are much less according to their ability than those paid by men dependent on the labor of their hands for a subsistence. Say, for instance, one individual worth \$50,000 gives \$5 to the poor, (which appears quite liberal, in the eyes of the world, for one man,) and the laborer worth \$1000 pay \$1, which appears none too much for any man, but the latter pays in proportion to his ability, ten times as much as the former, who has a fortune of \$50,000. The men of moderate means sustain the benevolent operations of the day.—(Western Citizen.)

The Bible rule of contribution is, in proportion to means—"according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not."

When shall we see the church and the state, distributing burdens according to this divine maxim?

INDEPENDENT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES. We are well aware that the great objection felt by ministers against having churches independent, is, that in this state they are too much beyond the control of the ministry as a body.

We beg to suggest that ever even independent churches the ministry may exert a most vigorous and precious influence for the exclusion or prevention of error. Their influence for these ends may be just what it should be—that of instruction, counsel, exhortation—that of fervent prayer and faithful labor for souls. Governmental influence—the power of ecclesiastical organization—is a mere cypher, in real value, compared with the influence of vigorous, intelligent, furnished minds and holy hearts, through the pulpit and the press. O, could this only be thoroughly realized, and could we only see a grasping after the right sort of power!—(Oberlin Evangelist.)

REVERENCE FOR THE BIBLE.—Admitting the injustice and wickedness of slavery, and invoking the authority of the Bible to sustain it.—(Western Citizen.)

"Persons who have nice scruples about religion, have no business in the army."—DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

"Doing unto others as we would they should do unto us," never caused a war.

What is a Church?

What constitutes a church?—

Not a Roman basilic or Gothic pile,
With a fretted roof, tall spire, and long-drawn aisle;
These only mock thy search:
Fantastic sepulchres, when all is said,—
Seek not the living church among the dead.

What is a Church indeed?

Not triple hierarchy, or throned priest,
The stolen trappings of the Romish beast,
Altar, or well-aug creed,
Rites magical to save, to sanctify,
Nor ought that lulls the ear, or lures the eye.

A band of faithful men

Met for God's worship in an upper room,
Or canopied by midnight's starry dome,
On hill-side, or lone glen,
To hear the counsels of his holy word,
Pledged to each other and their common Lord.

These, few as they may be,
Compose a Church, such as, in pristine age,
Defied the tyrant's zeal, the bigot's rage,—

For where but two or three,
Whatever place, in faith's communion meet,
There, with Christ's presence is a Church complete.

(Cincinnati Herald.)

THE DIFFERENCE.—The Rev. Mr. Spaulding, Missionary of the American Board, at Ceylon, being questioned on the subject of slavery, recently, at a meeting in Vermont, "rejoiced" that he was entirely ignorant about slavery or emancipation in that island, and his "pity," he said, was, "that he might return to his station as ignorant as he left it."—Another Missionary in that island, Rev. H. R. Hoisington, writes a letter, very joyfully communicating the news of the entire abolition of slavery in Ceylon. We condense this statement from an article in the Green Mountain Freeman of July.

To Subscribers.—In requesting the publisher to change the direction of a paper from one place to another, be careful, always, to specify the Post Office removed from, as well as the one removed to. And whenever you return a paper for discontinuance, be careful to write the name of your Post Office on the paper, as well as your own name. Attention to this, will prevent many mistakes, besides saving us a great amount of labor. We often have several subscribers of the same name. And we cannot be expected to remember where all our subscribers live.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to July, 1845.

S. Burpe, Lima,	\$1.00	M. Suckney, Lockport,	1.00
S. Coddington, Bristol,	1.00	W. Gates, Augusta,	1.00
M. Norton, Victor,	25	W. Harris, Brownhelm,	0.10
Dr. Hall, E. Bloomfield,	1.00	F. Stone, Jr. West Brook-	field, Mass.
J. Safford, Cambridge, Vt.	1.50		
J. Cowman, Honeoye,	50	Oca. J. Henshaw, do.	50
do. for J. Wilson, Mason	50	A. Beach, Oppenheim,	1.00
Centre, Michigan,	50	J. Tash, Kingville, O.	1.00
L. Noble, Crane's Corner,	50	E. C. Wright, Granville,	1.00
S. Brigham, Vienna,	50	Ohio,	1.00
E. Dwyer, Pine,	50	Bancroft & Guthrie, do.	1.00
E. Alden, Taberg,	50	A. Campbell, Hamilton,	1.00
A. Siedman, do.	50	C. Campbell, do.	50
Mrs. H. Sanford, Utica,	1.00	E. Palmer, W. Mendon,	50
do. (sent some time past,		J. Campbell, Litchfield,	1.00
but lately received)	1.00	B. J. Campbell, do.	1.00
E. Dewey, N. Y. Mills,	50	S. M. Pond, Bucksport,	2.00
Mrs. Lombard, Eldridge,	50	Maine,	
J. J. Wilson, Port Byron,	1.00	S. C. Leonard, Charles-	ton, O. for back No. 5
Judge Anderson, Gaines,	50	A. O. Merrill, Eagleville,	1.00
A. Judson, Jordan,	1.00	Ohio,	1.00
J. R. Hopkins, Auburn,	1.00	A. Colman, Ellicottville,	1.00
W. Cotton, Clockville,	1.00	G. Pitts, Honeoye,	1.00
H. Avery, Ledyard,	50	L. Noble, do.	1.00
W. Hecox, Skaneateles,	50	A. K. Brayton, North	50
D. Marsh, Cayuga,	1.50	Saluste, R. I.	
H. Amerman, P't Byron,	50	W. Eager, DeWitt,	1.00
S. C. Cuyler, Pulneyville,	1.00		
E. C. Bristol, Fulton,	50		
G. W. Hyatt, Auburn,	50	Total,	40.80

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Quarro Co., N. Y. No. 1. Inquiry and a Meeting. 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Aristo and Bulld. 4 pages, \$0.62 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.

HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office; Perry, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES Vol. III—No. 8.
Whole Number, 40.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. NY. AUGUST, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODFELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, OR AS OFFERED AS PRACTICABLE
—Subscriptions for one year, on the twelve
cents, always in advance, and free of postage.
—Persons who will procure four subscribers, and
pay without expense to the publisher, shall
pay for his services—Or, if procuring six
shall have two copies for his services—Or,
if procuring eight subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separately from
the volume, as follows, viz:
—Dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, 81 00
—Twenty papers, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
—Masters, if requested, will frank letters en-
closed in papers.

ON FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE- HOLDERS.

AL REFERTORY AND PRINCETON RE-
PORT, OCTOBER, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE
CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, JAN., 21, 1845.

[In continuance from the last number.]

PRINCETON DOCTRINE OF RELIGIOUS SLAVE- HOLDERS.

grand object of the writer in the Bib-
liography was, evidently, to put a stop
to anti-Slavery secession among "Old
School" Presbyterians, in Ohio and elsewhere,
to exert a similar influence on the Old
General Assembly which was to con-
vene in a few months, under circumstan-
ces making it almost inevitable that the slave
would have to be agitated anew in
the highest judicatory of the sect. In the
"School" assembly that "volcano had
erupted by Dr. Cox and nearly all the
professed abolitionists in that body long
silenced by their compromising and
erring theology. To "calculate the
consequences" and swim along the tide of "the
apparent good" was the highest point
of expediency which their great new school
had taught them. This "tendency"
of teachings to seduce them into the wor-
ship of "the least of two evils"—or the
"consequences" of such a worship, does not
arise, by the by, to have entered into their
calculations at all. And this is not mar-
vellous. The "consequences" of the theo-
logy of "expediency" lie too deep in the dark
to be "calculated" by any intellect not
endowed with infinity.

the problem before the Princeton writer
was to silence the anti-slavery agitation as of-
ficially in the Old School ecclesiastical con-
ventions, as it had been in the New. But the
consequences would have to vary according to the

widely different nature of the case. The ag-
itators, themselves, were not likely to assist
in the capping of the Volcano, to the smother-
ing of their own fires. Their theology, what-
ever might be its faults, was of a texture less
pliable and bending. "Triangular" and im-
shapen as it might be, it was a theology, nev-
ertheless. It taught the existence of a God,
and forbade the worship of rival devils, irres-
pective of their comparative size. And if its
conceptions of God were such as almost to
drive man out of existence to make place for
him, yet it could not, as a theological system,
be wielded to debar those of its disciples who
had, accidentally, discovered the existence of
man and his rights, from the benefit of hav-
ing a living God, instead of mere "expedi-
ency" to sustain them in the advocacy of jus-
tice.*

The Princeton writer, therefore, to main-
tain the peace of his Zion, without the trouble
of its purification, would need to make it ap-
pear that no such purification was requisite—
that slave holding is not sinful, and that the
churches therefore do not deserve the reproofs
of the abolitionists.

The process of this argument, and its
success, the reader has now seen. The Prince-
ton doctrine has had the advantage of a trial
upon the ground of its own election. For
the argument's sake, it has been assumed, for
the time being, that that ground is a tenable
one. That ground is, that slaveholding (as
the Princeton writer describes it) is not sinful
—that there is a distinction between slave
holding and the slave laws—that while the
former is innocent, the latter are sinful,
so far at least as they authorize (if they
do) human chattelhood, and compulsory
labor without wages, "forbid teach-
ing the slaves to read, prohibit marriage
among them, allow a separation of those who

*Perhaps the most marked distinction between "Old
School" and "New School," in the Presbyterian church,
lies just here—"Old School" is so jealous for a sov-
ereign God, that it hardly dares to admit of the existence of
man. Such a school would not be very likely to teach
inalienable human rights. "New School" is so rean-
tarian to find a place for man, in the universe, that it al-
ways seeks to exclude God from his own creation.—
Such a school may talk largely of man's powers and of
man's rights, but lacks the idea of a God to create
those powers and maintain those rights. Is it impossi-
ble to have a school of theology that shall find room for
God and man both, in the universe, at the same time?
Such a theology, in our nineteenth century of the Chris-
tian era, were it possible, would almost restore to us the
Christianity of the first century—a religion that could
not only teach divine predestination in connexion with
human freedom, but faith in connexion with good works,
church order in connexion of equal brotherhood, hu-
manity in connexion with piety, activity in connexion
with dependence, and the rights of man in connexion
with the supremacy of God.

are married, or render insecure the possession
of their earnings." The ground of the Prince-
ton writer, moreover, is that Christianity ad-
mits no compromises with sin, from prudential
considerations. So that if the churches do
adhere to a sinful course, in their relation to
slavery, or in their treatment of the slaves,
the abolitionists are bound to reprove them,
and if they remain unrepentant, to come out
from them. And a contrary course, from
prudential considerations, would be "immor-
al" "irreconcilable with moral honesty"—
"base in itself"—"the most effectual method
of teaching falsehood"—and characteristic of
"bad men." This is the Princeton ground.
And we have proved that slave holding pro-
fessors of religion are habitually guilty of all
the wicked practices sanctioned by the slave
laws. So that, if the Princeton writer is cor-
rect in his ethics, the facts of the case prove
the duty of secession from the Old School Pres-
byterian church.

But it is time, now, to recall the temporary
concession, made for the argument's sake, and
to affirm that

SLAVE HOLDING IS AS WICKED AS THE SLAVE LAWS.

It is so, because the practice of slave-hold-
ing sustains the slave laws, and it is wicked to
sustain and uphold, voluntarily, that which is
wicked.

In all the essentially wicked features of the
slave laws, the practice of the slave hold-
ers is in accordance with those laws, and if
the one be wicked, the other must be wicked
likewise. And all slave holders will insist
that their practices, in their treatment of their
slaves, is as merciful and as just as the sys-
tem of slave holding permits. The apologists of
slave holders always tells us that the reason
why the slaves are treated as they are, is be-
cause they could not otherwise be held in
slavery at all. They are confined to the plan-
tation, lest they should escape: They are for-
bidden to read and write, lest this knowledge
should facilitate their escape from slavery.—
They are forbidden free worship together,
lest they should plot the overthrow of the
slave system. Wages are not paid to them,
nor can they hold property, because the pay-
ment of wages would be an acknowledgment
that their masters have no right to their serv-
ices without their consent or, in other words,
a concession that they are not rightfully held
as slaves. The possession and use of proper-

ty would make them independent of their masters. And Henry Clay says, explicitly, that the very moment you admit the right of the masters to the slaves, you admit, of necessity, the right to sell them, from state to state, without their consent, and irrespective of family ties.

NO SLAVEHOLDERS WITHOUT SLAVE LAWS.

Repeal the slave laws, in the very particulars in which, even at Princeton, they are admitted to be wicked, and you wholly abolish the slave system in this country, and every shred and particle of it disappears. You destroy the only tenure by which a single slave is held in America, and declare every one of them free. Repeal what the Biblical Repository calls the wicked slave laws, and you do all that abolitionists have ever asked to have done, and this they have always and a thousand times said. Repeal those wicked slave laws, and there is not a single slave holder in America that *could* hold, or that would attempt to hold a single slave for a single minute.

Slaves are not held in America, as other property is held, upon the tenure of common law, and on the ground of original right.—They are not held on the ground of the rightfulness or the Bible warranty of any *such sort* of slave holding as the Biblical Repository describes. And even if they were, such a slave holding would be precisely what abolitionists and every body else mean by emancipation, and would place the colored people of this country essentially upon the same platform with those of the British West India, where emancipation has taken place.

Our American courts have repeatedly decided—(even in Louisiana, the decision has been made)—that American Slavery is the creature of the statute law, that it is a municipal (a “domestic”) institution, having no validity out of the jurisdiction of the local government that created it, so that if a slave should be providentially drifted by wind and water out of that jurisdiction, or carried out by his master, or go with his master’s consent, he *becomes free*, and cannot lawfully be enslaved. This proves, what we have just affirmed, that, aside from the wicked slave laws, no person, in America, could be held as a slave. Slave holding would cease. If the slave laws, then, are wicked, the practice of slave holding, which rests upon it, must be wicked, also.

AN OBJECTION EXAMINED.

Of this, the writer in the Biblical Repository appears to have some apprehension, and accordingly, he labors to ward off the argument that he seems to have anticipated, on that score. And this is his mode of reasoning.

“May not a man in England maintain that *feudal holding* is no sin, without defending all the English laws of

entail and primogeniture which relate to lands? May he not teach that it is right to hold property, without thereby teaching that all the laws relating to property, in any given country, are wise and just?”

Undoubtedly, he may, and for a good reason. The right to hold land is a real and not fictitious right, and does not depend, like the chattelizing of human beings, upon the enactments of Statute law, which can only regulate and protect—not originate the right of land holding. Land is a proper and legitimate subject of property, but *human beings* are not. The very fact that human beings can rightfully hold property in land, being of a nature essentially superior to land, is proof positive that human beings cannot rightfully hold property in human beings, who are the equals of each other, and equally capable of holding property in land. The very fact that man is a being who can rightfully hold property, is only another form of the fact that he cannot rightfully be held as property, by his fellow man.

Do away all the English laws concerning land holding, and the right to hold land stands unimpaired and untouched, just where it stood, in the nature of man and in the nature of land, before any such thing as English law ever came into being.

Do away all “the English laws of entail and primogeniture,” and all the other unjust or doubtful laws of England, concerning land holding; and then, all that is just and proper in the English laws concerning land holding will remain in full and binding force, as before.

But do away the slave laws of the Southern States—say—if the Princeton writer pleases—do away all the slave laws which he admits to be wicked, and the whole system falls to the ground, there being nothing left, either in the nature of things—no—nor in common law, nor even in the statutes of the Southern States, to sustain it.

Do away “the wicked slave laws”—those that the Princeton writer admits to be wicked—and not one single specimen of slave property, not even a bone, muscle, sinew, or toe nail, can be found, in all the slave holding States. No “immediate abolitionist” ever asked, or conceived, or can conceive, of an abolition of slavery more instantaneous and complete. To any competent lawyer, we confidently make the appeal.

TRY THE EXPERIMENT, AND SEE.

Let the matter be tested. There is the “cardinal law” of the entire system, that affirms the slave to be “a chattel personal, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever.” This law is so wicked and absurd that the Princeton writer denies the possibility of its existence! It exists; nevertheless; and Henry Clay (the chosen head of the Ameri-

can Colonization Society—the favored man of the clergy opposed to the “abolitionists”) declares its existence an undeniable fact, and insists that it is in fact from that forcible act of human beings, irrespective of family ties, that the Princeton writer admits to be wicked! Just repeat the “cardinal law” and the Princeton “innocent slave holding” becomes indictable at common law, and worthy of a condign punishment the man that shall persist in the practice, the next day after it is repealed! Any of the Princeton men skeptical on that point, let them come to the State of New York and try the experiment, here!

Take any other *one* item in the “slave laws.” Repeal so much of it as shall enable you to prohibit the sale of beings without their consent, or to the detriment of family ties. Or select, if you please, the wicked law withholding from a slave the same sanctity and protection which other marriages are guarded. Or annul the clause of the slave laws which enables the master to enforce labor without wages—which forbids slaves to hold property, and all their possessions to belong to the master, and withholding all legal protection to the property of slaves. Or repeal the laws which prevent the education of slaves, and withhold from them their natural liberties or fail to render them secure. In either of these cases you give the slave a death blow, which it could never receive. But when, at one blow, you remove all the wicked slave laws; with the same blow abolish the practice of slave holding; you make it impracticable, and unlawful, you brand even the attempt to hold a slave, as a slave, under any pretext with a CRIMINAL ACT, in the eye of the law.

What then becomes of the miserable hypocrisy, the Jesuitical cunning, that attempts to shield from the indignant condemnation of free people, the practice of slave holding, while reluctantly admitting the wickedness of the slave laws? Can grave Doctors of Divinity cover, with so thin a veil, the giant monster that paralyzes the American Ministry, the American Church? Are these the means to convince conscientious and intelligent Christians that it is no high time to get out of such a Babylon “lest they be of her sins and receive of her plagues”? “He that covereth his sin shall not prosper. But he that confesseth and forsaketh shall find mercy.” The Biblical Repository must not blame us for using this strong language, after having admitted the sinfulness of the practices which the wide world is

acterize the Old School Presbyterian and after having, itself, taught us, frank and honest language would be "irreconcilable with moral honesty in itself"—"the most effectual teaching falsehood"—"shocking to the sense"—tending to "the ruin of the faithful"—and characteristic of "the South." From that just condemnation, through divine assistance, to keep clear.

SLAVEHOLDERS—BUT WICKED SLAVE LAWS!

very worst, then, that can possibly be according to truth, against "the slave laws," even the WORST of this. They shelter and legalize the CRIMES that prevail in the American South, and including the Old School Presbyterian Church! The sum and the compromise of their atrocities lie here. Further they do not go—and they cannot!—we have proved on high ecclesiastical ground, including that of the Old School Presbyterian Church, affirming, in detail, that the wickedness sanctioned by the slave laws is practiced continually and without respite at the bottom of the church. We have it by showing that these practices are punished as criminal, were it not for the wicked slave laws." And we shall before we have done, that the same church and ministry are guilty of framing and holding "the wicked slave laws" and of their repeal.

THE "SLAVE LAWS" ARE WICKED.

Slave laws are wicked BECAUSE, according to Presbyterian (Old School) testimony shelter "three fourths of all the poplans, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven States of the Union"—the same punishment which would overtake any one of those same professors of godliness (of the laity or the clergy) if they had chance to be caught attempting, on the soil of Massachusetts or New York, the practices in which they indulge, without a caudate, at the South! The "slave laws" are "wicked," and the framers and holders of those laws are wicked, because, through the efficacy of those laws it comes to that every slaveholder at the South is not a professor, in law, as a kidnapper of a man would be treated at the North or in England. We will help us oppose these "wicked laws"! Will the Doctors and Biblical Scholars at Princeton, who admit them to be so, shall see, in due time. But we must

first keep our "fanaticism" in countenance, by putting it by the side of

THE FANATICISM OF THE (O. S.) PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH!

"1 Tim 1: 10 'The law was made for the MAN STEALERS.' This crime among the Jews, exposed the perpetrators of it to CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—Exod. xxi. 13; and the Apostles here classed them with sinners of the first rank. The word here used, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery or in RETAINING THEM in it. 'St. lots of men are all those who bring off slaves or from 'H, and KEEP, sell, or save them.' To 'sell a freeman, says Aristotle, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances, we only treat human property; but when we treat it retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves are constituted by the original grant, lords of the earth.'"

Such was the doctrine of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1793, and from that time until 1818, it was erased from their standards—one of the worst of "modern innovations"—by the eye—ever introduced into the Presbyterian church. The Colonization Society, established in 1816, was then just beginning to diffuse its new heaven.

When abolitionists go beyond the OLD School Presbyterian church, in denouncing SLAVE HOLDERS let the Princeton press bear testimony against them.

THE CHURCHES AND MINISTRY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SLAVE LAWS.

In respect to the "wicked slave laws"—what shall be done? The writer in the Biblical Repository says—

"It is plain that the church has no responsibility and no right to interfere with respect to the slave laws of the South. Those laws are, doubtless, in many cases, unjust and cruel, enjoining what God forbids, and forbidding what God enjoins. The existence of these laws supposes criminality somewhere, but the responsibility rests on those who made, and have power to repeal them. It does not rest upon the church. Christians who are members of communities where such laws are in force, have their share of responsibility with regard to them as citizens. But it is no part of the vocation of the church, as such, to interfere with civil laws. The apostles did not call a Synod at Jerusalem, to denounce the Roman laws, but they laid the foundation of a spiritual society, and let the world make its own laws. We would not brook the Legislature of our States passing denunciatory resolutions against our rules of church discipline, and we should not call upon the church to meddle with the laws of the land. As citizens, we have the right and duty to demand just and equal laws, but as a church we have other and higher duties." p. 24.

PROTESTANT JESUITISM.

What a web of Jesuitical sophistry have we here! Did any of the Rabbinical traditions making void the law of God, ever go beyond this? We involuntarily smile and yet shudder at the mingled stupidity and impiety of the Irish Prelate who, when reproved for his profanity, alleged, gravely, that he only swore as John Delauncy, and not in the capacity of Bishop! Just as though the devil could take full possession of the man, without any pollution or danger to the ecclesiastic!—Just so, with the Rabbis at Princeton! And just so, they flatter themselves it is, with the members of their church! "As citizens," to be sure, they may be responsible for the support of "wicked laws"—that is, they may

"have THEIR SHARE of responsibility with regard to them"! So the guilt, it seems, is divided up into joint-stock "shares," and the church members are guilty only in the fractional proportion of their participation in the sin! But then, it is only "as citizens" that they are to be blamed, after all! As "church members" they are spotless, and the church, that never admonishes them of their guilt "as citizens"—"has NO RESPONSIBILITY" in the case! It is admitted that "AS CITIZENS"—"Christians who are members of communities where such laws are in force" assist in "enjoining what God forbids and forbidding what God enjoins"—and yet, it is contended, that "no responsibility" rests on the church! What has become of the unbending ethics and the stern theology of Old School Presbyterianism, now! Alas! The heresiarchs of "expediency," who worship "the least of two devils" are moved from beneath, to greet the Princeton Doctors, at their coming—"Art thou become like one of us?" The pen of steel so recently employed in reviewing with thunderbolts the work of Dr. Roman on the Atonement—where is it now? Has it lost its power by contact with "the wicked slave laws"? If not, let it repeat its scathing rebukes of those who "resolve all virtue into expediency" and "deny the very nature of sin"—nay, rather, who boldly teach the innocence of sinning, "as citizens" and the ecclesiastical right of granting an "indulgence" for such sin!

WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE?

The church not responsible for the "wicked slave laws"? Then the church is not responsible for the wickedness of its members! And, apart from the membership, the brotherhood and the ministry of the church—what is the church itself? It is a non-entity—a nothing!

Who made "the wicked slave laws"?—Who "have the power to repeal them"?—THE CHURCH. And "the responsibility rests on those who made, and have the power to repeal them." So says the Biblical Repository itself, and thereby fastens the guilt on the church, where it belongs. For "Christians (i. e. church members) who are members of communities where such laws are in force, have their share of responsibility, with regard to them, as citizens."

And the "share" is not small, even if the guilt could be subdivided, and parcelled out, in as small particles as some of the modern physicians distribute their medicines. In proportion to their numbers, church members as generally vote to make and to sustain those laws, as other persons, both at the North and at the South. The "wicked slave laws" ex-

ist in the District of Columbia, by legislation of Congress, and by the vote of the majority of the whole country, northern and southern. So that we are all "members of a community" (an entire nation) in which such laws are in force." And we all "have a share in the responsibility of them, as citizens." How have those responsibilities been honored? How, by the Doctors at Princeton? For "as citizens, they have the right, and the duty to demand equal and just laws." Have they done it? Are they doing it?

"The number of church members in the United States—nay of Presbyterians alone—should they act "as citizens" against "the wicked slave laws" would soon secure their repeal. They hold, even numerically, the balance of power, which no political party could despoil. But this is not all. Church members and ministers are powerful "as citizens," far beyond the amount of their numerical power. The moral power of their simple example, "as citizens" would soon settle the question, if that example were on the side of repouling "the wicked slave laws."

THE VOCATION OF THE CHURCH.

"But it is no part of the vocation of the church, as such, to interfere with civil laws." So says this writer. Then it is "no part of the vocation of the church, as such" to "declare the whole counsel of God"—for a large portion of the Bible is occupied with teaching the political duties of men, in reproofing rulers, and in condemning wicked laws. The church and ministry, and particularly the Presbyterian church and ministry, have always been forward to do this, until they became slave holders, and they would continue to do so if they wished to have "the wicked slave laws" repealed. But this they cannot desire, so long as "the wicked slave laws" prevent so large a portion of their ministers and church members from being arrested and punished as felons! "The church, as such," would probably have little or no occasion to convene Synods to denounce the American slave laws, if the church members and ministry did not "as citizens" make and sustain the same slave laws—and if they did not indulge in practices which require "wicked slave laws" for their protection!

APOSTOLIC EXAMPLE.

"The Apostles did not call a Synod at Jerusalem to denounce the Roman laws." Perhaps Synods, (as Presbyterians understand the term) were not in use at that time. There was, however, a church at Jerusalem, that found it a part of its "vocation" to teach customs which it was not lawful for men to observe, being Romans. Christianity was

the prohibited religion, and Christians taught that the Roman laws enjoining idolatry were wicked and that "what the heathen sacrificed they sacrificed to devils." So the Princeton writer himself has reminded us, adding—"Elijah did not fail to denounce the worship of Baal, though Ahab and Jezebel were determined to kill the prophets of God, nor did John the Baptist fail to tell Herod that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife."—How much did all this differ, in principle, from calling "a Synod, at Jerusalem, to denounce the Roman laws." How did the Roman government understand the matter? And had there been members of the church at Jerusalem, who assisted, "as citizens" in supporting the wicked laws of the Romans, by their votes, while they had it in their power to vote for their repeal, can it be believed that James and Peter would have said that the church had no responsibility in respect to those laws? The first Christians did not wield political power, as American Christians do, now, and the church could not hold them responsible for wielding powers which they did not possess.

TRY IT IN NEW JERSEY.

Let the State enact "civil laws" impairing the rights of the churches and ministry, at points which they deem vital to their welfare, and see, whether "it is no part of the vocation of the church, as such, to interfere with civil laws!" Let the State of New Jersey, for example, enact a law forbidding the churches in that State to support pastors, who had been educated at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, where the doctrine is taught that it is not wicked to hold human beings in slavery. [It might be pleaded in favor of such a law, that republican liberty cannot be maintained under the teachings of a priesthood who consider despotism no crime, and who even teach that the Bible itself sanctions slave holding. And this argument would be based on precisely the same principle, would breathe the same spirit, and would be equally valid and tenable with the argument that would disfranchise Roman Catholic emigrants, because they have been trained in a school of religious despotism.]—Let such a law be but proposed, and we should soon learn whether the church and ministry at Princeton were too seraphic to "interfere with civil laws." The Princeton writer has himself, (quite inadvertently) told us the result. "We would not brook the Legislatures of our States passing denunciatory resolutions against our rules of church discipline"! Ah! You would not! How is it then that you can "brook the legislatures of the States passing

denunciatory resolutions"—nay—laws, preaching the gospel to the slaves, excluding the presence of white persons—the whole, even that of "proclaiming deliverance to the captive"—"Masters, render unto servants that which is just and equal"—"not servants of men." "Behold the cry of your laborers who have reaped down your wheat, and which is, of you kept back by fraud, and the cry has entered the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." How can the Presbyterian church "brook" all this? And how can it "brook" the laws of the States forbidding members of the Presbyterian church to teach Bibles—to be taught to read—to live in family relation—to train up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? How can that church "brook" the laws of the slave States against her rules of church discipline which enjoins conjugal fidelity, the searching of the scriptures? One fact contains the answer to these questions, and that is, that "three fourths of all Presbyterians, in eleven States of this Union, need and desire the protection of these laws, to keep them out of the penitentiary, the State prison, as a punishment for the practices in which they indulge. Whenever the Old School Presbyterian church shall make a part of her vocation "to preach good tidings to the poor—to set at liberty them that are bruised"—to "to preach the gospel to every creature"—to "declare the whole counsel of God"—then she will find it also "a part of her vocation" to oppose "the wicked slave laws." (To be Continued.)

AMERICAN BOARD.—The American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter for August contains an elaborate and lucid expose of the position of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in relation to the slave question. It was drawn up by A. A. Phelps, and consists, to a great extent, of documentary evidence, never before made public, including a recent correspondence between Mr. Phelps and others, with the Secretaries of the Board, and afterwards, with the Prudential Committee, in which, both the Secretaries and the Committee decline giving the abolitionists the specific information, in reply to their questions, to which the public are entitled.—The real state of the facts sought by the questions, however, cannot be concealed.—The statements of Mr. Phelps, in another article in the same paper, with the testimonials he adduces, and comprising many particulars, not before in our possession, make this number of the Anti-Slavery Reporter, a document of great value. It is for sale by French & Weed, No. 118 Nassau St. New York, at the low price of \$2.00 per hundred.

THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

We heard it alleged, in a Convention some time ago, that the Christians connected with the seven churches in Asia, were not admonished, by the Savior, to secede from their brethren, but to stay with them, and "strengthen the things that remain, and are ready to die." Thus conveying the impression that they were admonished to remain in connection with corrupt churches, notwithstanding the counter command—"Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

Let us examine this matter:

"Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write"—"I know thy works, and thy labor and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil, and thou hast turned them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars." "He that hath an ear let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches."

The "church" of Ephesus, it seems, was commended for its rigid and prompt proceedings against—not a member, merely—not an elder or bishop—but against an apostle, claiming to be such; for church dignitaries, in those days, were not tried, it seems, by "a jury of their peers"—of the same official grade, but by "the churches," the brotherhood-at large. What would be said now, if "the churches" should undertake to arraign and try the "successors of the apostles"—the D. D.'s—the Presidents, and Professors, and Bishops, and Moderators of General Assemblies! Fresh lectures, (instead of commendations,) doubtless, they would get, upon the evils of insubordination, ultra democratic spirit, fanaticism, and misrule. The church trial at Ephesus, nevertheless, went on, and we hear of no remonstrances of clerical bodies about "disturbing the peace of the church" or "bringing the sacred office into contempt." The result of this church trial we have in the text. The pretended apostles were found "liars." Some what "denunciatory" language in the verdict, one would think. It does not appear that they were found guilty of stealing babes from their mothers and selling them by the pound! They were found "liars" nevertheless, and the brethren of the church "COULD NOT BEAR THEM THAT WERE EVIL." Instead of considering this an indication of their "malign and fanatical spirit,"* Christ regarded it as an evidence of their *patience*, and self-denying labor in his cause. And just so he regards similar labors now, whatever our leading ministers may choose to teach, and however loudly they may complain. No one in his senses will suppose that the Ephesians, (who had

been instructed by the same apostle, who wrote to the Corinthians,) [See 1 Cor. v.] and who "could not bear them that were evil"—continued, nevertheless, to hold church fellowship with these "liars" after having condemned them in a fair trial!

"And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna, write these things saith the first and the last, which was dead and is alive! [Mark! It is Christ that speaks, in Pagan, not our nineteenth century Rabbin, in America!—I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty (but thou art rich,) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie, and are of the Synagogue of Satan." "He that hath an ear let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches."

And will any one that has an hearing ear, pretend to believe that the Spirit recorded this testimony to the churches of all ages and nations, to the intent that they should "bear" and tolerate, in their bosoms, the blasphemers who say they are Christians when they are not, but are of the Synagogue of Satan? Did Christ mean to have the church of Smyrna understand that those who belonged to the Synagogue of Satan ought to be retained in the church? Does any body believe this?

"And to the angel of the church in Pergamos write"—"I have a few things against thee, because thou hast them there that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. So thou hast also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaites, which thing I hate."

Now Balaam was one of those dignified Doctors who pride themselves in understanding perfectly well, what is right, in the abstract, and of being as much opposed as any body, to doing wrong. But then, like a prudent man he must have an eye to "other great interests" which would be sacrificed, if he were to take a fanatical, strait forward course. He was exceedingly solicitous to adopt such measures as would secure "the greatest possible amount of apparent good." The favor and patronage of great men, who ruled the State, was, in his eye, an object by no means to be despised.—What an "influence" he might thus secure, and why should he rashly throw it away?—Could he not contrive some way to help ungodly rulers curse the troublesome people of God, and, yet do it under such appearances, and in such a position, as to carry (apparently, at least) a divine sanction for his proceedings, along with him? His costly professional skill and erudition in interpreting the divine messages, why should not this honest art be used in the accomplishment of so wise an undertaking? And would he not manifest an accommodating, Christian spirit, in so doing? He could shift his ground as often as he found himself foiled, and carry his altars and sacrifices, in ample abundance, along with him. On what ground he succeeded in cursing the daring innovators of his times, he cared not, and why should he? So that he could but succeed, at last, in cursing them, effectively, and pocket the princely price! Yet

all along, he protested, steadfastly, that he could do nothing for or against what he knew to be right, any further than he could do so, in strict accordance with God's word—which he construed by the dead letter of the language, when it suited him, in opposition to its manifest spirit, and to the repeated rebukes of divine Providence. He could affirm himself to be unaware of any express divine prohibition on record, which should forbid him to assist Balac, and help him to contrive means for entrapping the children of Israel into an alliance with demon-worship, and a support of the grossest impurities enacted among men! Balaam, was, in short, as smooth, as sleek, as comely, as dignified, as learned, as foxy, and as rev, orenced a prophet, (regularly inducted, no doubt) as ever graced the academic walks of Lambeth, of Cambridge, of Andover, of Princeton, or even of New Haven.

The church, in Pergamos, had become infected, (so the spirit of inspiration informs us) with men of the same character and stamp with Balaam. A majority of the brotherhood undoubtedly, thought them good men. Some of their movements, to be sure, they could not exactly approve. But perhaps they only wanted more light. They thought it would be too uncharitable, too disrespectful towards such eminently learned men, too democratic and too much tending to confusion, division, and misrule, to try such prophets, as the church at Ephesus had done, and record a solemn verdict against them. What a lovely, kind, conciliatory, meek, accommodating, and forbearing spirit, the Pergamos brethren must have exhibited, in the view of one class of men.—What a contrast to the turbulent spirit prevailing at Ephesus! But he who seeth not as man seeth, took a widely different view of the matter. The church of Pergamos was rebuked for holding fellowship with such men—for retaining them in the church.

"And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira, write"—"I have somewhat against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols."

The sin of this false teacher was the upholding of gross immoralities in the church—and and favoring an affinity between the worshippers of the true God, and the idolatrous religionists around and among them. And the divine charge against the Christian brotherhood at Thyatira, was, that they had suffered such a teacher to have a place and a reverential hearing in the church, as a trust-worthy guide. Church discipline should have removed such an intolerable nuisance from their midst. But the prevailing sentiment at Pergamos had been in favor of "charity" and "forbearance" falsely so-called. Very likely, too, they had spurious pietists there, in high repute for their

*Another redeeming feature of the Ephesian church, which, in some respects had "lost their first love," is thus noticed—"But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaites, which I also hate." Such expressions of hatred would be thought evidences of a malignant spirit now-a-days!

spirituality of mind, who could lecture against the danger of donuciation and legalism—who could persuade the devout to be careful, and not let more questions of outward morality distract or divert them from attending simply to the hidden light of inward faith and divine communion. Only make persons spiritually minded—they might say—and there would be no necessity for assailing, directly, any specific form of immorality—and why disturb the peace of the church by measures which would only exasperate, and be productive of little or no good, since outward reformations were of no value. Such sentiments could not but have been prevalent at Thyatira, for we perceive the fact in the fruits they produced—just such fruits as the same sentiments produce, in modern times. Even Jezebel herself would undoubtedly applaud the piety and wisdom of such counsellors, and her influence was evidently very great. But Christ characterized the policy as constituting the very “depths of Satan.” (Chap 2: 24.) For our sakes was this written. “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches.”

“And unto the angel of the church at Sardis, write”—“I know thy works, that thou hast a name, that thou livest and art dead. Be watchful and strengthen the things that remain and are ready to die, for I have not found thy works perfect before God.” “Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me, in white, for they are worthy.”

This is the message confidently quoted as conclusive evidence that Christians ought not to secede from a corrupt church. The church, say these expositors, was dead, only a few names remaining faithful, but so far from exhorting them to “come out” they were exhorted to remain in the church and keep it alive. On this we remark,

1. This exposition, if correct, is conclusive against all secessions from any church, however corrupt, so long as true Christians remain in it who could be exhorted to “come out.” To this very point, and for this very object the exposition is adduced. The same exposition of this text has all along been used as an argument against seceding from the Romish church, and it is perfectly conclusive, if the exposition be correct.

2. This exposition brings this exhortation of the text in direct contradiction to the divine command to come out of the spiritual Babylon, which all protestants understand to mean the old corrupt church. “Come out of her my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.”

3. The exposition is equally conclusive against all the church discipline that excludes any ungodly person from the church, because the exclusion of multitudes from church membership, is the same thing as the exclusion of a single person, only that it is done on a larger

scale, and the greater the number of wicked persons, the greater is the necessity and the obligation of excluding them. When a faithful minority secedes from a corrupt church, because it is corrupt, the seceders constitute the true church and the secession is equivalent to an excommunication of the wicked majority. If any true Christians still remain in the corrupt church, the “schism” is their own act, in refusing to remain with Christ’s church, and act with it, instead of acting on the side of anti-Christ. To deny this principle is to deny that there should be any church discipline to the extent of excision, in any case; unless it be said that when the majority become wicked, the minority ought to sustain and fellowship them in their wickedness—and this latter is in fact, openly said, every day. It follows,

4. That the exposition under review supposes Christ to have given directions to the church at Sardis, directly the opposite of his directions to all the churches before mentioned, who were censured for retaining wicked men in the churches.

5. The exposition is also manifestly incorrect, because it is self-contradictory, and absurd. It supposes, in so many words, that the church is a dead church, and not a living one. Otherwise the exposition would not cover the case of secession from a dead church. But then, the expositor turns a short corner and says that the faithful few are exhorted to remain in this already dead church, for the sake of keeping it from dying! An exposition that might be suspected of having been imported from some of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland.

6. The truth is, the text says nothing about remaining in the church, and if it did, the living church of Christ must have been intended, and not the dead church of anti-Christ, from which all true Christians are commanded to “come out”—a command which will stand, when all the silly jests of scoffers against “come-out-ism” shall have been silenced by the brightness of the Savior’s appearing.

The things that remain and are ready to die, were the things to be strengthened, and not a corrupt and dead church! What these things were, it is easy to see, and that they were things pertaining to the living and not to the dead! They were spiritual things, such as love, faith, holiness, and fidelity to God. “These things” remained, that is, they dwelt in the bosoms of those who “remained” faithful—the “few names” that were left after the rest were blotted out and cut off. The angel (or messenger—servant—bishop) of the church was charged to cherish what remained that was worth preserving, assuming for granted that all the rest was to

be excluded and cast away. And we know that the way to strengthen a little remnant of pious Christians, or the graces that remain in them, in times of declension, is not to keep them under the paralyzing influence of a dead church! The text recommends nothing of the kind.

All the force of this confident, and unnatural misinterpretation lies in assuming—(what is evidently without foundation) that the word “remain” has reference to the remaining of faithful Christians in a corrupt church! The sentence contains nothing of the kind, or looking in any such direction.

A message of approval and encouragement was added, by the Savior, to the church at Philadelphia, accompanied by a rebuke of the high professing pretenders who laid snares for them and aspersed them. “Behold I will make them that are of the Synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie, behold I will make them come and worship at thy feet and to know that I have loved thee” Precious consolations, these, for the faithful, in dark times, who dare to be singular and keep Christ’s words.

And finally—“Unto the church of the Laodiceans write”—“I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would thou wert either cold or hot.—So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold or hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.”

Here is presented a picture which might be studied with profit, in the times on which we are cast. In every distinguishing feature, the Laodicean church has its counterpart among the churches of the present day.

(1.) Nothing over zealous or fanatical could be charged upon them. They were cool, collected, quiet, dignified, and composed. (2.) They were neither to be charged with having renounced religion, on the one hand, nor with being over-heated, enthusiastical and reckless on the other. How happily they preserved their balance between extremes! (3.) They were rich. Rich in this world’s wealth—rich in learning—respectability—acquirements—talents—teachers—facilities of every kind for learning and doing what was required of them. (4.) They were increased in goods. Their influence, numbers, talents, wealth, respectability and apparent influence, were steadily rising. Men of the world and infidels who once opposed them, were doubtless on good terms with them now. How manifestly, thought they, the dealings of God towards us mark us as the special objects of his approbation and favor. There were no fierce contentions and disturbing agitations among them.—(5.) They had need of nothing. No reformatory process, they supposed, was needed by them. They needed, certainly, none of the instructions that fanatics and agitators had to

offer them. Who can doubt that the church of the Laodiceans, could it now stand up, at once, in our midst, would be regarded as among the model churches of the land? To utter a syllable against it, would be evidence of a malign and fanatical spirit, of course.

"Ho that hath an ear, let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches."

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, AUGUST, 1845.

NOTICE.—J. C. Norton, Liberty and Reform Office, Cazanova, is authorized to receive subscriptions and payments for the Christian Investigator.

IMPORTANT PUBLICATION.—We are indebted to Alvan Stewart Esq. for a copy of his noble "Legal Argument, before the Supreme Court of New Jersey, May Term, 1845, for the deliverance of 4,000 persons from bondage." Though a majority of the Court decided against Liberty, yet chief Justice Hornblower gave an opposite opinion. The case we understand is to have another hearing, before a Court of Errors, and we have strong hopes that the persevering efforts of Mr. Stewart will ere long overthrow slavery in that state. The argument is sold by Finch & Wood, 118 Nassau street, N. York.

PROPOSITIONS

FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION.

1. Pure religion cannot flourish among a people, nor can their civil and religious liberties be secured, without the presence and the influence of a religion, whose churches and ministry teach the inviolability of human rights, plead the cause of the oppressed, and exemplify in their institutions, polity and usages, the holy equality of souls before God.

2. The leading and prominent religious sects in this country do not, through their churches and ministry, teach the inviolability of human rights; they do not plead the cause of the oppressed, and they do not exemplify, in their institutions, polity, and usages, the holy equality of souls, before God; or is there any rational ground to expect that they ever will.

3. Pure religion, therefore, cannot flourish in this country, nor can the civil and religious liberties of the people be secured, unless the friends of pure religion and of civil and religious freedom connected with the prominent religious sects, withdraw from them, refuse to sustain, or to co-operate with them—and unite themselves together for the organization and support of churches on the New Testament model, for the advocacy of human rights, and for the exemplification of Christian equality, unity, and freedom.

"WE MUST PRESERVE OUR INFLUENCE!"

—Time-serving ministers and world-courting churches, who keep silence on the subject of

slavery, lest their testimony against that sin should injuriously affect their "influence" and cripple their efforts to "do good" in promoting the "salvation of souls," are little aware of the crop of popular contempt they are preparing to harvest, by the course they pursue. They little dream that the same politicians to whom they truckle, secretly despise them, and that the church and ministry are thus rapidly losing their hold on the confidence of the very people whom they strangely hope to propitiate by their derelictions of duty! A very brief extract from the N. Y. Tribune will illustrate our meaning. Here is an editor, prodigal in his abuse of abolitionists in general, a bitter opposer of the Liberty party, and having no sympathy with the Garrison movement any farther than he may hope to use it to cripple the Liberty party and thus benefit the Whig cause. Yet hear what he says of the miserable cant of those who complain of the infidel tendencies of some abolitionists, while they, themselves, with all their professions of Christianity, keep silence.

He is writing an answer to the editor of the Boston Traveler, who, in reference to the late William C. Bell, reputed to be an infidel, while agent for the paper of Cassius M. Clay, (a whig abolitionist) had re-echoed the common slang of New England ministers opposed to abolitionism, against all such abolitionists as were not orthodox, thus striving to excite prejudices against the anti-slavery movement. Mr. Greeley says:

And in the third place, if it were the fact that the Christians of the Slave States persist in supineness and indifference with regard to Slavery, leaving the work of exposing its enormities and mischiefs to infidels, it will be well for Christians to keep quiet about it, or, if we are afraid of the bearing of Mr. Clay's Anti-Slavery paper, just incite some more orthodox believer in the South to start a better one.—[N. Y. Tribune.]

CHURCH REFORM IN VERMONT.

Two "State Conventions of Anti-Slavery Christians of all denominations," in the State of Vermont, will have been held, (Providence permitting) before this article will have reached our readers. We find the notices of them in the "Green Mountain Freeman" of June 20th. One of the Conventions was to have been held at Morrisville, July 3d, and the other at Ludlow, July 11. The times selected were immediately after two State Liberty Conventions, to be held in the same places, one day previous. The call says—

There is nought of the two designed. But at the same time our main reliance, in attempting to purify the church, is on those Christians who are ready to give "the unfruitful works of darkness" a stern reproof at the ballot box. Many such Christians will be already assembled at both those places; we wish to accommodate the largest number. We say, therefore, brethren and sisters in the Lord, Come, one and all. Fathers and mothers, in Israel, and you who have but begun to learn of Jesus, let us see you at Morrisville and at Ludlow.

Our readers will be gratified to see the close of the "call" with some of the names annexed.

Something must be done to revive undeffled religion. "Zion is desolate." "How shall Jacob arise?" "I will be inquired of for these things, saith the Lord."—We who abhor slavery, must not, will not, fail to do what we can, to drive him from his strong hold, the church of God. Is there not enough of the spirit of Balaam yet upon the earth, to lead us to throw ourselves in the gap and save a polluted, rebellious church from the deserved wrath of an angry God? Our object in calling these meetings is not to destroy or disorganize, but to save. We wish to consult, and pray, and act, as the spirit of christianity demands. Again we say, Come—Come not to see and hear, but come to pray, and to be "doers of the word." Our common Saviour, in the persons of his despised followers, is suffering in prison, and in sickness, yes, and in slavery, too, in this land of Bible—a legalized system "the vilest that ever saw the sun." A host of his professed followers are consenting unto his death. How long shall we hold our place and thus give our consent also?

Montpelier. E. J. Comings. Many others would give their names if there was room to insert them.
Ferrisburgh. Rev. C. Prindle, Rev. N. Day, Miss D. A. Webster, and some 30 more.
Shelburne. The whole Wesleyan Methodist Church.
Carnwall. Dea. A. Bingham, and 25 others.
Williston. Eld. B. Hurlburt, Eld. C. Green, Rev. L. G. Bingham, and 25 others.
Burlington. Rev. O. Shipman, D. Fish.
Bakersville. Rev. T. H. Canfield.
Hinesburgh. John Allen, Austin Bucher.
Glover. Rev. R. Mason, and 8 others.
Wolcott. Rev. J. Glord, and 8 others.
Greensboro. J. O. Elsworth, and 4 others.
Jamaica. Rev. S. Lincoln and 4 others.
Roxbury. Samuel Robertson, and others.
Norwich. Rev. S. Kellogg, and 40 others.
Middletown. Rev. L. D. Pomroy, and others.
Charlotte. John M. Niel, George Pease, 1st., Chs. Grant.
Vergennes. Dr. A. Sprague.
W. Topsam. Rev. S. Leavitt and others.
Warren. D. Upham, and others.

PRO-SLAVERY CLERGYMEN COMPLIMENTED.—The Rev. Dr. Junkin is the leading manager of affairs in the Presbyterian General Assembly. The doctor has published a book on slavery, to which the Hon. J. C. Reed, one of the Supreme Judges of Ohio, made the following allusion, in his opinion in the case of Watson:

"I have known but one deliberate effort on the part of a minister of the gospel to reconcile slavery with Bible principles, and so far from regarding that an authority, I can only view it as evidencing a sort of moral insanity, a breaking up, as it were, of the faculties, to perceive or distinguish moral truth."—[Cincinnati Herald.]

If Judge Read had been attentive to the discussions of the last twelve years, in the religious periodicals of the country, he would not have supposed Dr. Junkin to stand alone, in his pro-slavery theology. So decidedly has the religious press in general, been committed to similar views, that the most unexceptionable articles written in opposition to them, and presented to religious editors by influential members of their own sects, have for the most part, been refused an insertion. And to the present hour few pulpits and few presses, in our principal cities, are open to those who teach that the Bible is opposed to slavery, while they are wide open to those who teach or who favor the opposite doctrine.

The allusion to religious teachers by our legislators and jurists, in their discussions and decisions shows the weight of responsibility resting on churches and ministers. An instructive commentary upon the plea of the Biblical Repertory (a defender of slave-holding) that

the churches "are not responsible for the slave sales!"

SOUTHERN DEFINITION OF SOUTHERN CHRISTIANITY.—The Liberator Recorder, a Southern Baptist paper, whose editor is about the largest specimen of self-complacency, extant, contends earnestly that slavery is not at all inconsistent with Christianity. And in speaking of the universality of slavery at the South, he says: "If our preachers are not all slave holders in fact, they are without exception such in principle." And again: "All our churches sanction the principle of slave holding, in every way in which it is possible to sanction any thing." If this is reliable testimony, (which we doubt) what a Godless set of ministers and churches they must have at the South! No wonder that you run rampant there, and that all laws human and divine, are regarded with unbounded contempt.—[Chr. Freeman.]

AN ITEM IN THE HISTORY OF THE TIMES.

The friends of Christian liberty will do well to keep an eye to the passing events of the times. Indications are abundant of a continual struggle between the opposite elements of spiritual despotism and religious freedom.—While it is true that the general tendencies of the age are onward, towards the full possession of the "liberty wherewith Christ maketh his people free," it is, at the same time true that the very fact of this onward progress is continually chafing the conservators of existing usurpations, who, with all their characteristic "prudence," are sometimes goaded into the very imprudent experiment of grasping at additional powers and prerogatives, instead of quietly preparing themselves to resign with dignity and gracefulness whatever of that sort of patrimony they may have inherited from their sacerdotal fathers, but which the common brotherhood, in the name of common sense, common humanity, and our common Christianity are beginning to challenge.

Our distant readers, especially at the West, may not have been apprized of some recent clerical movements in New England, and their result. A few extracts from the eastern papers will suffice for a record of them.

CONGREGATIONALISM.—An effort is making to secure in Massachusetts a more efficient system of union for the Congregational churches in that State. Dr. Woods, of the Andover Theological Seminary, is the originator of the movement. The plan recommended is something like the Connecticut and Rhode Island consociation system. The country associations, however, have all condemned the plan, and the whole matter will probably rest where it is.—[Newark Daily Advertiser.]

All true, especially the last sentence.—[Emancipator.]

A subsequent number of the Emancipator gives an account of a discourse recently preached by Dr. Hitchcock, of Randolph, before "the Pastoral Association." The speaker seemed to have in his eye this movement of Dr. Woods and gave it some pretty home thrusts. Widely as even Massachusetts Congregationalism differs from the pure church Independency of apostolic times, and which we trust is soon to be restored, the preacher, among others, was not ready to risk the experiment of a further departure from it. In his glorifications of "the pure democracy of

Massachusetts Congregationalism" we cannot sympathize, but he distinctly enunciated some radically sound principles, worthy of a better practical observance, every where. The Emancipator says,

"The sermon was listened to with much attention by those who could hear it. If it be, as doubtless it is—a just index of the sentiments of Massachusetts Congregationalists on church polity, we think Dr. Woods and his associates have done wisely in suppressing for the present, their report on church government, and postponing till some more convenient season, any attempt to presbyterianize the Congregational churches in Massachusetts."

The Emancipator preserves, likewise, some portions of the sermon containing important scraps of historical information concerning the rise and growth of church independency in England, and America, which we cannot forbear to copy.

"Models after the civil government of Great Britain, the king, lords and commons being represented by the pastor, a bench of ruling elders, and the brethren of the church, the elders having a veto on the church, and the pastor on both. After the death of Charles I., our puritan ancestors approved the commonwealth as established by Cromwell, and began to alter their church order accordingly; as Cromwell dropped the House of Lords, so they dropped the House of Lords, spiritual, the bench of ruling elders; and as he knocked off the crown from the head of the king, so they knocked off wigs, bands, and spiritual authority from the pastor, and reduced his power simply to that of moderator of a church meeting. In other respects they had made Congregationalism a more perfect democracy."

Of the semi-monarchical power of the New England Pastors, there has been, among laymen, no little complaint. But we do not recollect to have seen, before, so full a clerical recognition of the *historical fact*, and its causes. Dr. Hitchcock seems to think an improvement has taken place, and perhaps there has, since the period first mentioned, yet the reform may remain incomplete.—There may have been an improvement at one time, and a deterioration afterwards. In many respects we know it to have been the fact, for Punchard's History of Congregationalism records the rise of the Pastoral Associations—first without exercising any ecclesiastical functions, but gradually assuming, without direct authority from the churches, the prerogative of licensing ministers, afterwards; a practice so rigidly maintained, at the present time, that no minister, however acceptable to the brotherhood, would think of attempting the exercise of clerical functions, without that clerical sanction and endorsement.

If Congregationalism, both in New and in Old England, put on a more democratic form, during the Commonwealth under Cromwell, and in consequence of it, we may rationally infer that it might have receded back again, somewhat, on the "restoration" of the despotic Stuarts. And if the American Revolution may be supposed to have given the New England churches a new democratic impulse, the long reign of the slave power over the nation, along with the unavoidable influence of continual contact with Presbyterianism could hardly fail to have produced tendencies in an opposite direction, as the recent attempt proves.

Could the Andover dynasty but have succeeded fully in their earnest and persevering efforts to put down or to corrupt or dilute the rising abolitionism of the Congregationalists, the plan of Dr. Woods would probably have gone into effect, as quietly as it has now expired. Where our civil and religious liberties would have been ere this, but for the democratic tendencies of abolitionism, Heaven only knows. The upward progress of the age, since 1835, when free discussion in church and state, was apparently about to be permanently suppressed, may serve as data for conjecture. But never can we be safe, either as citizens or as Christians, until the reign of radical New Testament democracy in the church, be fully restored. Instead of looking to the "lords of the Gentiles"—to kings, lords, commons, Lord Protector, or slave holding Presidents, for models of church order, Christians must learn to look into their Bibles for the infallible and immutable standard. Founded on *first principles* and explicit *divine directions*, as they should be, not on fluctuating and fitful expedients, their ecclesiastical polity would not change with the fashions of their garments, and no employ would be found for the generation of ecclesiastical tinkers, whose Saybrook and Cambridge platforms can never, with all their incessant hammering, be kept in any tolerable repair.

PUBLIC SPEAKING.—When Sir George Murray attempted to excuse himself from taking office under the Duke of Wellington, on account of his inexperience in public speaking, "Pooh! pooh!" said the Duke, "do as I do; say what you think, and don't quote Latin."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, up to August, 1845.

B. Green, Honesoye,	1.00	L. A. Wicks, Stow's	2.00
S. Lewis, Albion,	.50	W. H. Burrell, Hansom-	1.00
J. N. Robinson Honesoye,	.50	W. H. Burrell, Hansom-	1.00
J. Cobb,	do.	W. H. Burrell, Hansom-	1.00
Miss Taylor,	do.	M. M. Woods, Batavia,	.50
H. Bushnell, W. Bloom-	1.00	R. Norton, Elba,	.50
field,	1.00	B. Woodman, Hamilton,	.50
A. Priddy, W. Meadon,	.50	C. M. Hawley, do.	.50
R. Haines, Millville,	1.00	G. Smith, Prierboro,	.50
H. R. Alger, Honesoye,	1.00	Rev. Joslyn, Elgin, Ill.	.50
J. Pierpont, Boston,	1.00	Mr. Judd, Warsaw,	2.00
O. Hawes, Potsdam,	1.00	G. W. Green, Albany,	1.00
W. W. Alexander, Clinton,	.50	W. Thayer, Honesoye,	.50
J. A. Read, W. Hartford,	2.50	E. Hooker, Farmington, Ct.	1.00
A. F. Hanna, Cadiz, O.	1.00	S. P. Hough, Whitesboro',	1.00
J. C. Norton, Cazenova,	.50	C. F. Williams, Albany,	1.00
do. papers sold,	1.00	S. Cole, Ashburnham, Mass.	1.00
do. for W. Babins,	do.	W. Leary, Lee,	1.00
Onondaga Hol.	.50		
		Amount,	\$38.00

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honesoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arist and Build. 4 pages, \$0.62 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honesoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

Where may be had
Cards, Blanks & Handbills
Together with every description of Book & Job Printing

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. III—No. 9.
Whole Number, 41.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. Y. SEPTEMBER, 1813.

WILLIAM GOODFELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.
Any person who will procure four subscribers, and the money without expense to the publisher, shall have a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

If any particular number will be sold, separate from the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

per dozen, \$0 50	Sixty papers, \$2 00
per single paper for 1 00	One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing for papers.

ERMIT FELLOWSHIP WITH SLAVE-HOLDERS.

LICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, Vol. I, No. 1, 1844. SUPPLEMENT TO THE PRINCETON WHIG, JAN. 31, 1845.

PRACTICES OF RELIGIOUS SLAVE-HOLDERS.

(In continuance from the last number.)

CHURCHES OPPOSE THE REPEAL OF THE SLAVE LAWS.

Let us have another view of this subject, present to our readers. The religious professors of this country, including the Presbyterians, have not only failed to oppose these wicked slave laws, either "as churches" or "as citizens;" (which latter, it is conceded "is right and duty to do," and even to "DEMAND" their repeal)—but they have, to a great extent, been forward to enact these wicked slave laws?—and they are still active, both laymen and ministers, in laboring to prevent their repeal.

The church has furnished a large portion of the slave holding legislators by whom the slave laws have been framed, and very seldom has it furnished any who have made any earnest efforts for their mitigation or repeal.—Among these are Members of State Legislatures, Governors of States, Members of Congress, Senators, Heads of Departments, Vice Presidents, and Presidents of the United States. The first President, Washington, was not only a church member, but is almost canonized by our Protestant sects, as the patron saint of the nation. But he gave his assent to the wicked law of 1793 for the return of fugitive slaves, contrary to the express legislation of God in the Bible. "Thou shalt not deliver up his master the servant that hath escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, in one of thy cities, where it liketh him best." Andrew Jackson and John C.

Calhoun, firm defenders of "the wicked slave laws" were cherished members of the Old School Presbyterian church, all the while. And among the very numerous members of Congress from the non-slave holding States, who are or who have been church members, how exceedingly small have been the number of those, (if any) who have ever earnestly advocated the repeal of the wicked and unconstitutional slave laws of the Federal District! Not even John Quincy Adams, though a church member, from New England, would consent to their repeal! The Orthodox Doctor at Princeton, may, perhaps object to our counting Mr. Adams among church members, because he is only an Unitarian. But when was the Christianity of Mr. Adams ever impeached by his orthodox opponents, (political or ecclesiastical) on that ground? And no one, most assuredly, would suspect Theodore Frothinguysen, the very pink of New Jersey Presbyterianism, of a stronger affinity to abolitionism than Mr. Adams. His recent disclaimers are sufficiently explicit, on this point—nor is it in his power to deny that his opposition to abolitionists has been opposition to the repeal of the slave laws.

THE HERESY OF ABOLITIONISM.

On no other ground, and for no other reason, have "modern abolitionists" ever been opposed. Their "demanding" the repeal of the slave laws (which the Princeton writer says they have "the right and the duty," as citizens, to demand) has, all along been known and understood to be the distinguishing characteristic of the hated sect. Had they contented themselves with condemning "slavery in the abstract," all would have remained quiet, and the world would never have been enlightened with the Princeton defences of slavery, or of slave holding in the abstract! Had they only exhorted individuals to emancipate their slaves, there would have been little alarm. The Colonizationists, claimed at the north, the occupancy of that ground, and boasted of their wonderful success in liberating, in sixteen years, the proportionate natural increase of less than one whole day!

But "modern abolitionists" struck deeper, and "demanded" "as citizens" the abolition

"It is on this same ground that "modern abolitionists" have been so constantly contrasted with the quiet Quakers, who never disturbed any body by agitating the repeal of the slave laws. For this the Quakers were complimented by Henry Clay, in the same connexion in which he deprecated political action against slavery!—Martin Van Buren rendered them a similar tribute.

of the slave laws! They announced in National Convention at Philadelphia, in 1833, that there then rested upon the people of the free States, "the highest obligation to remove slavery by moral and political action, as prescribed by the Constitution of the United States." This was explained, and was well enough understood, by every body, to mean simply the repeal of the slave laws!

OBJECTIONS AGAINST ABOLITION.

Then it was, and therefore it was, that the flood of opposition broke loose. A repeal of the slave laws—would "dissolve the Union"! Would "turn the slaves loose, to cut the throats of their masters!" Would "send them roaming as vagabonds through the land!" The "North would be over-run with them!" "Amalgamation" would be the result! It was "treasonable!" It was "incendiary!" It was "blood thirsty!" It was "unsafe!" It was "fanatical!" It was "revolutionary!" It was "disorganizing!" It was "the Jacobinism of the first French Revolution!" The slaves "could not take care of themselves"! So said the pulpit—so said the religious press. So said the Colonization orators—Gurley, Einloy, Hawks, Ogden, Frothinguysen, Bethune, Danforth, Breckenridge, &c. &c. &c.

And all, merely because abolitionists proposed the repeal of "the wicked slave laws." The *ne plus ultra* of our "fanaticism" was our calling those laws wicked, and demanding their repeal. The very topics and catch-words of opposition, already quoted, and with which the land rang, year after year, sufficiently prove this. Nobody understood them otherwise, at the time, or understood that abolitionists were held guilty of any other indiscretion, treason, or insanity than that of seeking the immediate repeal of the slave laws.

THE MEASURES!

The "measures" of abolitionists—so imprudent—so objectionable—so "fanatical."—What were they? And what are they still? Preaching against "the wicked slave laws!" Printing against "the wicked slave laws!" Petitioning against "the wicked slave laws!" Questioning candidates for office about their course in respect to "the wicked slave laws!" Nominating candidates and voting for candidates pledged to vote against "the wicked slave laws." Sending forth lecturers, holding Conventions, printing papers, distributing

tracts, "agitating the community"—in favor of a repeal of "the wicked slave laws."

ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABOLITIONISTS.

Arguments and measures against the "fanatical abolitionists."—In what have they consisted? In what do they consist, now? Arguments to prove the inferiority of the colored race—their incapacity to occupy any other position than that which is marked out for them by the *slave laws*—to prove that those laws are for their benefit, and that they are "better off" under their operation than they could be if they were released from them! Arguments to prove that we are under the obligations of a constitutional compromise, compact, and guaranty in favor of the slave laws! Arguments to prove that the colored people can never rise, in this country, to an equality with the whites—that the two races could never live peacefully together, in freedom, so that there is a necessity, *for the present, at least*, of holding them under "the wicked slave laws." The Presbyterians of New Jersey know by whom these arguments have been urged. Then we have had arguments to prove that because "Christ's kingdom is not of this world," Christian people had better "stand aloof from political excitements," and avoid the "dirty waters of politics" (so far, at least, as voting against "the wicked slave laws" is concerned) lest they should lose their spirituality, grieve the spirit, and hinder the progress of revivals! To vote for a distinguished slave holder has, at the same time, been recommended by leading ministers, all over the country, without any fear of political contamination or excitement. To dissuade Christian people from voting against "the wicked slave laws" their consciences are sometimes quieted by the consolation that only a small *share* of the guilt rests upon them, and that only "as citizens" and that "no responsibility" rests on the church! Sometimes we are told in "Literary and Theological Reviews," that opposition to the slave laws is opposition to civil government, which is an ordinance of God, and therefore abolitionists are "justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." And, aided by these appeals, attempts have actually been made, in several of the non-slave holding States, to procure enactments punishing as traitors against the government all those who were opposed to the slave laws!—And while these attempted measures were in progress, and apparently about to be consummated, no Christian pulpits or religious presses, except those of abolitionists, did any thing to allay the spirit of persecution, and nearly all the leading religious presses and pulpits opposed to abolitionists, were evidently in re-

quisition to increase it, and blow it to a flame.

APOLOGIES FOR THE SLAVE LAWS.

Which of "the wicked slave laws" have not been defended, or apologized for, in detail, by the clergy and religious editors, opposed to abolitionists? We have cited, in another connexion, the language of the Vermont Chronicle, designed, evidently, to neutralize and parry off a condemnation of the laws forbidding the slaves to be taught to read.* We hear a defense or apology for the laws enforcing slave labor without wages, whenever we hear a "compensation" claimed for the master in case the slave laws are abolished. We hear it every time it is urged against the abolition of slavery that it would "bankrupt the South." We hear it, whenever we hear abolitionists charged with vituperation and slander for calling slave-holders robbers and thieves. For they would doubtless be punished for robbery and theft, by the laws of all civilized communities, if the slave laws protecting the practice of enforcing unpaid labor were repealed. The laws authorizing the separation of families by sale, are defended and sustained by all who oppose the abolition of the inter-state slave trade, and who, at the same time, admit the constitutional authority of Congress over the traffic. And here, again, stands John Quincy Adams, and the great majority of church members who are not abolitionists. And the most infamous and detestable of all the slave laws—the law for pursuing and kidnapping fugitive slaves, on the soil of the free States, has been abundantly defended by the clerical opponents of abolition, and abolitionists have been held up to odium in the churches, because they would not assist in the execution of these laws.—Judges, Justices, Sheriffs, Constables and Governors, in good standing in the churches in the free States, have been active in executing these laws, and "three fourths of all the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Baptists, and Methodists, in eleven States of the union"—"hesitate not to apprehend and restore run away slaves, when in their power." So says Rev. James Smyth of the Amite Presbytery, Mississippi, and who has ever disputed the statement?

What mean the arguments of Prof. Stuart, endorsed by Pres. Fisk, re-echoed from hundreds of pulpits, scores of religious presses,

*Within a few months, the Orleans County, (N. Y.) Bible Society has declined furnishing Bibles for fugitive slaves! The New Orleans Auxiliary of the A. B. S. declared, long ago, that the furnishing of Bibles for slaves never entered into the design of the Bible Society. And this statement is confirmed by the fact that the A. B. S. reported that each family in the U. S. had been supplied with a Bible, when the slaves had never been taken into the account. Arthur Tappan's proposed donation to supply them was indignantly rejected. So much for the opposition of the churches to this feature of "the wicked slave laws!"

and never dissented from by any of the abolition clergy in the land, going to prove Paul was instrumental in returning a fugitive slave to Philonon? What gross hypocrisy and shameless perversion of scripture we here, if it be not intended to inculcate Christian duty of returning fugitive slaves under the American slave laws!

And what mean Prof. Stuart and other that class, when they speak of the "pre-
rightful authority" of the slave masters? What shadow or pretence of such "authority" could be exhibited, in the absence of the existing slave laws?

The action of Baptist churches in the South, quoted in a former number, is active conformity with the slave laws annulling marriage, and sustaining those laws. And northern Baptists who protest against it "disturbers of the peace of the church—disorganizers—fanatics—abolitionists!"

President Wayland's Book of Limitations so enthusiastically welcomed by the anti-slavery clergy of all sects—what is it? what is its scope and aim? Most indisputably to prevent any agitation or action, and professors of religion, and other citizens, the abolition of the slave laws! To this point it has been quoted and referred to in speeches in Congress, Governor's Messages, Speeches in State Legislatures, and Legislative Reports. And the same fact is true of the paper of Prof. Hodge, published in the Biblical Repository at Princeton, in 1835. Concerning that document the Rev. G. Howard, in an article in the Southern Christian Sentinel, a Presbyterian paper, said "The South owes a debt of gratitude to the Biblical Repository for the fearless article in behalf of the position that SLAVERY is forbidden in the Bible. The writer of the article is said, without contradiction, to be Prof. Hodge, of Princeton." And we have no evidence that Prof. Hodge or the Editors of the Biblical Repository were aggrieved at the imputation of having written and published a "defence of American Slavery," at the time, though they may attempt to distinguish between slave holding and the slave system now. We will put their professions to the test. "The wicked slave laws" of their own State of New Jersey—under which hundreds of persons are held as slaves! Have they ever opposed them? Are they opposing them now? Has Theodore Frelinghuysen ever opposed them? Or do any of the members of the Presbyterian church, except abolitionists? Some features of the slave laws of the South may be lacking in those of New Jersey. They are slave laws, nevertheless, and are wicked, if "SLAVERY" is wicked.

"THE LEGAL RELATION" INNOCENT.

ow often has it been re-iterated by the
cal opposers of abolition that "the legal
on between the slave master and the
is not sinful." If this be not the *present*
ion of the Biblical Repository, what is it?
he LEGAL Relation." But what IS that
ion aside from the SLAVE LAWS by
h it is defined, enforced and protected?—
ish "the wicked slave laws" and what
mes of the innocent "legal relation,"
It is a relation that would send a man
State's Prison! If the "relation" cre-
by the laws be innocent, how can the laws
ing it be wicked? Will it be said that a
of the slave laws are morally right, and
of them wicked? Let it be shown
what part of them is *not* wicked (the
we mean, that exist at the south, not
that the Princeton writers may imagine;)
let it be shown, too, if it can, that there
er enough in the *innocent* part of the
laws, to hold a single human being in
ry!

SLAVERY DOCUMENTS VS. "SLAVE LAWS."

so early documents of the Anti-Slavery
ties—State, local, and National, (from
to 1830, more especially) abounded in
tions of slavery, by the American slave
by citations and extracts from the laws
slave States, laws affirming human
elaborate, annulling marriage, forbidding
tion, protecting the enforcement of un-
labor, denying the right of the slaves to
property, authorizing the separation of
es by sale, and infringing the religious
of the slaves. The public were told
ly and continually that by the *abolition*
ery, we meant solely the *repeal of these*
wicked slave laws," accompanied by any
special legislation as might be needed, or
sed to be prudent, for the preservation
blic order, in consequence of the change.
als, Reports, Manifestoes, on sheets and
amphlet form, were gratuitously sent
gh the non-slaveholding States, to all
ligious editors and ministers of all the
ent sects, so far as their names and resi-
s could be, by laborious and expensive
y, ascertained, and also to leading civil-
statesmen, literary and intelligent gen-
en, especially those known for their
ng in the different churches and sects.
reds of thousands of copies were th's
sted, at an expense of thousands of del-
in the course of two or three years, be-
the circulation of the same statements
publication and sale of such books as
s Inquiry," and "Phelps' Lectures"—
no prepared by an eminent Christian
man; and the other by an evangelical

clergyman, in high repute. Men known and
united then, honored, in the Presbyterian church
as among the most munificent contributors to
their enterprises, were at the bottom of this
movement. The name of the Tappans is a
sufficient endorsement to this statement, to
which; (from 1835) may be added that of
Gerrit Smith, to say nothing of many others.

THESE DOCUMENTS NOT MISUNDERSTOOD.

The entire movement was a simple propos-
al for the repeal of the "WICKED SLAVE
LAWS." And *THUS IT WAS UNDERSTOOD.*
How was it received? How, by the churches
and ministry of the various sects? How by
those of the Presbyterian sect?

We repeat it—the movement was *WELL*
UNDERSTOOD to be a simple, direct, unam-
biguous, straight forward proposal to abolish the
SLAVE LAWS, and nothing else. Intelli-
gent men could not help knowing what these
plain anti-slavery documents meant, and they
did know.

The very word "*abolition*" told every one
who heard it, what was the proposed move-
ment. "*Abolition*" of what? The aboli-
tion of the slave laws, to be sure. Thus the
word had always been understood, and used,
in New England, in New York, and in Penn-
sylvania where the SLAVE LAWS had been
abolished, and had always been known to be
the abolition of slavery, the legal termination
of slave holding. The "*abolition of the*
slave trade," too, by England and America,
had been known to be the abolition or repeal
of the laws legalizing that traffic. The then
pending effort in England, for the abolition
of slavery in the British West Indies, was well
known to be an effort for the abolition of the
slave laws of those islands, a movement which
was then denounced in this country, by the
opposers of American abolitionists, with the
prediction that the repeal of the slave laws
would deluge the West Indies with blood!—
For a long time the most available charge
against us was, that we followed in the foot-
steps of the blood-thirsty fanatics in England,
Clarkson, Willberforce, Buxton, Sturge, Stur-
art, and Thompson, the two latter of whom,
had even then, visited our shores, as Sturge
has since done.

THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IS THE REPEAL OF THE SLAVE LAWS.

All the opposition to "*abolition*" or "*aboli-
tionism*" that either England or America have
yet witnessed, is opposition to the abolition of
the slave laws. No arts nor menaces have
been spared to lure or drive us from this posi-
tion. We were "*abolitionists*" and not sim-
ple emancipationists—that was the head and
front of our offending—we sought the aboli-

tion of the SLAVE LAWS and not simply
the manumission of a few individual slaves.—
The "Old Manumission Societies" were in
good odor, with those who persecuted us, in
the worst of times. We were exhorted—and
still are—to content ourselves with efforts to
"improve the condition of the slaves—make
them more intelligent, moral, and religious"
nay, to content ourselves with "building up
an empire in Africa" by colonizing the free
people of color, and let the "anti-slavery agi-
tation alone."

The "*abolition of slavery*" is nothing
more nor less than the repeal of the slave
laws. There has been no abolition of slavery
in any part of the world, and there never can
be, but the repeal of the slave laws. This
we have, all along, insisted upon. And every
body knows it to be the truth. And it is be-
cause abolitionists are known to be seeking
the abolition of the slave laws, that they are
opposed.

RECEPTION OF THOSE DOCUMENTS.

The reception and treatment of the anti-
slavery documents that have been described,
prove this. Those documents, consisting,
simply in extracts from the slave laws and
statements of their character, together with
appeals in favor of their abolition.* These
were the "*pestilent documents*"—the "*fire*
brands" the "*insurrectionary,*" "*revolution-
ary*" and "*incendiary*" publications against
which religious editors and ministers caution-
ed the churches and the public; first rousing
the mobs against us, and then seeking our sup-
pression by penal law! The writer of these
remarks had, at one time, a spare flour barrel
literally crammed full of these "*pestilent doc-
uments*" which had been returned to the
"Emancipator" office through the mails, from
the dignified personages, many of them min-
isters and church members, to whom they had
been addressed, and a large portion of them
adorned (in violation of the Post Office laws)
with the scribbled and pencilled expressions of
their horror and displeasure.

CHARACTER OF THE OPPOSITION.

At every step, the opposition we have en-
countered, has been opposition to the abolition
of the "*wicked slave laws.*" Messages of
Presidents, (a Presbyterian President among
the number) Congressional Reports, Gag
Law Reports (one, at least of them, from a
Presbyterian Senator,) Speeches in Congress,
and in State Legislatures, Governor's Messa-

*If it should be said, in contradiction of this state-
ment, that the *abuses* and *crusties* incident to slavery,
were the burden of these hated documents, rather than
the abolition of the slave laws, it will make the matter
still worse, for the ministry and churches who spurned
them! It is too late, now, to try out against exaggera-
tions of cruelty. The most frightful pictures drawn,
have come from Southern witnesses.

gas, Stamp Speeches, Newspaper essays and paragraphs, Sermons, exhortations, &c. without number—what have they been levelled against, if not against appeals in favor of the abolition of the slave laws? What petitions were those that could not be heard, in our halls of legislation, but petitions for the repeal of the slave laws? Senator Clay's celebrated speech in the Senate—what was it, but a speech against the abolition of the "wicked slave laws"? Gen. Harrison's violent speeches against abolitionists, at Chevoit, and at Vincennes; what were they, but speeches against any proposals for abolishing the "wicked slave laws"? Why, and on what ground did both Clay and Harrison deny the right of the people of the free States to agitate the subject of slavery, but because, as they affirmed, they had no right to abolish the slave laws!

Now the subject was disturbed.

In the church, too, as well as in the state, what has made the disturbance, if not the proposal to abolish "the wicked slave laws"? How happens it that the N. Y. Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church required a pledge of young candidates for the ministry that they should "refrain from agitating the church with discussions on the subject" of abolitionism? How came the General Conference of the Methodist E. Church, in 1830, to disclaim "any right, wish, or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave holding States of this Union"? (Adopted by a vote of 120 to 14.) How came it to pass that Elder Davis of Georgia, who openly vindicated, in the hearing of thousands, and without the least reservation or exception, the slave laws of that State—how came it to pass, we demand, that he was taken by the hand as a worthy brother, by the heads of the Baptist sect of the North, and their pulpits thrown open to him, without the least expression of dissent from his sentiments? And how happens it that when a Brisbane, a Grosvenor, a Colver, or a Calusha, of the same sect, wishes to occupy the same pulpits with an exposure of the wickedness of the same slave laws, that the subject becomes, instantly, so *political* that the pulpit doors are, almost uniformly, closed against them? How happens it, if there is no partiality in favor of "the wicked slave laws"?

A DILEMMA.

Will it be denied that, in all this political and ecclesiastical opposition to "abolition" the point of opposition was the abolition of the slave laws? What *other* "abolition" did the abolitionists ever propose?

Will our Princeton writer adventure to

grapple with the other horn of the dilemma? Will he claim that it was the proposed abolition—not of the slave laws, but only of the "abuses" and cruelties of the system that has drawn down all this twelve years' storm of political and ecclesiastical persecution upon the heads of the "reckless and fanatical abolitionists"? Will the tarnished fame of the American churches and ministry, in the sight of the civilized world, be white-washed into spotless purity, by his urging such a plea?

POLITICAL ABOLITION—WHAT IS IT?

The very fact that "political abolition" is opposed—nay—the fact that it is not, by the great mass of professed Christians, and ministers of this country, earnestly espoused, will be proof, to all coming generations, and at the day of judgment, that they are not opposed to "the wicked slave laws." For what is "political abolition" but the wielding of our powers "as citizens" for the abolition of the slave laws? The very thing which the Biblical Repository concedes we have "the right and duty to demand?" Out of their own mouth, then, the Princeton Presbyterians stand condemned. They are not "no government" men, with conscientious scruples against casting their votes. They have no cloak for their sin. Against the "demand" for a repeal of the "wicked slave laws" they still raise the cry of "the integrity of our National Union vs. Abolitionism"—plainly showing that a political union with known sin is more precious to them than the abolition of "mischief framed by a law."

IMMEDIATISM AND GRADUALISM.

One grand point of complaint against "modern abolitionists," from the beginning, has been their insisting upon the duty of *immediate* abolition—*unconditional* abolition—in opposition to the "gradual emancipation" of their predecessors, an emancipation contingent on the circumstances and convenience of the slave masters. This shows that the ground of debate has been, all along, the abolition of the slave laws, a measure which has been represented as being *equitable*, uncompromising, unkind, and even unjust.

Had it been conceded, by our opponents, (as it never has been until recently) that the slave laws are wicked, with what show of decency could they have complained of our demand for their immediate and unconditional abolition? Were we wrong in demanding the "immediate and unconditional" abolition of that which is wicked? Were we "fanatical" in this? Or will the Biblical Repository admit that a gradual, a future abolition of wicked laws, an abolition dependant and contingent upon the circumstances and con-

venience of the slave masters, would be harpmony with Old School Presbyterian Theology, as taught at Princeton?

A gradual abolition would be a gradual peel of "the wicked slave laws"! A general emancipation would be a release of all slaves at a time from the controlling power of "the wicked slave laws," leaving the people under their grip! Is this the Christian course that we ought to recommend, in preference to abolishing "the wicked slave laws" at once, and "proclaiming liberty through all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof?"

And if the long and still pending contest between a gradual and contingent abolition, emancipation, on the one hand, and an "immediate and unconditional" abolition or emancipation, on the other, be not a contest in respect to "the wicked slave laws" or the holding of persons subject to their injustice, what then, let us ask the wise men at Princeton, is the grand point in dispute? Are we disposed to demur against "the immediate and unconditional abolition" of all the "abuses and cruelties" "connected with slavery"? How much time would they allow for Christian Presbyterians to indulge in these, or to be subjected to them? For Presbyterians slave holders, and are held as slaves, what contingencies, or under what circumstances would they have these abuses and cruelties cease? In short, where is the fanaticism or the heresy of demanding immediate and conditional abolition—whether of the abolition of slavery, or of the "wicked slave laws"? Can they tell? And can they square their answer with the uncompromising theology taught at Princeton, in the controversy between Dr. Beman and "New School?"

THE PRINCETON POSITION.

A day of joy and gratulation will it be, when the Biblical Repository ceases to furnish "Princeton Whig" and other opposers of "political abolition" with defences against the "demand" of abolitionists "as citizens" for "equal laws." When it no longer waxes off the rising indignation of our "citizens" against the "wicked slave laws," by denying the existence of the "cardinal principle" of the whole system—and by framing excuses for a church that, in its membership and ministry, creates and sustains it, declaring that she has "no responsibility" for the actions of its members!

If any doubt remains, in the minds of Princeton teachers, after reading the preceding remarks, whether or no the anti-slavery test be one in respect to sustaining "the wicked slave laws," we will make one proposal to them, which will be decisive of the

matter. Let them go to work, honestly, sincerely, and perseveringly, in opposing what they understand and admit to be "wicked slave laws." Let them do this, openly, and before the sun. Let their actions "as citizens," correspond with their words. Let them fully exercise their "right" and discharge their "duty" to demand equal and just laws." Then let it be seen whether they can avoid becoming identified with the fanatical abolitionists, in the community in which they live, through the northern states, and at the south.

They cannot do it, any more than they can blot out the sun in the heavens, or annihilate time and space. They cannot do it, as no one has been able to do it before them. Pres. Wayland's "Elements of Moral Science" was understood as discountenancing the slave laws. The South and the North immediately put him down as an abolitionist. And what course did he take, to regain his character and standing in the American churches? Why, he wrote his book of "Limitations" to dissuade Christian "citizens" from taking any measures for abolishing the slave laws! And thus his marred reputation was mended, and his "University" absolved from harm! A change of sentiment in New England has now driven him into a controversy with Dr. Fuller, in which he partly arraigns the slave laws, and begins again to be claimed and to be stigmatized as an abolitionist! Dr. Channing opposed anti-slavery societies, discouraged anti-slavery agitations, disparaged American abolitionists, and did his best to prevent the community from counting him one of their number. But all in vain! He had written against the slave laws, while apologizing for slave holders, and so the Biblical Repository, while almost compelled to adventure a similar experiment, classes Dr. Channing among abolitionists!—And John Quincy Adams, in spite of all his protestations against it, could not help being claimed as an abolitionist, and denounced as an abolitionist, for no other fault on earth but his simply and honestly maintaining that abolitionists had a constitutional right to petition for the repeal of the slave laws, which laws, he himself was ready, as he declared, to support. The Princeton Doctors should count the cost, therefore, if they really contemplate an honest, earnest condemnation of the "wicked slave laws."

But whatever they undertake or decline un-

*The Southern Editors branded the clerical Editor of the Journal of Commerce as a "hypocrite" because he said the slave laws were wrong, and said that the abolitionists were wrong likewise. A similar rebuke was administered by the Southern members of the Methodist General Conference, to the anti-abolition clergy of the North. They called it "knavish" to condemn abolitionism and the slave laws, at the same time. And this disgust caused the Southern secession.

dertaking, let them not think to blot out the fixed and changeless records of the age and nation they live in. Let them not attempt to conceal or cover up the fact that the position of the American churches and ministry, for the last twelve years, (with the exception of those known as abolitionists) has been the position of determined and inveterate hostility to any earnest and honest attempt to procure the abolition of the "wicked slave laws."—An attempt to conceal this fact, at this late day, and when the civilized world is in possession of the documentary evidences of its verity, would only add impudence to guilt, and infamy to merited condemnation.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.

BROOKLYN, N. Y. Wednesday,
2 P. M. Sept. 10, 1845.

DEAR BRO. CURTIS.—I hasten to give you early intelligence of the Board. This morning the long dreaded question came up, and the prospect now is that it will have a definite and speedy decision—not without some debate, it may be, but under circumstances giving little ground to expect a result in conformity with the requirements of pure religion.

For some days past, and up to this morning, there have been rumors afloat which have revived the faint hopes of ever-confiding abolitionists, that a brighter day was dawning upon the Board. It was said that the Committee on the slave question, of which Dr. Woods was Chairman, had found it difficult to agree—that Dr. Woods' draft would either be laid aside or greatly altered—otherwise David Sandford and others would bring in a Minority Report. Prof. C. E. Stowe, another member of that Committee was noticed on the spot this morning, and some hoped that the forthcoming Report would be from his pen. One rumor had it that Dr. Woods, finding himself likely to be overborne, would give it up and be passive—or probably not attend the meeting of the Board. But when, at 11 o'clock, this forenoon, the Report was called for, behold, after a little delay, Dr. Woods himself made his appearance and read his Report. And truly it was Woods, himself, and nothing but Woods, from beginning to end, only less evasive and indefinite than his former productions on that subject. It admits, explicitly, that slave holders are, and have been, received in the Choctaw and Cherokee churches from the beginning. It does not pretend that the Missionaries give, or are directed by the Board, to give the slave holders any reproof, direct, of the practice. It recommends a continuance of the same policy—the gathering of slave holders

and slaves into the same churches. In justification of this policy a course of argument is introduced which would be equally pertinent to prove that drunkards and other immoral persons ought to be received and retained in church fellowship. The ground is assumed that men may give evidence of faith and repentance while chaffing their fellow men—while trampling humanity and fundamental morality under foot. A document more antagonistic to the doctrines of the Gospel, as understood by abolitionists, cannot easily be framed. To this Report, the names, even of C. E. Stowe and David Sandford were signed, so that the Committee were unanimous in the measure!

Thursday Morning, 6 o'clock. The Report was under discussion the whole of yesterday afternoon and evening, until 9 o'clock. Its adoption was advocated by Judge Jorasp, of Montrose, Pa. (once an abolitionist,) Dr. Leonard Bacon of New Haven, Prof. C. E. Stowe, Rev. J. P. Cleveland, of Cincinnati, Rev. Jotham Sewall, of Maine, Chancellor Walworth, Judge Darling of Penna., Seth Williston, D. D., Bennett Tyler, D. D., William Wisner, D. D., Rev. Z. S. Barstow, and the Secretaries, Anderson and Greene. On the other side we had David Root, J. Brown, Esq. of New York, Dr. Ide, of Medway (father-in-law of Charles T. Torrey,) and Amos A. Phelps. A Mr. White, a S. Carolina clergyman, and Edward Beecher of Boston, made speeches which it would be difficult to classify, as they were not decisive, on either side.—A. P. Williams of Farmington Conn. made persevering efforts to be heard, but was singularly prevented. Dr. Anderson closed the evening's discussion. He was aware, he said, that there would be a division among the friends of Missions. To this, he had made up his mind, and was prepared for it. He was willing that those who could not conscientiously agree with the doctrines and the policy of the Report should go on, apart, and work in another organization, by themselves. Let us, said he, who can come together, on the basis of this Report, be permitted to go on, by ourselves, and unmolested by those who hold opposite views. Allusions, said he, have been made, to the increasing dissatisfaction with the Board, but I think my situation enables me to know the public sentiment of the religious community. I take my stand, and am willing to abide the result.

One remarkable feature of the Report was made apparent in the discussion—viz. its "uncertain sound." Its advocates could not agree whether it condemned slavery or no. The South Carolina gentleman at first thought it

did, and that he could not assent to it. But Dr. Bacon's explanations of it might have satisfied him, had not Prof. Stowe, one of the Committee, in his replies to the abolitionists, given it an opposite construction. He was puzzled, now, and hardly knew what to think of it. Bro. Phelps maintained that Prof. Stowe had put more abolition into his explanatory speech, than there was in the document itself.

On the main, practical point, however, there was little chance for mistake. What- ever the Report, or its expositors might say about the slave system—"the abomination of heaven and earth," as some called it, yet it was, nevertheless to be eradicated in the bosom of the Mission Churches! And the discussion drove the friends of the Report into a Bible apology for slave holding, so far, at least, as its undisturbed tolerance in the Christian church, is concerned. It was here, on the Bible, that Dr. Wigner and Dr. Williston planted themselves, and exclaimed strongly against the views of Mr. Dwight, a clergyman of Portland, who, though careful to disclaim being a technical abolitionist, was not satisfied with the Report, because it did not sufficiently condemn slavery, and had ventured so far as to say that the light of reason, of conscience, and common sense "back of the Bible" was sufficient to teach us the wickedness of slave holding. This, the Doctor thought horrible doctrine and inconsistent with a proper reverence for the scriptures. Some of their eloquent blows at Mr. Dwight on this topic, elicited somewhat uproarious and merry demonstrations of approval from a portion of their clerical auditors.

Mr. Phelps replied to several distinct points in the Report—and moved amendments, including Resolutions against sustaining Missionaries who are slave holders or who gather and preside over slave holding churches.

Thursday, 1 P. M. The forenoon has been chiefly occupied with a further discussion of the Report. Dr. Anderson thought further discussion would be useful. The principles and policy of the Board, were now, for the first time, to be definitely settled and laid down. This would form an era in the history of Missions, and serve as a precedent, in future times. It would henceforth be understood that the Missionary cause was not to be saddled with the load of all the other reforms that could be put upon it. It was not to be interrupted, nor turned aside, by questions of this sort.

Prof. C. E. Stowe followed. He said those who believed all slave holding to be necessarily sinful could not be expected to co-operate with those who sustained this Report. On the

other hand, those who held the sentiments of this Report, could not co-operate in a Society that should take any other ground. Very few of the Board, he was sure, could do so—nor was it probable that they would ever change their opinions. Christian Missions on the other part, as proposed by Mr. Phelps would be altogether a new experiment. Could it succeed, so should rejaice. Slavery was the greatest evil and the greatest sin in the land, yet the Bible, he thought, bound us to another method of treating it. He went into a lengthened argument which I cannot follow, now.

A. F. WILLIAMS, of Connecticut, succeeded next in obtaining the floor, and spoke ably against the Report. I am, said he, a layman, one of the supporters of the Board. I wish to know the position it occupies. Can I learn it from this Report? It first says slavery is wrong, but it afterwards labors to prove that it may likewise be right. The slave system is wrong but slave holding is not. In the world, slavery is wrong. But in the church it is right! This, I cannot understand. I think it worse in the church than in the world. Its influence is greater. If a wicked profane man holds slaves, his example does not recommend the practice. But if a Doctor of Divinity holds slaves, the pernicious influence is great. Gentlemen have undertaken to prove that the New Testament sanctioned slavery. [Here, several voices from about the platform, said, No!] Perhaps I am too thick headed to understand. [Then you are, said one.]—I think the mass of the people, (said Mr. W.) will understand your report as I do. If the Committee, as is said, wished to condemn slave holding, why do they not say so, in terms that we can all understand—and understand alike? Consider the Golden Rule.—How can a man be a slave holder and follow that rule? All slaveholders withhold the hire of the laborer. Is there no sin in that?—James says "Go to now, ye rich men, weep" &c. &c. Can a man give evidence of piety and not pay his laborers? It has been conceded by gentlemen that the Sandwich Island Missionaries were right in making the disuse of tobacco a term of Communion, because of the great evils found connected with that practice. These same gentlemen are eloquent, too, in setting forth the evil consequences of slavery among the Choctaws. Why, then, by their own rule, do they not insist on a relinquishment of the practice, as a condition of Communion among the Choctaws?—Why more lenient to the slave holders than to the tobacco chowers? One of the speakers (Prof. Stowe) had drawn a parallel between slave holding and polygamy, and had demanded whether we were prepared to ex-

clude Abraham and Jacob from communion? He would answer by another inquiry. Suppose the Sultan of Turkey becomes a convert and applies to your Missionaries for church membership. Shall they admit him while he continues in connexion with his harem?

Dr. Pierson, of Brookline, Mass. advocated the Report.

Hon. LINCOLN CHASE, of Mass. followed, on the same side. The churches, in Worcester county, he thought, would sustain the Report and the Board.

Dr. BACON said—"Those who believe all slave holding to be sinful cannot go with us, in adopting this Report. Neither can we go with them, in their views. The churches will not. The people will not. They cannot stand such nonsense! [A general laugh!].—I cannot conscientiously go with a Society that goes on the principle of Mr. Phelps' amendment. Dr. B. concluded by offering another set of Resolutions instead. The first declares the slave system at war with justice &c. incurring the displeasure of God, and deploring its existence in the Choctaw "nation," &c. The second says, that the mere relation, &c. is not so sinful as to be a bar to church membership. The third says, that Missionaries should receive all who give evidence of piety, &c. and the fourth recommends church discipline in cases where the master's power is abused, &c. &c.

H. G. LUNZOW was in favor of the Report and thought all abolitionists ought to be satisfied with it. He eulogized the late Dr. Richards, and told how dreadfully he had been abused. He edified us, likewise, with the history of a very pious, rum-selling deacon, whom he once knew.

Mr. BULLARD, a Clergyman from St. Louis, made a pathetic speech, and quoted Robert Hall in favor of receiving all Christians into the churches. [Christian Union, as they understand it, seems to be making rapid progress in the Board, and all sectarian divisions will perhaps be swallowed up, in the great one idea of promoting missions on the plan of receiving slave holders into the mission churches.]

JUDGE WILLIAMS of Conn. moved a recommitment of the Report, and both sets of Resolutions, to a new Committee of five, which was carried. The Committee consisted of Judge Williams, Dr. Bacon, Prof. Stowe, Dr. Benjamin Tappan, Secretary Greene, and Mr. Webster of Hopkinton.

FRIDAY, A. M. Judge Williams, on behalf of the Committee, made a verbal Report.

The Board, he said, had all along declined acting on the subject of slavery in this country, and had thus defined its position. They could go no further now. Slavery in the Mission churches had, indeed come up for examination and had been referred to the Committee whose Report had been discussed before the Board. Two different amendments had been proposed, the one by Mr. Phelps, the other by Dr. Bacon, both of which involved the principle of legislating on the subject.—The Committee therefore recommended the rejection of the Amendments and Resolutions proposed, and the adoption of the original Report.

Dr. TAPPAN, one of the Committee, said that, for himself, he would have preferred adopting the Resolutions of Dr. Bacon, but on the whole, he concurred.

Dr. DE WITT thought the original Report would be a document of great value. The Resolutions of Dr. Bacon would introduce an embarrassing element, and produce trouble hereafter.

Mr. WENSTER, one of the Committee who had just reported, rose to say that he did not assent to it, and must submit a minority report. He wished the adoption of Dr. Bacon's Resolutions. He argued against some of the features of the Report. The general impression would be that it left a loop hole, for the free entrance of slave holders into the mission churches. But if the Report were adopted, he should be satisfied with the result.

Dr. HAWES said his relation to the Anti-Slavery cause required him to say a few words. He hoped to live and die an abolitionist. He approved the general principles of the Report. He should have preferred to have it say that slave holding in the church was not to be regarded as a permanent arrangement. He would like, too, to have it more fully set forth the distinction, made by its advocates, in the debate, between *personal* and *social* sin. Some complain that the Report would not be understood. He thought otherwise. Some had anticipated dissatisfaction and secession. But among all his acquaintances, he knew of only one person who would make the abandonment of slave holding a test of church membership. He should go for the Report as it was, without the amendments.

BRO. PHELPS, now took the floor, and in a clear and searching speech, exposed the sophistries that had been employed on the other side. He should criminate no one. He should not follow the example that had been given,

of calling the arguments of his opponents "nonsense"—nor of charging them with being "incited by the devil." [I hope Brother Phelps will write out and publish his speech, to which I can do no justice, here.] He closed by renewing his amendment in substance, the Resolution he had before offered.

The problem, when he sat down, was, in what way it was best to dispose of it. Some were for the previous question. Others were for laying it on the table. John Tappan said this Amendment must first be seconded by a corporate member, before it could be acted on. After a pause, some one seconded it, in order that the vote might be taken. Chancellor Walworth was very desirous that no vote on that Amendment should be taken. He deemed it important that every vote taken should be unanimous. He feared this vote would not be, though it would be, on the original Report. Dr. Anderson thought it best to vote directly on the Amendment. This course was finally taken, and bro. Phelps' Amendment voted down, though there were several votes in its favor.

The question now came up on adopting the original Report, as first read by Dr. Woods, and without a syllable of Amendment. Dr. De Witt called for the Yeas and Nays, which were ordered. On calling the names, every corporate member present (the honorary members could not vote) voted in its favor. Mr. Dwight among the rest. Dr. Samuel H. Cox, who had been a silent spectator of the whole debate, answered the call of his name, with a peculiarly emphatic *Aye*.

And so the anti-abolition character of the American Board is definitely, unanimously, and permanently settled. All those who wish to sustain missions on the principle of *excluding slavery* from the churches gathered among the heathen, will now know how to act. They must labor by themselves. But in what manner shall they organize? That is the next question. The Annual Meeting of the Union Missionary Society is to be held in New York city next week. Consultations will then, doubtless, be held.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

POSITION OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.

MR. EDITOR.—To accompany, or follow the account I gave you of the late meeting of the American Board, at Brooklyn, I now send you copies of the Amendments and Resolutions proposed by AMOS A. PHELPS, and also of those proposed by Dr. LEONARD BACON, neither of which found favor, in the sight of

the Board. These should be carefully preserved by the friends of Free Missions, for future reference, and especially for the purpose of comparing them with the Report adopted by the Board, whenever it appears in print.*

The Amendments of A. A. Phelps, were the following:

"In conclusion the Board adopt the following preamble and resolutions as a summary exposition of the views and principles embodied in the foregoing remarks, and of the rules that should govern the Executive officers and Missionaries of the Board in their practical application.

"Whereas, in the providence of God, this Board, in conducting its operations among the Indians and elsewhere, has been brought into such contact with slavery as to demand some judgment of the Board respecting the moral character, and the adoption of some general rules of conduct for the guidance of its Executive officers and Missionaries in cases where they are brought in contact with it, while seeking their one great object: therefore,

Resolved, That as this Board regard the system and practice of slaveholding as a great moral evil, entirely opposed to the spirit and principles of the gospel whose propagation is its especial and appropriate work, it can never in the persons of its officers, agents, or Missionaries, sustain any relation to it, implying either approbation or sanction.

"Resolved, That in accordance with this general principle, this Board cannot appoint or sustain slaveholders, remaining such after remonstrance, as Missionaries.

"Resolved, That while this Board will not imperatively direct or concern itself with the internal discipline of churches gathered by its Missionaries on heathen ground, and might seem to be an unauthorized interference with the liberty of Christ's house, so neither can it allow such Missionaries to interfere in a similar way with its liberty in the appropriation of its funds; and therefore, that as this Board, in the exercise of its liberty, would feel called upon to withdraw its support from Missionaries and churches receiving drunkards, gamblers, and the like to their communion and retaining them in it, so it cannot continue its appropriations to Missionaries and churches which, after remonstrance on the subject, deliberately continue to receive slaveholders remaining such, after due admonition, to their bosom and retain them in it.

"Resolved, That the Board will expect its Missionaries, ministering to churches that have slaveholders in them, to pursue the same course in respect to their instruction, admonition, discipling as slaveholders, as if the same individuals were drunkards, gamblers or the like, and that if the Missionaries in the exercise of their liberty and after full deliberation shall decline to do so, this Board hereby directs its Executive officers to dissolve further connection with them as Missionaries of this body.

It was hardly to be expected by any one, that the Board, whose prominent members had prepared and advocated such a Report as that of Dr. Woods, Chairman of the Committee appointed at the former meeting, would be induced to adopt an Amendment and Resolutions, so perfectly opposite to that Report.—Dr. Bacon said he could not. But he was evidently desirous of so amending the original Report that there might be some room left to defend it against the objections of such men as Mr. Dwight of Portland, who, although they disclaimed being abolitionists, in the common acceptance of the term, were, nevertheless, dissatisfied with the original Report.

Dr. Bacon, therefore, submitted the following:

1. Resolved, That inasmuch as the system of domestic slavery, under every modification, is at war with the principles of Christianity, with natural justice, with industry and thrift, with habits of subjection to law, and with whatever tends to the advancement of civilization

*I learn it is already published in the Journal of Com-

and the ascendancy of the Gospel, and inasmuch as it brings upon every community which establishes and upholds it, the righteous displeasure of God, and the reprobation of the civilized and Christian world, the existence of slavery in the Cherokee and Choctaw nations is deeply to be lamented by their friends, and particularly by this Board, as having been, for more than a quarter of a century, engaged in labors tending to their moral, intellectual, and social advancement.

2. Resolved, That while the strongest language of reprobation is not too strong to be applied to the system of slavery, truth and justice require this Board to say that the moral relation of a master to one whom the constitution of society has made a slave, is not to be regarded as in all cases such a sin as to require the exclusion of the master, without further inquiry, from Christian ordinances.

3. Resolved, That the Missionaries of this Board, every where, are expected to admit to Christian ordinances those, and only those, who give satisfactory evidence of having become new creatures in Christ.

4. Resolved, That the master who buys and sells human beings, as merchandise, for gain,—who does not recognize in respect to his servants the divine sanctity of their relations as husbands and wives, and as parents and children—who permits them to live and die in ignorance of God, and of God's word, who does not render to his servants that which is just and equal, or who refuses to recognize, heartily and practically, their dignity and worth, as reasonable and accountable beings, for whom Christ has died, does not give satisfactory evidence of being born of God, or having the Spirit of Christ.

It will be noticed that these resolutions, making the same distinctions recently promulgated in the Princeton Repository, are very careful not to condemn the act of *slave holding*, and they only say that the *abuses* of the practice are sinful, and that those do not give satisfactory evidence of being Christians, who buy and sell human beings as merchandise for gain, who do not regard the sanctity of the family relation, who keep their slaves in ignorance and heathenism, who do not render unto them that which is just and equal, nor treat them as reasonable and accountable beings for whom Christ died.

By adopting these Resolutions, the Board would only have been putting into a practical form, the concessions of the Doctors at Princeton? Could they not adventure so far as that? It would seem not! As Dr. Do Witt afterwards expressed it, in the debate, it would introduce a disturbing influence, and occasion future inconvenience! Undoubtedly it would! For all men of common discernment would see that the practices thus condemned were identified with *American slave holding*! Such men as Chancellor Walworth and Theodore Frelinghuysen, it was whispered, would be very sensitive, if any such sentiments should receive the sanction of the Board. And what Chancellor Walworth himself said before the Board, confirmed this. What was to be done? How should the Board escape the responsibility of a direct vote, on these two separate amendments of Mr. Phelps and Dr. Bacon? Judge Williams very adroitly moved the recommitment of the whole subject to a new Committee of five, which was carried, and he was appointed Chairman. That Committee, without having either of the documents referred to them, immediately decided to recommend the original Report, without the

amendments! This would have *appeared* a little, by not *directly* voting down the amendments. But bro. Phelps did not suffer them to escape in this way. He renewed the substance of his amendments in the following—

"And finally, in accordance with, and in reply to the memorials submitted to it from Worcester County and elsewhere at its present meeting, the Board deem it right and proper to say, that its funds cannot and will not be expended in maintaining slaveholding Missionaries, or building up slaveholding churches; that in carrying out the general principles laid down in the first part of the foregoing report, in their practical application to the question of receiving slaveholders to, and retaining in the Missionary churches, the Board will expect its Missionaries and churches to treat slaveholding, in the matter of instruction, admonition and discipline, in the same manner as they should and would treat drunkenness, gaming, falsehood, bigamy, idolatry and the like; and that whenever and wherever it shall appear that the Missionaries and the churches, in exercise of their appropriate liberty, do not do so, it will be the duty of this Board, in the exercise of its liberty, to dissolve farther connection with them."

Notwithstanding the efforts of Chancellor Walworth and others, to dodge this question, it was finally voted upon, and voted down.—Some voices, it is true, were heard in their favor. But on the calling of the names, in voting for the original Report, every response given, was an *aye*, and this must have included some who had just voted for the opposite sentiments! They must all *hang together*, right or wrong. If the mountain will not come at the call of Mohammed, Mohammed can go to the mountain!

"The beginning of the ending" has come.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

New York, Sept. 15, 1845.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, SEPTEMBER, 1846.

A HINT TO WHOM IT CONCERNS.—It is becoming quite common for the members and pastors of sectarian churches (particularly of the Congregational sect) to affirm strongly that they do receive into membership, as opportunity offers, all applicants for admission whom they consider to be Christians, however much they may differ from them in rituals and in minor points of speculative theology. Baptists and Methodists, they are willing, they say, to receive with open arms, and without requiring of them the abandonment of their peculiar views. And hence they plead "*not guilty*" to the charge of being *sectarian*, and of violating the unity of the saints.

Undoubtedly there is evidence of progress in all this. But is it consistent and proper for churches whose practice thus conforms to the principles of Christian unity, in this matter, to keep up, without alteration, their old sectarian creeds, which bind all the members to uniformity on these points? Is it right for them to profess *one* thing on *paper*, in order to "*make a fair show*" in the sects whose favor they covet, and, at the same time profess and practice the *opposite* in order to meet the objections of unionists and prevent the growth of churches whose practices and professions agree?

And is it right for the same members, and

ministers of Congregational churches who thus make a boast of their own liberality and recognition of open Christian church membership, to continue their former opposition to those who teach and who consistently exemplify the doctrine of Christian union? Is it becoming in them, after having proclaimed their own readiness to receive those who hold the Baptist and Methodist views, to throw out dark hints, insinuations, and innuendoes concerning the "*looseness*" of the independent local churches, gathered on union principles, and whom "*looseness*" consists only in the practice of the *same* liberality; guarded with the additional care to receive and retain no members who falsify their Christian professions by trampling on the poor, and by holding out the intoxicating cup to their neighbors? Is the spirit of Christian unity exhibited by those who say they are ready to receive Baptists and Methodists into their churches, and yet say also that a neighboring church is a motley mixture of every thing, having no fixed and definite character, merely because its membership is made up of those who came from the Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, and Methodist sects?

Similar questions, too, we might ask, concerning church independency, lay ordination, church order, and the equal brotherhood of saints. Intelligent Congregationalists (and even Presbyterians) will often concede (as they always must, when in controversy with Episcopalians) the entire length of all the doctrines that the "*Christian Investigator*" has taught on these subjects. Is it quite fair, then, and becoming their high professions, for the same persons to keep up the cry of "*fanaticism and disorganization*" against us for teaching, in earnest, the very truths they profess to believe? Are we "*fanatics*" because we practice what they preach?

FREE MISSIONS.—A consultation of the friends of Free Missions was held at Boston, during the sittings of the Great Eastern Liberty Convention. A Committee, of whom A. A. Phelps is Chairman, was appointed to call a Convention or Conventions on that subject.—The committee contemplate calling *two* Conventions before long one for N. England, and the other for the State of N. York. Notices of the times and places will be given in the papers.

PEACE PRINCIPLES.—There were lately preached in London, on the same Sabbath, one hundred and ten sermons on the subject of peace.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoya, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1, Iniquity and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, \$0.62½ per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.

HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

Where you may buy

Cards, Blanks & Handbills

Together with every description of Book & Job Printing

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—ISAIAH, LX, 11.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, procuring eight subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Copies, per dozen, 50 50 Sixty papers, 3 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

"THE MARRIAGE QUESTION IN AMERICA."

LAW OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

The following communication from a legal gentleman, well known in Western New York, will be sufficient for the instruction of any who may need information, concerning the laws of this State. The reader, if apprized of some recent events, in this neighborhood, of which we have made record, will doubtless be cause of thankfulness that the laws and liberties of the people are not yet in priestly hands, however absurd and anti-republican may be the constitutional provision that renders ministers ineligible to civil office. Pity were it, that clerical usurpations and assumptions should render such a provision plausible!

We think it proper to remark in this connection that the validity of marriages, according to the legal decisions cited by our learned correspondent, is a distinct question from that of the most appropriate and becoming mode of their celebration or solemnization. We should hesitate to say, with some of the friends of liberty in England, (disgusted, as they are with priestly and aristocratic rule,) that marriage is simply a civil contract, requiring, properly, the presence of a magistrate, but not the solemnities of religious worship. While all should be left free, in this matter, it seems to us that as marriage is an institution of Divine as well as human appointment there is beauty in connecting the ceremony with a religious recognition of the fact. The presence and participation of a minister of the Gospel or some other pious person, in offering

prayers and explaining the sacred obligations of the contract, appears proper to the occasion, but should not be enforced by law. Equally proper is it that sufficient publicity and order should be preserved to prevent imposition, prevent outrages on public decency and morality, and secure the equitable descent of estates. Beyond this, the civil law should not interfere.

WARSAW, Aug. 1, 1845.

WILLIAM GOODELL:—Dear Sir.—An article in the Christian Investigator of June, 1845, entitled "The Marriage Question in America" has attracted my attention. It requires deliberate efforts at keeping cool, to remain unprovoked at the blind and insatiable bigotry of an American, whether priest or layman, who will deny the validity of marriages solemnized by ministers appointed by lay ordination; and that too, in the State of New York! To say nothing about the immense interests at stake—involving the purity of society, and the legitimacy of every mother's son of us all—it may be well to state briefly the law on the subject of marriage, and to show how unincumbered with useless forms and inconvenient and absurd restrictions, the law regulating the solemnization of marriage in the State of New York, is

If the laws of this State allowed none but ministers of the Gospel to solemnize marriage—still will it be contended that this would not include lay ordained ministers? The law regards every man *not* a part of the ministry, by any particular sect to which he belongs—and in the mode prescribed by such sect, as a minister of the gospel. No act of ordination in any form is requisite. A mere vote of a church is sufficient provided that be the mode of consecration of such church. No minister or priest need be present at such ordination.—

A person thus selected, or ordained if you please, as a minister, is regarded by our laws as competent to administer any religious ordinances recognized by the sect or church to which he belongs. He would even be exempt from taxation on the ground of his ministerial character, whether Mormon, Presbyterian, Catholic, Congregational or Independent; and would also be incompetent to hold civil office. You will not find two opinions on this subject, among lawyers, if you do among ministers.

By the Revised Statutes (see sec. 8, art. I, title I, chap. 8 of the 2nd part,) it was provided that "for the purpose of being registered and authenticated according to the provisions of this title, marriages shall be solemnized only by the following persons:

- "1. Ministers of the Gospel and priests of any denomination.
- "2. Mayors, recorders and aldermen of cities, and
- "3. Judges of the County Courts and justices of the peace."

"Sec. 9. When solemnized by a minister or priest, the ceremony of marriage shall be according to the forms and customs of the church or society to which he belongs.—When solemnized by a magistrate no particular form shall be required." &c. &c.

Will any one say that the words "any denomination," do not include the Independent Congregationalists,—who from their first existence have practiced lay ordination? Or the Presbyterians or Baptists who at their formation did the same?

The provisions of the Statute above quoted, went into effect on the first day of January, 1830. On the 20th April in the same year (1830) these regulations and others contained in the same title, were repealed, and the entire statutory provisions swept from the statute book. The act of April 20th, 1830, declared that the solemnization of marriage need not be in the manner prescribed by the Revised Statutes, and that all lawful marriages contracted in the manner in use before the Revised Statutes, should be as valid as if the articles containing these regulations had not been passed. By the act of April, 1830, the rules of the common law were substituted in the place of statutory enactments; and there the matter now stands.

It may be well then to know how very essential it is, in common law, that marriage should be solemnized by a minister of the gospel clerically ordained.

So far from such a necessity it is of no consequence to its validity, whether any minister or priest, ordained in any manner whatever, be present. Nor is the presence of a civil magistrate requisite. And I may add still further it is not absolutely necessary, in order to render a marriage valid, that any person whatever be present to "administer" the ceremony. Between parties competent to contract marriage, a simple agreement *in carba de presenti* us "we here agree now to be husband and wife," constitutes valid marriage, *whether followed by co-habitation or not*. And an agreement *in futuro*, us "we mutually promise to marry each other," if followed by co-habitation is a valid marriage; for the act of the parties is taken to construe their words into an intention of marriage *in presenti*. A marriage may even be implied from co-habitation; and that too in a question involving the inheritance of estate.

In the case of "Jackson, Ex dem. Dies and wife vs. E. Winne," found in the 7th vol. of Wendell's Reports, at page 47. This question was passed upon in some of its parts, by the Supreme Court of this State. Our court then consisted of John Savage Chief Justice, and Jacob Sutherland and Samuel Nelson Justices. In deciding this case the court, unanimous in their opinion, cite with approbation, from Jacob's Law Dictionary the following—

"Nothing more is necessary to complete a marriage than a full, free and mutual con-

"sent between the parties." Also Wood's Institutes p. 120, "*expousals de presenti* or marriage is contracted by *consent only*."—And the court quote the maxim of the civil law—"*Nuptias non concubitus sed consensus facit*" and declare that "this has ever been regarded in courts of common law as a good definition of marriage."

But a case decided in our Supreme Court, at its May Term in 1841, found in 1st Hill's Reports, p. 270, entitled "*Starr and others vs. Peck*," presents this matter in still clearer light.

This was an action of ejectment tried at the Albany Circuit in Oct. 1840, before Cushman, Circuit Judge. A young sailor of Connecticut by the name of Samuel Starr visited one Miss Sarah Barnes, in the way of courtship for about a year. He went to sea. It was rumored before he left that they were engaged. He was detained at sea beyond his expectations. A few days before his return, a daughter was born to Miss Sarah Barnes and named Abby Starr. When the child was about ten days old, the marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Starr was publicly solemnized. They lived together till death, and had a son, named Chauncy Starr. Abby and Chauncy were always treated by them as their children.

The land in question belonged to Samuel Starr (the sailor.) The Plaintiffs claimed the whole estate as the children of Chauncy Starr. The defendant claimed one half as the heir at law of Abby. His claim was contested on the ground that Abby was illegitimate—having been born before her father and mother were married. The facts above stated appeared on trial.

The judge left it to the jury to say whether there had not been a marriage *in fact*, before the ceremony, and before Samuel Starr went to sea. The jury found a verdict for the defendant (the heir of Abby.) The plaintiffs took exceptions and moved for a new trial.

Judge Cowen in delivering the opinion of the Court, denied a new trial, and said among other things that "there can be little doubt that the parties had at least agreed to be married, and that the ceremony was delayed till after Abby's birth in consequence of the proposed husband's accidental detention on his voyage. But it is true that the parties had power to contract marriage *inter se*, before the husband went to sea, without the intervention of a clergyman. Such is the common law, which we must presume was the law of Connecticut at the time. The public celebration or ceremony is sought to be explained, by saying, that it might very properly have been required for the satisfaction of the parties, the family, and the public. To this may be added the presumption that the parties would not indulge in a connexion which was immoral, not to say criminal, especially when they might, themselves alone, have rendered it innocent, by a marriage contract *per verba de presenti*. We are to presume against a notorious act of immorality, almost as strongly as we would against the commission of a legal crime. The proof is plain that the object of the parties was marriage, and it seems not at all extravagant to presume, in favor of the female at least, that before submitting to

a connexion which she must otherwise have considered criminal in the highest degree, she would have required such a form of contract as to change its character. And that it was not publicly acknowledged and solemnized before the birth of the child, may be set down as the result of [the husband's] accidental detention at sea. No peculiar form of words is necessary to such a contract. Thus a contract in words merely executory, followed by the act of the parties, on the faith of such contract is equivalent to words of present import. The circumstances are to be taken as giving a construction to the words and rendering them presently operative. The evidence I think may be considered quite strong that Abby's parents had, before her birth, made a contract of marriage, either *per verba de presenti* or *futuro*; and whether in one form or the other, the consummation which resulted in her birth, rendered the marriage complete."

As I have already occupied more space than I intended I will close by stating a few deductions from the above authorities.

1st. Marriage, solemnized by a minister appointed by lay ordination, is as valid, as though performed by one clerically ordained.

2nd. Marriage, solemnized by any man or woman of years of discretion, whether minister or magistrate or not, is as valid as though performed by a minister, ordained in any manner.

3d. The parties themselves, may marry themselves, by agreeing to be husband and wife till death—in the presence of witnesses or even alone.

I think the "zealous gentleman" mentioned in your article, should he attempt to get a lay ordained minister indicted for solemnizing a marriage, would be laughed at by any intelligent grand-jury, not only as foolishly intending to obstruct the freedom of marriage, but as also most queerly seeking to prove himself an illegitimate.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, &c. F. C. D. McKAY.

THE AMERICAN BOARD—SLAVERY.

LETTER OF MR. GREENE.

The position of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in respect to the slave question is now exciting renewed and increasing attention. The Correspondence of Rev. Amos A. Phelps and others, first with the Secretaries, and then with the Prudential Committee which has been widely circulated in the Anti Slavery Reporter and other papers, is remarkable for nothing more than for the studious care of both the Secretaries and the Committee to *decline answering the questions* propounded to them.—We have now to present another side of the picture.

In a letter to one of their Missionaries, (Mr. Hall, of the Allegany Missions) and in reply to some questions propounded by him,

Mr. Greene, one of the Secretaries, throws off all disguise, and gives us decidedly a *pro-slavery* answer to the inquiries as any petition of the slave holders could desire. And this is the more remarkable, as the questions are so similar to those of Mr. Phelps and his associates, which could elicit no answer at all. And yet, this apparent discrepancy should elicit no surprise. To *decline* answering such questions is equivalent to answering them on the *pro-slavery* side.

It may be well, in publishing, as we now do, this Letter from Mr. Secretary Greene, to give some account of the circumstances which drew it forth.

Rev. WILLIAM HALL, a Missionary of the Board, among the Allegany Indians in Cataraugus County, in the State of New York, is known as an abolitionist, and happens to be a reader and patron of the Christian Investigator. Some time in December last, we received an interesting Letter from bro. Hall, in relation to our Editorial course, and particularly in regard to our views of the American Board. With permission, we publish extracts from this Letter, and the subsequent correspondence, as we think it important to show how abolitionists, and even those of them who are Missionaries, have been misinformed and misled, in respect to the real position of the Board.

FROM MR. HALL'S FIRST LETTER.

"I differ from you in my opinion of the A. B. C. F. M. I have now been laboring more than ten years under the patronage of that Board of Missions, and do not discern any sufficient *anti-slavery* reasons for withdrawing my connexion with them."

[We omit here a paragraph in which bro. Hall admits that "the corporate members of the American Board of Missions"—"in their private feelings and capacities, favor the Colonization Society"—which is unfriendly to abolition—but contends that abolitionists have to do with them only in their *public* capacity and acts as a Board. He then proceeds.]

"With the American Board, not as men, but as a body of men, we have something to do. We have a right to petition them not to send agents to collect funds from slave holding churches. We have asked it, and after a little hesitation, they grant our request. We also, very properly, asked that they would not receive the price of oppression, as offerings to the Lord, and I am informed by the Rev. Asher Wright, of the Seneca Mission, who spent several weeks at the Missionary House, last fall, that, in answer to this petition, the Board officially directed all its agents not to receive any thing, by way of donations or otherwise, which they suppose to be the product of slavery.

"This being the case, in what respect is it a *pro-slavery* Board? Yea, in what is it not an *anti-slavery* Board? Is more than one cor-

to member a slave holder? And was he chosen before our glorious anti-slavery act?

But you will say he should be voted out, so do I. Others say that such action is called for, however. Many preferred abolitionists say so, and they have the same right to their opinions that we have to ours. And opinions of our beloved brethren should be properly respected, unless they are, beyond all doubt, for mistake, of an inferior character.

If it be true, as you have been informed, that any of the Missionaries of the Board tolerate slavery in their churches, or at least countenance it, I have no doubt they will be rebuked by the Board, when the fact is fairly before them, as I am confident it was not, at the time of their last annual meeting. If they approve such things, I shall feel very differently towards them, when I find it out, (which will soon) from what I now do.

In refusing to add any slave holders to the number of their corporation since its organization, in refusing to send agents to get funds from slave holding churches, in forbidding their receiving agents to the price of oppression as an offering to God, are they not, thus far, decidedly anti-slavery? Are we to regard them, as we do the two great political parties, irreclaimably tied to the slave power? May we not expect that the abolition heaven which manifestly wrought a great change, both in feelings and in their policy already, will raise the whole lump? For my part, I am confident that if the anti-slavery influence of our beloved country does not withdraw from the American Board, it will be but a little time before it will be as thoroughly organized as we desire."

I am, dear Sir, your brother, &c.

WILLIAM HALL.

In reply to this Letter, (Dec. 27) we suggested to bro. Hall our reasons, founded on public acts of the Board, for thinking that Hall had been entirely misinformed, though doubted not the honesty of the individuals mentioned, who had doubtless made representations to him which they believed to be true.

In reply to bro. Hall's mode of reasoning, and especially his discrimination between members of the Board, in their individual capacities, and the Board, as such, we made a number of remarks which we need not here repeat. Our readers will be ready to anticipate the substance of what we should say, on points. But we suggested, particularly, the importance of rightly understanding the

after recapitulating the public acts of the Board, we said:

Now if it be true, that the Board, after this, has entirely changed its policy, why does it not publicly announce the fact? It will furnish me with documentary evidence that it has done so. I promise you that the readers of the Christian Investigator shall be in possession of it, even if it should be the first paper that has the news. A written statement from the Secretaries of the Board, with leave of publication, will be sufficient.

Now, my dear Sir, if your connexion with

the Board will not procure such a statement, I think you will not blame me for insisting that your confidence in it ought to be withdrawn."

WILLIAM GOODSELL.

FROM THE SECOND LETTER OF MR. HALL.
ALLEGANY MISSION, July 8, 1845.

"In pursuance with your suggestion, I laid the subject of Slavery before the Board in the following inquiries, viz:

1. Does the Board send agents to collect money from slave holding churches?

2. How long since it has ceased to do so?

3. Has the Board instructed its agents not, knowingly to receive the price of oppression as offerings to the Lord?

4. Does it refuse all donations, legacies, &c. which it supposes to be the product of slavery?

5. Does the Mission to the Choctaws, or elsewhere, tolerate slavery in its churches?—If so, does the Board approve it?

"The first Letter which I wrote the Board on the subject, was mislaid, and therefore not answered. I at length wrote another, urging the importance of an answer which might be spread before the public, and received the following.

"MISSIONARY ROOMS, Boston, }
March 22, 1845. }

"Rev. WILLIAM HALL, Allegany Mission.
My dear Sir.—Yours of Feb. 17th, with a date of March 12th reached me this morning, and brought to my mind yours of the 21st January, which I supposed I had answered, but on turning to my Letter Book, I found no answer copied there. On examining my files, I find that, by some oversight, it got among my answered Letters without having received my attention. This I regret, and lose not a moment in replying.

Relative to your enquiries, relative to slavery, let me say.

1. The only agent of the Board who has slavery to much extent in his field, is Mr. Mallin, whose field includes New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, in all of which slaves are held. In the last three there may be eight or ten churches which the agent visits. Whether there are slave holding members in any of them I do not know.

2. We have had very little agency in soliciting funds in the south-western and southern States, since the General Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions was organized in 1837—18, though more or less of money has been contributed from individuals or churches scattered over that territory up to this time.

3. The Board have never given their agents any instructions as to what money they should receive, having reference to the part of the country in which the donor resides, or the source from whence he obtained his money; (i. e.) they have never told their agents not

to receive money from counterfeiters, or swindlers, or rum makers, or rum sellers, or makers of hard bargains, or soldiers, or bowle knife makers, or keepers of bawdy houses, or gamblers, or cotton fabric manufacturers, or shoe dealers who sell all their work at the South, or high-way men, or African slave stealers, or their descendants who are made rich by such profits, or slave holders, or slave workers, or slave sellers in this country, or any similar classes of persons. When the Board give any instructions of this nature, they will doubtless proceed on some general principle, covering the whole of this ground; but for the agent of the Board or any other similar institution to be making inquiries when or how the contributor of each sum obtained his money, or to be making any proclamation of his unwillingness to receive these bad sorts of money, before he would take a collection, would probably render him so ridiculous, in the eyes of the objector himself, that I can hardly suppose that such instructions will ever be given. Yet, if the principle is a good one, and donations from such persons are to be guarded against, it is right to make all this trouble to keep our treasury clean. All we have yet done is to tell the agents to hold up the good object, and urge good motives, and let the giver be responsible for the rest.

4. A legacy would probably be received or rejected, according to the circumstances of each. I am not aware that any legacy to which any person would object, has ever been received by the Board. What will be done hereafter, I cannot say. It is not probable that the Board will lay down general principles for deciding cases which may never occur, or perplex themselves on the subject, when they have so much of pressing business on hand.

5. There are some members of the Mission churches among the Choctaws and Cherokees who hold slaves. And the Missionaries, as far as we can ascertain, have pursued in admitting them, and in instructing them afterwards, about the same course which Paul did, Col. 4: 1, and 1 Tim. 6: 1, 2, not approving nor defending, but still suffering the relation to remain, till the Gospel should ultimately put an end to it. The Board will probably look further at the subject, at the next annual meeting, but what they will do I cannot tell.

"As I am obliged to leave town immediately, I cannot write more at length, as I desire to do, nor could I defer writing longer.

"With Christian regard to Mrs. Hall and yourself with your children, I remain, very truly yours.
D. GREENE."

I showed the above letter to bro. Wright,

*Probably intended for Gal. iv.

upon whose authority I wrote you as I did before. He seemed perfectly confounded, and borrowed the Letter, and carried it to Buffalo, and showed it to bro. Hopkins, of the first church, who, I understand, was also surprised at its pro-slavery character. Bro. Wright showed me a letter upon the same subject, from bro. Cannon (Geneva) which we were unable to reconcile with this one from Mr. Greene. There is therefore some mistake, in all probability, and it may have grown out of the great haste in which Mr. Greene seems to have written. My mind is now perplexed about the course of the Board. May the Lord direct them and us. I am as thoroughly convinced as you are that "anti-slavery is essential to Christianity."

I am your friend and brother,
WILLIAM HALL.

In reply to the foregoing, we wrote Mr. Hall some account, (published in the Green Mountain Freeman) of the Missionary meeting in Vermont, and the remarks of Mr. Spaulding, the Missionary, and of Dr. Anderson the Secretary of the Board, the latter of whom said that "some of the most pious, devoted, and active members of the church at the Cherokee station, were slave-holders."—We also forwarded to bro. Hall a copy of the Anti-Slavery Reporter, for August, containing the "Exposé" of bro. Phelps.

FROM THE THIRD LETTER OF MR. HALL.

Under date of Aug. 7, bro. Hall writes as follows—

"It is with deep humiliation that I am now compelled to admit, that the position of the A. B. C. F. M. really is, what I supposed myself (when I opened our correspondence) able to prove it *not to be*.

We hope bro. Hall will take a position corresponding with the new light he has obtained, and promptly throw himself upon the friends of a free and honest Christianity for his support.

We cannot occupy much space now, in comments upon the Letter of Mr. Greene. Nor can this be needful for those who have attended, earnestly, to the facts and principles involved. It is too late in the day to deceive any except those who are resolutely bent on self-deception, with such evasive mystifications, such open mouthed scoffs at all common honesty and common decency in the prosecution of enterprises for the promotion of religion. Why attempt, for the twentieth time, to shift the issue, by answering objections which every intelligent reader of these discussions knows have never been urged? Why talk of the motives of the donors when the objection was made against receiving and so

liciting their *stolen goods* without reproving the practice, and under circumstances which involved a *consenting with the theft*? Let the supposition be made that "counterfeiters, or highway men, or keepers of bawdy houses" were as commonly found in the churches and in the pulpits of this country as slave holders are! That the American Board, with one such person in their body, were in the habit of soliciting funds from such churches—that they held those as members in their Mission churches, who were guilty of these practices and obtained their wealth by them—that one of the Secretaries publicly commended them as "the most pious, devoted, and active members of the churches," and that another of the Secretaries wrote to the Missionaries, Bible apologies for such practices and for their tolerance in Christian churches! Under such circumstances would it become too "*ridiculous*" or too "*perplexing*" for Mr. Greene to attend to the matter? We confess we fear it *would*, for we find it is beginning to be maintained, already, by some professed abolitionists, and half conceded by others, that the standard of church discipline, is to be—not the morality of the Bible, but the prevalent morality of the community in general! To this point, doubtless, the controversy must come. And the issue is to determine whether or no Christian Institutions, in America, are to be *subverted and become extinct*.

PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCHES AND MINISTRY.

Our little sheet has been, so much occupied with discussions in relation to church matters, that we have done little towards recording the passing occurrences of the times. Our limits seemed to forbid it. The position of the American churches, in relation to slavery, we supposed, was pretty well understood by our readers. Comparatively little is now done, in any periodical, that we know of, to keep up a connected record of what is going on in the churches, in relation to the subject. Nineteenths of all the anti-slavery papers are devoted, mainly, to the *political* aspects of the cause, and have little room, as their editors have little time, to furnish this description of anti-slavery literature for the public. Some of these editors evidently pursue the policy of letting the church and ministry alone, fully persuaded that little help is to come from that quarter, and indisposed to brood over what cannot be mended, or engage in what they regard a profitless contest.* And so it comes to pass that little or no public record is made

*These Editors ought to enquire more closely into the prospects of reforming the State against the unchecked influences of the ministry and the church.

of one of the most remarkable features of times. All over the free States, in almost every little village, or neighborhood, there is a church controversy going on, except where the pro-slavery party rules with a sway unquestioned and undisturbed. Go where you will, we hear of new cases in which active abolitionists are undergoing the most relentless and bitter church persecutions. Letters from eight or ten different states, are bringing us most incessant repetitions of the same story. We cannot attend an anti-slavery Convention or fall in with abolitionists on public occasions or in the public conveyances, or converse with an anti-slavery lecturer, without hearing, more or less, of new cases of kind. Very frequently an extra sheet or pamphlet brings us a fresh account of these proceedings, sometimes before a church session, sometimes before a Presbytery, in which the weight of ecclesiastical authority is brought to silence the voices of those who most distinctly plead for the enslaved, and thus throw the rest into silence. We cannot avoid the impression that much more of this has been done, within two years past, than at any former period since the anti-slavery enterprise commenced, and that the violence of opposition daily gains strength. And yet it is unfrequently said, or taken for granted, the opposition in the churches is gradually melting away! One reason of this impression, doubtless is, that anti-slavery papers, already noticed, do not contain so many as formerly. Abolitionists, in each neighborhood or village, are therefore led to consider their case a *peculiar* one, and calling for special wonder or commiseration—(this is evident, often, in the manner of their telling their story,) little thinking that they are relating in *substance*, what is daily going on in different places, within ten or twenty miles from each other, for hundreds of miles, in every direction, around them. Another cause of deception is found in the fact that many of the resolutions, more or less explicit, adopted by Churches, Church Sessions, Presbyteries, Associations, Consociations, &c. more frequently seen in print than formerly, and even in denominational papers, that, recently, would admit nothing of the kind pollute and secularize their columns. It ought to be noticed that, with few exceptions, these anti-slavery resolutions are so awkwardly drafted as to be ambiguous or evasive, so that it ought to be known that abolitionists and anti-slavery advocates (particularly in clerical bodies) have deliberately put their wits together for the sake of propping up the *sect* to frame resolutions so that persons known to hold most opposite sentiments might vote for them and thus *seem to agree*! In many major

cases, too, whether the Resolutions were explicit or evasive, the policy that, on the part of the majority, has secured their adoption, has been that of *quieting the agitation*, and *laying the subject asleep*. It is neither uncan-did nor unsafe to say this, because, again and again, the policy has been openly avowed.—In the last General Conference of the Metho-dist Episcopal church, apologies were made to the Southern brethren for the apparent anti-slavery action in the Northern Confer-ences, on the ground that this was found the best method of quieting agitations of the abo-litionists and preventing secessions. Anti-slavery Resolutions were adopted in the N. Y. State Baptist Convention, some years ago. At the next meeting of the Convention (at Whitesboro', where we were present) the abolitionists undertook to obtain some redress for the pro-slavery course of the Convention's periodical paper, the Baptist Register, whose Editor had attempted a Bible defence of slave-ry, and excluded communications sent in re-ply. The anti-abolitionists remonstrated against this and other attempts to introduce the anti-slavery subject into their discussions; because, said they, it is a breach of good faith. It was understood, said they, when we passed, so harmoniously, those resolutions against slavery, at our last Convention, that, on condition of adopting them, the matter should rest, and we should be pestered no more on the subject! Strange to tell, the abo-litionists present, did not contradict the state-ment. "And so they wrap it up."

It is well known that the bitterest pro-slavery church in the land—churches where a prayer must not be uttered for the slave, where anti-slavery meetings cannot be held, or a notice read, where the minister and most of the members vote for slave holders and eagerly circulate forgeries against the Liberty candidate without making any acknowledgments afterwards—where an active abolition-ist, ordained by the same sect, cannot preach, while a slave holder of almost any sect would be welcomed—and especially, where some consistent and thorough abolitionist must be singled out for exemplary church vengeance and malediction, *there*, as a matter of course, the real facts must be smothered up and cov-ered over by bringing some frivolous charge rather than the true ground of offense, and the church must be careful to adopt something that can be denominated an anti-slavery Res-olution. If a Presbytery, composed partly of abolitionists and partly of opposers, (a major-ity of the latter), are about to put some new screw upon their pulpit doors, behold! the screw is plastered over so nicely with an anti-slavery resolution, that even the clerical abo-

litionists connected with the body will chuckle over their wonderful achievement—point triumphantly at the plaster, and keep quiet about that which it conceals!

But we must not write another dissertation, where we should only produce a few facts.—We have felt, for some time, that we must try to make room for a few specimens of what is now going on, lest it should be thought by some that the date of Birney's London pamph-let, showing the position of the churches at that time (1830 or '40) was the *end of the chapter* of church opposition to the cause of the poor, and the rights of mankind.* We only group together a few cases that happen to lie before us, on our table; at the time of writing. We have not been on the look out for them. Occupied as we have been, and well persuaded of the general fact, we con- fess we have shared, somewhat, in the preva- lent distaste of abolitionists for that kind of reading. We promise our readers not to feed them more than seems needful, with such dishes, which are far enough from being pleas- ant to us, or to them. The first case that happens to come up, is from the State of Maine

CASE OF WILLIAM P. M. REED.

[From the Bangor Gazette.]

CLERICAL DESPOTISM.

Excommunication of an Abolitionist from a Church!

We learn that an excellent man and indefatigable friend of human rights, William P. M. Reed, of Hampden, of this county, has been excommunicated by a so-called clergyman, who preaches at the Methodist church in that place, on account of his abolitionism!

Several charges it is said were trumped up against Mr. Reed, to conceal the real cause of the proceedings against him; such as assault and battery upon a boy, "un-just and contemptuous criticisms of ministers;" but the great unpardonable crime consisted in his talking abo- litionism on the Sabbath!

We believe that Mr. Reed admitted that he punished his brother—a young lad—for quarrelling with another lad near his house, with a stick, and the charge was de- clared proved, though his parents approved the act!—When the charge of "unjust and contemptuous criticisms of ministers" came up, there was no testimony to sup- port it. The clergyman then asked if any one had heard Mr. Reed speak contemptuously of his first day-sermon!

"I will answer the question," said Mr. Reed, myself; "I said of that sermon, that it was milk-and-water; the chief part water!"

The charge, we think, was declared sustained.

In regard to talking Abolitionism on Sunday,—Mr. Reed admitted that frequently he had remained in the meeting house during the intermission, and when con- venient, had urged the claims of the slave upon the sym- pathies and exertions of such as were disposed to listen to him.

One "brother" said that Mr. Reed had offered him an abolition tract upon the Sabbath.

"And you refused it?" said Mr. Reed.

"Yes."

"Why?"

"Because I didn't want political tracts put into my hands on Sunday."

"But did I offer you this abolition tract until after I saw you put a 'Democratic flag' in your pocket? And did I not urge you to take my tract that you might have the antidote with the bane?"

"Well, I believe it was so."

*The truth is, the church opposition up to that time, had been chiefly put forth by the larger ecclesiastical bodies, and a few city churches and ministers. The example thus early set has since been followed almost every where, and a vast majority of the churches, at this moment are either active and bitter in their opposition, or wholly inaccessible to the discussion, in any shape, or manifestly torpid, and in- different, like Gallio, caring for none of these things. It is of the governing majority in each church that we speak.

Another charge was for refusing to commune with men who approve of Slavery; and on the day of the excom- munication a Methodist minister, called Baker, we think, said that he did not believe there was a man who ap- proved of Slavery this side of Portugal.

Said Mr. Reed: "One has communed with you this day, whom I have heard approve of Slavery recently; and say, farther, that he would like to be the owner of slaves."

After Mr. Reed's excommunication, several withdrew themselves from the church, declaring that they would not countenance so infamous a proceeding. The affair is producing much excitement in the Methodist society in Hampden, and many who have heretofore taken no interest in Abolitionism, it is said, are exceedingly in- dignant at the course that has been pursued in the case.

We have given but a partial account of this piece of pro-slavery clerical despotism; but so far as it goes, we believe it is substantially correct.

The Editor who gives us the above facts, very charitably concludes that there have been few, if any cases, equally flagrant, in that county or even in that state. Perhaps there have not. But if he had traveled with us, *one brief month, in one of the most prom- ising counties in that State*, he would have found, we dare not say how many half sup- pressed and half uttered exhibitions of a sim- ilar spirit. The case of Mr. Reed comes so near an average specimen of the many sim- ilar occurrences that, so far as this class of cases is concerned, we might as well pause where we are, and let the reader's imagina- tion or recollection vary the minute details, and shift the names, to suit the neighborhood he resides in. But here comes a case of a somewhat different type.

CASE OF JOSEPH J. TUCKER.

Those who have been accustomed to attend the annual meetings of the N. Y. State Anti-Slavery Society at Utica, will remember who Joseph J. Tucker is.—A plain, strait forward, hard handed, out spoken farmer; not unfre- quently in his shirt sleeves, and always in home spun, rising to speak, sometimes from the gallery, sometimes from a remote corner of the house, and sometimes from among the Doctors and Honorables in the centre or near the platform—but always making himself heard, listened to with undivided attention, never boring us with long speeches, sometimes uttering a volume in a sentence, and common- ly saying more in two minutes (the average length of his speeches) than most college learned men would say in two hours. Among the first to see through a knotty question, to find the right side of a befogged controversy, to rally for the true, to explode the false, to throw out a timely hint, or to plank down a needed contribution, you may commonly ex- pect to find Joseph J. Tucker "on hand."—A correspondent of the Liberty Press, Aug. 2, states his case thus:

Mr. Tucker was a member of the Presbyterian ch. of Cherry Valley; a man whose moral character all know- ledge to be good, (to this fact D. H. Little, a worthy citizen and deacon of the same church bore hon- orable testimony before the Presbytery, about three years ago, after repeated expostulation with the church, and after repeated expostulation with the church, and finding to his regret, that they could not "see eye to eye," on these ques-

Mr. Tucker asked for a dismission. *This was denied him.* I would here ask was he to do? What could he do but "to come out from among them" and separate himself from those who, by their church relations, fellowship the "dealers in slaves and in the souls of men?" Yet for taking this course, (than which none other is of God allowed) for his refusing to have "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness," so at least he views it, he was last March, arraigned before the Church and excommunicated.

Here Mr. Tucker would have the matter rest, counting it no grievous dishonor to be proscribed by a pro-slavery church, but at the earnest solicitation of a *pretended* abolitionist, appealed to the Presbytery. What was his astonishment then to see this man who was so anxious to have his wrongs righted, appearing before the Presbytery with the "all in opinion" that Mr. Tucker must be excommunicated?

I cannot but imagine that the "those among them" who in heart believe it high time for the Church to clear the skirts of her garments from blood-guiltiness must have felt to hang their heads at the spirit manifested in the discussion of Mr. Tucker's case before the Presbytery. The figures used to illustrate the heinousness of covenant-breaking showed how servile a man can be. And the invectives of the prancing officer against abolitionists in general and against Mr. Birney in particular, must have taught them that although in the estimation of many it is deemed highly out of character to have abolition introduced in both "Church and State," yet floor-breaking finds the members of its family in both.

The above case differs from that of Mr. Reed in the particular that while Mr. Reed was excommunicated solely for his anti-slavery efforts, while in the church, Mr. Tucker freely seceded from the church of his own accord, after a regular dismission had been denied him. This was equivalent to a refusal to certify his regular standing in the church. It was virtually saying that he was not a proper person to be a church member, while, at that time, his active abolitionism was doubtless, the only ground of objection against him. Yet they did not then proceed to excommunicate him! He could not be let out of the church, (however unfit for church membership) nor could he be treated with the customary courtesy extended to church members—that of giving them an honorable dismission when they wished to leave! The object evidently was, to compel him to stay in an anti-abolition church. Afterwards, he was excommunicated for having left them. This (as the writer intimates) was not to be considered a grievance. His secession might perhaps be regarded as a previous excommunication of them, so that their act only confirmed and ratified his. But there was certainly something remarkable in the ruse employed to get the case into the Presbytery, for the purpose, as it would seem, of having the culprit hanged over again, more conspicuously, the second time. Perhaps it was thought that the legal requirement, in such cases had not been sufficiently met—"hanged by the neck, until dead." Such men as bro. Tucker are not very easily killed, especially by anathemas from that quarter. The Presbyterial abuse of Mr. Birney, recorded in this case, shows how little political abolitionists are likely to gain by refraining to keep up agitations of the church question. There is no such thing as earnestly opposing slavery, in any manner,

without "disturbing the peace of the churches" that are in fellowship with it.

CASE OF ELIJAH MANDEVILLE, OVID, (N. Y.)

We next take up the "Civil Bee," extra, for July 22. Containing the statement of Mr. Mandeville, concerning the proceedings of the Session of the First Presbyterian Church, in Ovid, in his case.

MR. MANDEVILLE, it seems, became dissatisfied on account of the pro-slavery character of the preaching sustained there, and concurred in, by the majority of the church. Whether this dissatisfaction was well grounded or not, the reader may judge, from the following account and extracts, by Mr. Mandeville of a printed book by Rev. THOS. LOUNSBURY, the pastor, entitled "The Touch Stone of Truth"—"published after having been delivered from the pulpit in seven successive discourses."

Speaking of slave holding ministers and church members, he says:

They "are as noble spirits as the world can produce" and "we must cordially embrace Christians of the South," (i. e. these traffickers in human flesh) "in the fellowship of the gospel, cherish them, and aid them in their labors of love"—aid them in robbing their poor neighbors of their earnings, extorted by means of the lash, and their inhuman laws. We are told that [see lectures page 141—5] "we should do no such thing as withhold communion from him, or threaten to withhold; because he happens to be a slaveholder, and we not." By thus doing we are told, we would be "determined that our own views of duty should be a rule of action for them, and if they will not submit their consciences in abject servility to our dictations we will take eternal vengeance on them. We cannot call fire down from heaven on them, but what we can do we will do. We will denounce them with opprobrious epithets, we will spurn them from the Christian family. Holding men in civil bondage is innocences when compared with this arrogant dogmatizing over the consciences of others. It is the very spirit of anti-Christ, which has kindled the fires of persecution in every age and drenched the earth with the blood of the martyrs."

And so the attempt to clear the Presbyterian church of "men stealers, guilty of the highest kind of theft" (according to the former doctrine and language of the Presbyterian church,) is an exhibition of the very spirit of anti-Christ, and church discipline for the worst of offences is "kindling the fires of persecution!" Nay, this is said of the simple act of reproving their oppressions! And it is a "breach of covenant" in central New York, A. D. 1845, not to sit down contented under preaching like this!

But this is not all. A legislative or judicial abolition of slavery, according to this very Reverend Thos. Lounsbury, would be "legislating over" the rights of conscience, and an usurpation of power, of which civil governments may not with impunity be guilty! Whatever else civil governments may do in the matter of restricting human rights, whatever slave codes they may properly enough enact, annulling the relation of marriage and forbidding to read the Bible, there is one thing, according to this profound theologian, justly jealous as he is of the encroachments of hu-

man authority, which they may not do. They may not annul the right of the Southern Presbyterians to hold slaves! Hear him!

Again we are told, (page 151) "when therefore we cast off Christians of the South" (i. e. professors of religion who reduce a fellow being to an article of commerce) "and separate ourselves from them, we entirely denude ourselves of all power, to benefit the slave. It is only through the Christian master that we can reach the bond servant to unclasp his fetters and raise him to the rank of a freeman. How else can we reach him? We have no right to legislate over the conscience of his master. God will not permit us to do it. If the slave ever gains his freedom innocently and with a good conscience, he will gain it by the voluntary action of his master."

And again:

"Coercion may arouse into action a savage ferocity, produce a plentiful effusion of human gore, and fill the land with the wail of agony; but it will not unclasp the fetters of the slave nor fit him for the enjoyment of liberty." (page 154)

Neither by church discipline nor yet by human legislation, then, may the slave system be touched, without sacrilege! Can it be possible that this clerical gentleman professes to believe in any civil government or penal law? "The law" (if there be any) very evidently "was not made for men stealers" according to his teaching! And can he pretend to believe in the Scriptures which he thus contradicts? In the Christian religion that he thus blasphemes? In the Christian church that he thus libels? In the distinction between the church and the world, between holiness and sin, that he thus subverts and denies?—For the credit of this person, his friends, if have any, should distinctly and promptly repel, on his behalf, the charge of his being so hypocritical as to profess a belief in any of these things! Honest Atheism, if such a thing can be, becomes decent in the comparison with a religion like this! It is "breach of the Presbyterian Church Covenant," (is it?) to abjure religious teachers like those? God be praised! It is not "a breach of Covenant" with Jesus Christ and his saints, in any portion of the Universe!

And why did not the Reverend Gentleman go on, while his hand was in, and tell us how it would be "a dogmatizing over the the consciences of others" to exclude sheep stealers, along with babe stealers, from the Christian fold? A "kindling the fires of persecution" to "denounce with opprobrious epithets, and spurn from the Christian family" the high way robber who forcibly deprives a few dollars, along with those who forcibly seize upon the earnings of a whole life? A "legislating over the conscience of" the shop lifter "which God will not permit" to rescue for the right owner, the property he has seized, on a smaller scale than he who seizes the owner himself, with all he can possess? A "coercion" which may arouse into action of a savage ferocity, produce a plentiful effusion of human blood, and fill the land with a wail of agony, to attempt the recovery, by civil law,

of our ravished wives and orphaned babes, when they shall be wrenched from us by kidnappers or decoyed from us by syrens?

Out upon such theologasters! Shame upon such a priesthood! Not Baal himself, in the days of Jezebel, ever boasted a more beastly one! And all this in Seneca county, N. Y. A. D. 1845. Is there a *Presbytery* in Seneca county? A *Synod* in Central or Western New York, to which this apostate belongs? Have they any shame left? If so, the perpetrator of this foul outrage will hear from them! But *will* he?

Only figure to yourself, reader, the Rev. Thos. Lounsbury, in the Parliament of Great Britain or in the Legislature of New York a few years since, could he have been there, gravely teaching that "God will not permit us to legislate over the conscience of the master" and abolish the slave laws! Or look at him, at a Missionary meeting in London, by the side of William Knibb, Dr. Wardlaw, and John Angell James, teaching the ecclesiastical phase of the same doctrine, there!—Would you not blush to be known among them as an American, from the same State, and of the same sect?

Unfortunately for the women whippers of Antigua; the negro traders of New York and Newport, the wisdom and piety of a Lounsbury, came a half century too late, and was located too far at the West, to accommodate them in the perpetuity of their infamy.

"Full many a flower is born to blush unseen." To rescue such a gem from oblivion, abolitionists should do what they can. We give the name of THOMAS LOUNSBURY, conspicuous type in our columns. Alas!—he stands not alone! Other ministers, in abundance, without courage to preach, or convenient means to print such sophistries, so industrious enough to prattle them where they think they will be received! You!—did then vote for anti-slavery Resolutions, or semblance of them, in their clerical Associations, to cover up their disgrace. We could not be greatly surprised to hear that Lounsbury had done something of the kind, though we have heard no such report of him.

Are we too severe on such men? Should we "make allowance for their want of information, and good sense?" Then let their friends who thus apologise for them, induce them to take positions in society, appropriate to their own representations of them? Let

We would not say this of a person who should rarerly speculated himself into a disbelief of civil government and of penal human laws, in general. This might be an error of the head, not of the heart. We are speaking of a man who would doubtless be indignant at the proposal that he, himself, should be deprived of the protection of the law.

them not sit under the shadow of their pulpits—the droppings of their insanity—and talk of the *fanaticism* of men who refuse to do so? "*Misinformed*," are they? But it is not their avocation, their cherished *monopoly* too, to teach? Do they not belong to the "learned ministry"? The "efficient ministry—the competent ministry—the duly ordained and authorized ministry," that the people are admonished to sustain, and to call *Reverend*?—Of what value are our Colleges and Seminaries, our Presbyteries, Synods, Conferences, and General Assemblies, those vaunted safeguards of the *intelligence* of the pulpit?—May we not, at least, avail ourselves of the Episcopal privilege of protesting, in the language of Cowper, against the imposition practiced upon community, by making such men ministers by the imposition of hands?

"From such apostles, O ye mired heads
Preserve the church! And lay not careless hands,
On skulls that cannot teach, and will not learn!

A priesthood such as Baal's was, of old."

Does the weak and sickly evangelism of our times, (with difficulty distinguishable from the liberalism and the Universalism that it was wont to denounce) condemn the language of Cowper as "vituperative and unchristian"? Hear then the language of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the prophet Malachi, addressed to a priesthood, "*misinformed*"—forsooth and forgetful that "one God crowned us"—that "we have one father"—and accordingly neglecting to "be a swift witness against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right." [Compare chap. 2:7, 10, with 3:5.]

"The priest's lips should keep knowledge" [it is their *business* to be well informed] "and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts. But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law. Ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore have I made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law."

Such was the preaching that ELIJAH MANDEVILLE could not conscientiously sustain.—Perhaps he remembered the apostolic directions concerning the position to be assumed towards those who evidently bring "another gospel" instead of "the gospel of deliverance to the captives." Perhaps he had read the terrible denunciations of Christ himself against such practices, in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, along with his previous admonition, (Matt. vii. 15, 20,) to "beware of false prophets," and "know the tree by its fruits." Can it be possible that in this enlightened age, and

at this late stage of the anti-slavery movement, there can be found a church that could take sides with such a pastor, against a church member thus aggrieved? The following is extracted from Mr. Mandeville's account of his case:

"Holding different views of moral duty in relation to the subject of human rights with a large portion of the members of the church, (and especially with the Pastor, after he had delivered his course of pro-slavery lectures,) I wished to withdraw from the church peaceably, and to be permitted to enjoy my own opinions without, if possible, giving offence to the church, or in any way disturbing its peace and harmony. In order to carry out these views I stated to the Pastor and session my feelings on the subject, and requested a letter of dismission. This they refused to give unless I would give my reasons in writing, and as I was not accustomed to write for the inspection of classical scholars and theologians, I was quite delicate about complying with this requisition.

Though the session refused to give me a letter according to my request, I called upon the Clerk of the Board of Trustees, and notified him to take my name from the subscription list, according to the rules of the society, hoping that the matter would here end, but not so, for within three or four months from the time I withdrew my name from the list of subscribers, I received the following letter from the session:

Ovid, Feb. 15, 1845.

Dear Sir: I am directed by the Session of the church of which you are a member to call your attention to a written notice of your secession from said church, which they had reason to hope you would have submitted to them before this time, and they wish me to signify to you that if said written notice of secession be not submitted to them within a reasonable time after the date of this communication—they will be under the necessity of commencing with you a course of discipline and of tabling charges against you as a covenant breaker.

Very respectfully,

Thos. Lounsbury, Clerk of Session.

This letter I read with astonishment not only from the fact that the subject was not finally disposed of; but from its spirit and authoritative tone, particularly the last part: "they wish me to signify to you that if said written notice of secession be not submitted to them within a reasonable time after the date of this communication, they will be under the necessity of commencing with you a course of discipline and of tabling charges against you as a covenant breaker." Does the covenant or constitution of the church or the word of God authorize the session to make any such demand, and if not where did they get the authority? Though I thought at the time and I am still perfectly satisfied that the requisition of the session upon me was entirely destitute of lawful authority, yet that I might not give any implied offence either against the church or the session, I reduced to writing my principal reasons for wishing to secede from the church, in a plain and frank manner, and submitted them to the session for consideration: and the following is a copy:

[The paper before us contains next the Letter, for which we have not room in our little sheet, but have already presented some portions from it containing the doctrine promulgated by the pastor.]

The manner in which Mr. Mandeville answers and uses up the logic of his learned and "duly authorised" teacher, should be a caution to the effeminate literati who undertake to supply religious teaching for the common sense citizens of Central and Western New York. Something besides the classic heathenism prescribed for the literary institutions founded in the twilight of the dark ages and still implicitly confided in by the ecclesiastical guardians of pulpit competency, will be necessary in order to keep the mass of the people in their long accustomed attitude towards a clerical caste, for any great length of time. The extract that follows may serve as a specimen,

not only of Mr. Mandeville's defense, but of the manner in which the mass of community are learning to tower above a race of clergy utterly incompetent to grapple with, much less to instruct, the rising intelligence of the age.

Again, if we are sincere in our opposition to the spirit of "making our own views a rule of action for others and of denouncing them with opprobrious epithets as they do not submit their consciences to almighty dictation?" Why do we so earnestly contend that if those who are abolitionists, absent themselves from the communion where oppressors and extortioners are admitted, or if they should refuse to support a pro-slavery minister, should be dealt with as covenant breakers, why "denounce them with opprobrious epithets and spurn them from the Christian family?" or if a member seceded from a church in which he cannot be child, why sequestrate him to give his reasons in writing, and if he does not comply to "our dictation" threaten him with church discipline.

If we are opposed to the spirit of "making our own views a rule of action for others," why not let him go in peace, why "take signal vengeance on him because he happens to be" in favor of civil and religious liberty, and we not "we cannot call him down from heaven upon him but what we can do we will do, we will commence with him a course of discipline and of tabling charges against him as a covenant breaker, and spurn him from the Christian family." Why do we thus denounce him? Where in the word of God do we find a warrant for such "arrogant dictation and dogmatizing over the consciences of others?" If we are not authorized by the gospel to take such a course, where is the necessity of commencing with him (you) a course of discipline and of tabling charges against him (me) as a covenant breaker. Happy is the man that condemneth not himself in the thing that he alloweth.

For every day was it for the Pastor and Session, when they required of the modest and "unaccustomed" layman that he should write "for the interest" of classical scholars and theologians, and that too, on pain of being excommunicated from the church!

How long it has been held requisite for laymen dissatisfied with their pastors to give them their reasons in writing; on pain of excommunication, we cannot say, but from the workings of the present experiment, we are inclined to think that much good may come out of it. We should like to see what success any class of laymen could have, in attempting to give their reasons in writing for not abjuring religious teaching of such a character. And yet we are not quite prepared to make the writing of compositions for clerical inspection a test of church membership, at a time when it is held an "arrogant dictation" to require common honesty and decent morality of them.

But the compliance of Mr. Mandeville, in writing his reasons, availed him nothing. To write reasons that could not conveniently be answered was worse than not writing at all.—The "reasons" were handed to the Session and "all was quiet again for several weeks," when Mr. Mandeville was publicly excommunicated, on the Sabbath, from the pulpit.—This public announcement was accompanied by the reading of the proceedings of the Session, a copy of which was afterwards obtained by Mr. M. and appears in the paper before us. This document purports to quote from

Mr. Mandeville's Communication, his "principal reasons" for seceding. But strange to tell! The principal reason so largely insisted on in that communication, and the foundation of nearly all of them, is entirely suppressed, and not even hinted at! No hearer or reader of the Session's official statement of Mr. M.'s reasons for seceding would conjecture that dissatisfaction with the Pastor on account of his pro-slavery preaching constituted any part of the difficulty or that the slavery question, entered, at all, into the matter! Why was this, if the Pastor and Session were not restrained by a sense of shame, and a consciousness that, if a full statement were made, their position could not be sustained? Much as such Pastors and church Sessions (as is pleaded for them by their apologists) may lack correct information on the great moral and religious questions of the age and nation they live in, (and their ignorance, in comparison with the community in general we have no disposition to deny) the present case plainly proves what is seen, every day, by tens of thousands, scattered throughout the free States, that they know enough to show evident signs of guilt and to cover themselves, by every artifice that cunning can invent, from the scrutiny of the public gaze. The reader probably knows that the secrets of a Presbyterian church Session are frequently as little known to the church and congregation as are those of any neighboring Masonic Lodge. Into so sacred an enclosure, the people do not often adventure to pry. Mr. Mandeville says he should have had no great reason to complain, had they fully and fairly stated the reasons he communicated to them, and since they did not, he has been compelled to publish the facts as they are.

(To be Continued.)

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, OCTOBER, 1845.

Died, at East Mendon, Monroe Co. N. Y. October 24th Mr. CLEMENT GOODALL, (a beloved brother of the Editor of this paper) in the 51st year of his age.

He early made a profession of the Christian faith, lived in peace, and left behind him an unsullied reputation having been remarkable for his conscientious integrity, and habitual regard for the "Golden Rule."

Christian reader, what think you of the morality of the following sentiment?—

"One fellow I was obliged to run through the body, and so put an end to a coward. You must not think strange of this, for we would put a man to death for even looking pale on board this ship!" A. STEARRETT.

Frigate Constellation, Feb. 14, 1799.

To look like an incarnate fiend is the course

namer, that becomes the man-butcher in the time of action. To look pale at the duties and victims of his profession, in a cardinal sin, which disqualifies him for his bloody vocation.—[Advocate of Peace.

"What constitutes a State?
Not high-raised battlements, or labored mound
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crown'd
Not bayn and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts, (proud)
Where low-bred baseness wafts perfume.
No—men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake, or den,
As boasts excel cold rocks and brambles ridge
Men their duties know,
But know their rights, and, knowing dare stand
Prevent the long-ruined blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain;
Then, constitute a State;
And sovereign law, that state's collected will
O'er thrones and globes elate,
Sits empress, crowning good, repressing ill;
Smit by her sacred frown,
The fiend Discretion like a vapor sinks,
And e'en the all-dazzling brown Jehink
Hides his faint rays, and at her bidding

"Payments and Donations," for the Christian Investigator, up to October, 1845.

E. Gilbert, Honeoye, \$1.00	J. Rybrandt, Lockport, 3.00
S. Harper, Lima, 3.00	R. H. Leonard, Spencer, 1.00
W. Whitney, N. York, 1.00	J. Alberty, Lockport, 1.00
E. Weed, Paterson, N. J., 1.00	M. M. Southworth, do, 1.00
T. S. Wright, N. York, 1.00	M. F. Fryer, do, 1.00
D. Carr, Winthrop, Me., 1.00	E. Harwood, do, 1.00
Mr. Dickinson, Durham, Conn., 50	J. Roberts, do, 50
Wm. Lyman, do, 60	L. Pratt, N. Ridgway, 60
Wm. Jackson, Newton, Mass., 3.00	A. D. Miner, Lima, 1.00
S. Wells, Glensville, 60	H. L. Steadman, Lima, 1.00
C. Grant, Charlotte, Vt., 50	G. C. Mosher, Bangor, 1.00
W. Hart, Old Guilford, Conn., 1.00	G. Crane, do, 1.00
E. Fish, Sandwich, Mass., 50	C. Gerrard, J. Stone, 1.00
M. Cushman, Amherst, Mass., 50	W. Squires, W. Gay, 1.00
J. Pettit, Fredonia, 1.00	Z. Hawkes, Spelthorne, 1.00
A. Hill, Wampsville, 1.00	Mass. (by D. R. H.), 1.00
E. Spooner, do, 1.00	J. Copeland, Geneva, 1.00
A. G. Haman, N. Haven, Conn., 1.00	P. Read, Richmond, 1.00
O. Stevens, Peterboro, 1.00	

The friends of this publication will that we need additional support.

The above is all we have received in months—less than the cost of paper and printing.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodall, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. and a Meeting, 8 pages, at 61.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, 61.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Aries and Bull. 4 pages, 60.62 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 41.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODALL, Editor and Publisher
Honeoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

Where may be had
Cards, Blanks & Mandibles
Together with every description of Book & J. S. J.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. III—No. 11. }
WHOLE NUMBER, 43.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. NOVEMBER, 1816.

} WILLIAM GODDARD, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—ISAIAH, LX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
months, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from
the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 30 50 | Sixty papers, 82 00
Twenty-eight papers for, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing
money for papers.

PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCHES AND MINISTRY.

CASE OF WASHINGTON STICKNEY.

Hitherto, we have given specimens of ecclesiastical dealings with laymen. We come now to the case of a brother duly licensed and ordained by clerical authority. Bro. Stickney, a Pastor of an independent Secession Church at Canastota, Madison co. Other points besides slavery, were involved in this case, (and in the last preceding one.) We give Mr. Stickney's account of the result:

[For the Liberty Press.]

THE AXE HAS FALLEN.

I published in your paper, of September last, some account of my trial before Utica Presbytery, on the charge of schism. It is now consummated, and I lay it before your readers, as a duty I owe to the friends of religious freedom. As faithful guardians of human rights, it becomes us, wisely, to understand the true position of those with whom we may be called to contend, in the great struggle in which we are engaged. I have before expressed the opinion, that the greatest barriers, and the most rancorous opposition, to the glorious consummation of our holy principles, would be seen in the direction of ecclesiastical power. I have seen nothing, in more recent developments, tending to weaken that conviction, but, every day, it is becoming more and more strong.

From a sacred regard for the essential and heaven-bred distinctions of our holy religion, I was impelled, under a most solemn sense of duty to God and the world, to demand a dissolution of my ecclesiastical connections. I found myself painfully embarrassed, and to some extent thwarted, in my feeble efforts to advance the cause of our common humanity by my association with a body, that seemed, in a great measure, to have lost sight of the sublime ends of Christianity, and the high and holy responsibilities of the Christian ministry,

and to be more zealous to protect their own interests and their high claims to exclusive clerical prerogatives, than to preserve, among men, the imperishable distinctions of our holy religion itself. There was a clashing of interests of the holiest of causes on earth with the earthly interests, and prerogatives of a body, that had degenerated into the narrow limits and spirit of a sect. To which I should acknowledge allegiance—to which I should prove treacherous and apostate—with which I should identify my whole soul and influence—was a question which I found myself solemnly bound to decide. So busily had ambition seemed to labor, so deeply had pride and selfishness diffused their accretion and corroding influence, that the very vitals of a sound morality seemed palsied. The great heart of humanity lay quivering and bleeding—offered up by millions in the man-marchant's stalls and on the bloody altar and national religious union, to preserve the power and glory of a sect. The grand equality of mankind—the common rights of the Christian brotherhood—the royal Priesthood of all believers—the great doctrine answering to our common, natural and spiritual equality and birth-right, that the body itself is the legitimate source of all power to men on earth—these lofty truths, standing out in their sublimity, under the blended lights of both natural and revealed religion, were practically denied. The beautiful and holy Temple lay prostrate in the dust. The light in the golden candlestick was burning dim, and ready to expire. The seamless garments lay rent in twain. For the promotion of these great truths, as containing the very essentials of a sound religion as constituting the very heart and lungs of a system deserving the name of Christianity, in distinction from the creeds of men, the laws of the desert, or the coran of Mohammed—for the promotion of these, I pledged myself to God and the world. These, by my ordination vows, my covenants, in secret and in public, I was bound to defend, and, as far as I could, unfurl their banner to the world.

This, in my feeble efforts to accomplish, brought me into collision with the spiritual power of Utica Presbytery. By referring to my letter on which the charge of schism is founded, it will be seen, distinctly, that I only asserted these great cardinal principles, without the acknowledgment and defense of which we cannot defend our common Christianity against the scoffs and assaults of an infidel world, and make it seem, as it is, harmonious with the light of nature and the guardian of the imperishable rights of mankind. The committee, to whom my case was referred, say, explicitly, "after reading this extraordinary paper," that he has made four points, as reasons why his relations with this Presbytery should cease.

First. He says "I do not approve of the government of the Presbyterian church in these United States."

Secondly. "I object to them, as tending to spiritual pride and ecclesiastical ambition, by concentrating the power and prerogatives, which belong to the brotherhood, into the hands of a few."

Thirdly. "I object to your terms of Christian fellowship, as opposed to the only foundation which Heaven has ordained for the fellowship of Christian hearts and Christian hands."

Fourthly. "I request a dissolution of my connection with your body, because you are still in connection with slaveholders."

It would seem that there was something sufficiently definite in these reasons for my dismissal, something that needed no explanation or elucidation to men that had ever studied the first principles of Christianity; that had ever read their Bibles or heard of such a man as Martin Luther and the Reformation. There was something here, however, that Utica Presbytery could not fully comprehend.—Perhaps some Puxton gun of heresy, or some sub-marine explosive enginery lay concealed. My request was denied. I was summoned a distance of some twenty miles, "to explain on certain points, implied, if not expressed." I regarded the summons, as I felt bound to defend the issue. But my explanations, and my defence of the democracy of the New Testament Church government; my denial of the exclusive assumptions of a clerical caste; their power, cupriciously, to make ministers of Christ, and then to unmake them, by first laying their hands on and then taking their hands off, whether clean or unclean, as Napoleon made Kings and dispensed thrones, were as displeasing to Utica Presbytery as the "extraordinary paper itself." "What need have ye of further witness?" He denies our authority! I am now called to plead to the following grave

CHARGE.

That the Rev. W. Stickney entertains and expresses opinions schismatical, and adverse to his professions and vows, made at the period of his ordination, as a minister or pastor in the Presbyterian Church.

First specification. "In alledging in a letter to the Moderator of Presbytery, that he did not approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in these United States."

Second specification. "In alledging, in the same letter, that he objected to the terms of Christian fellowship held by the Presbyterian Church."

Is this all? Is the question I seem to hear rising from a thousand voices, as their eyes fall upon this charge and these specifications. And has it come to pass among professed Protestants, in a country where battles have been fought and blood poured out for religious freedom and the rights of man, that a minister, in good and regular standing, of unimpeachable moral character, as admitted by his accusers, and for whom many of them express

great regard, shall be degraded from the sacred office, and be ranked with profligates and apostates, by the exercise of the highest power claimed on earth, for the exclusion only of the vile? And that too, in contending for what the Independents of England struggled for, against corruption and ghostly spiritual tyranny, and for which Roger Williams struggled and suffered banishment, by Presbyterian power in America, in the days when the bigotry of a Laud begat the Star Chamber, and when the Quakers and the anabaptists and the Wheelwrights were exiled by the Puritans and burnt on Boston Common—when nothing could save the advocates of “soul freedom” in England from “the fury of the Bishops but the wide ocean and the savage deserts of America;” and nothing could protect them here from religious bigotry and fanaticism but exile or death?

It was easy enough for me to show the falseness of the charge which, Ahab-like, was prosecuted against me, and to show that my accusers, by their innovations upon primitive church order, government and christian union, were anti-scriptural in theory and schismatical in practice. I was allowed to proceed without interruption, through through this stage of my defense, until I came to speak of the horrible confederacy of my ecclesiastical connection with the crimes of American heatonism and oppression. I designed to show their support of the old Guinea slave trade, piracy and kidnapping, transferred from the old world to the new, to fatten our soil with the blood and tears of the unoffending children of Africa. I meant to prove that they were, by theory and by practice, around the Savior's table and at the sacred altar, by profound silence or by an open, unblushing advocacy and practice of the celebrated Doct. Taylor's doctrine, that “an enlightened Christian would vote for the least devil of the two,” in every way, ecclesiastically at least, sustaining the highest crime and “the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man,” and yet maintain a sound Christian character, worthy of the approval of a Savior who died to wash out oppression from the globe and to establish justice and mercy in the earth. I intended to prove the necessity which my ordination vows imposed upon me to abandon a body which, in Heaven's clearest light and most direct and emphatic commands, *still* persisted in fellowshiping “the works of darkness,” and holding in the most fraternal embrace, robbers of the poor, stealers of men, buyers and sellers of mothers and young babes. I was, however, interrupted by Mr. Boardman, of Rome, and here closed my remarks, though it was decided I might proceed.

After due and solemn deliberation and some impressive remarks on the necessity of preserving the order and purity of the churches and ministerial authority from contempt, I was found guilty of schism, and suspended from the functions of the gospel ministry until the next meeting of the Presbytery; when it was resolved that I should be deposed for contumacy, should I refuse to appear at their subsequent meeting. On receiving the notice, I at once resolved to obey the citation, most of all desiring to confine them to the issue between us.

On the day appointed, the cold was intense—the roads were filled with snow, and traveling was impracticable. It was out of my power to reach the Presbytery, as was also the case with a majority of its members. Notwithstanding, a motion was made for my deposition. And who, shall I inform you, was the most strenuous advocate for this papish and bigoted act of ecclesiastical tyranny? None other than Ira Pettibone himself. To him belongs the honor of urging on his more hesitating and fearful brethren to the consummation of the deed. How strong must be the influence of the love of sect, and how inflexible the determination to preserve arbitrary ecclesiastical power, and ministerial caste, when such men will consent to trample down a brother's rights, in union with those who spurn from their altars the cause of the perishing. I was informed by one who was present, that even this most remarkable and pernicious sentiment was advanced: “I would depose him if he were as pure as an angel.”

Did bigotry, armed with the inquisition, ever give utterance to a sentiment more abhorrent to the spirit and precepts of our holy religion? Thus, in the midst of obstacles which Providence had laid in my way, without charge of heresy, without the shadow of an imputation resting upon my moral character, in defiance of the most expressive teaching of their *own constitution* and in contempt of still higher authority, the *Bible* itself, they, from their vatican send forth their Papal bull; but, I doubt not, it will fall as harmlessly at my feet as did the thunders of the Vatican at old Rome, at the feet of Luther, or the noisy sky-rocket, exhibiting, after its explosion, no signs of rain—only a dry, burnt stick, too worthless to be picked up by the boys in the street.

Must I not be constrained to believe, then, that what one of their own number told me, is true?—that the *secret design* of this whole prosecution, was to destroy my influence at home and abroad, as they saw at *whatever cost* I was determined to go out from their pro-slavery sect. To their own consciences and their God they must answer. Whether they will succeed in the eyes of the lovers of impartial freedom, who know their rights and are prepared to defend them, in their efforts to crush me, to defend their tottering claims, the future will determine better than the present.

Of one thing they cannot rob me—a good conscience in this whole matter, and the honest conviction that I have resisted a most daring assault upon the heritage of spiritual freedom and the rights of the Christian ministry. They may continue to nestle in the infectious bosom of the soul drivers and men breeders of the South, and receive the sop of their more guilty confederates of the North; but the 30 pieces of silver will be found, at last, to have gathered upon them a terrible rust, and the price of treason to humanity, justice and mercy, may, at last, be found to have been too dearly purchased, when the indignation of insulted Justice shall pour forth its lightning blaze, and the heavens shall be involved with the tears and groans of God's despised and outraged poor. The time may come even while we are yet busy amid the spleen scenes of life, with the responsibilities that Heaven has thrown upon us, when the mark of des-

potism, such as mine, will be worn as a loftier badge of fidelity to truth, and holy freedom, than all the honors and dignified titles that ecclesiastics can confer, while struggling to chain down the spirit of freedom and hallow the wasting corruptions of earth.

W. STICKNEY.

Cannastota, May 21, 1845.

P. S. I am bound to say, in justice of bro Spencer (Franklin Spencer) and Beebe, that they resisted the despotism of the Presbytery from beginning to end.

W. S.

We cannot forbear to subjoin a few comments upon these Presbyterian Proceedings. The right of the Presbyterian church, or its Presbyteries, to exclude from a continued membership in those bodies, those whose principles and usages do not correspond with those of the Presbyterian church, we are by no means disposed to call in question. They hold this right in common with all other associated bodies, whether religious or otherwise. In a Presbyterian church, or in a Presbytery, no man may claim the right of membership or the right of being a minister, simply because his character as a *Christian*, or as a *Christian minister* is beyond dispute and is recognized by the members of those bodies. Simple Christianity or the capability of teaching it, do not supply the well known tests of admission among them. It is not simply as Christians, as Christian churches, or as a Christian ministry that they organize. It is *Presbyterianism*, not mere Christianity that is exalted as the distinctive basis of the arrangements into which, as Presbyterians, they have entered. A man might as reasonably expect that Christian character, or the proper qualifications for teaching Christianity should entitle him to a membership in the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences, or to a Professorship in the University of Dublin, as to suppose that those qualifications entitle him to a place in a Presbyterian church, or to a seat among the clergy of a Presbytery.

It is no ground of complaint, therefore, that Mr. Stickney, holding the views of Presbyterianism which he had expressed, was cut off from being a minister of the Presbyterian church. To such a privilege he has no longer any claim. Such a position he did not desire. He felt that it would be inconvenient and incongruous, and improper in him, to remain connected with them; and in them to retain their connexion with him. Accordingly, his request was, that the connexion might be dissolved.

Now, if the Presbytery were simply desirous of the same, why did they not grant his request? By dissolving the connection under such circumstances, the Presbytery and the Presbyterian church would have been disincumbered of the person who had ceased to hold their distinctive views. No person,

henceforward, would hold either the Presbytery, or Presbyterianism, or the Presbyterian church responsible for any of his alleged delinquencies or errors. Unless by some immoral act, or by some fundamental heresy, he had forfeited his character as a Christian, or as a Christian minister, this was certainly all that the Presbytery was called upon to do, in his case?

But was this the course they pursued? No! His request was denied. What was the significance of this act? Did they desire to hold him in compulsory membership? And that too, after he had signified his dissent from Presbyterianism? This we can hardly suppose. And the result shows that they did not. They meant to do what they *did* do. They meant to exclude him. Why then could they not have simply granted his request?

But they summoned him to a trial! They preferred charges against him! And what charges did they bring? Had he broached heresies subversive of the Christian faith?—And was it therefore, needful, not simply that the Presbyterian connexion should be disincumbered of him, but also that the Christian community and the public in general, should be warned against so dangerous a person?

The charge does not say this. The specifications cover no such ground. The charge is neither founded on alleged wicked practices, nor the teaching of anti-Christian doctrines. It relates only to schism. And the specifications amount merely to his changed views in respect to Presbyterianism! Quite remarkable is it that no notice is taken, in these specifications, of his complaint at the Presbytery in connection with slave holders. We may infer that he was not incorrect in that statement. And it would seem too, that his request for a dissolution of the connexion on that ground, was not charged upon him, either as a heresy, or as a fault.

The charge, therefore, is reduced to a narrow compass. He is charged with having become convinced that Presbyterianism is not the proper mode of church government! He is "charged" with having informed the Presbytery of that fact! And, to this "charge" it ought to have been added that he asked a dissolution of his connexion with them! Who has ever before heard of a charge of this kind? Does it accord with the common usages among sects of this country? Cannot a member or a minister step out of one ecclesiastical connexion or sect into another, without being arraigned on a charge of schism, and a violation of covenant or ordination vows? The facility with which ministers run back and forth between Congregational and Presbyterian churches—one thing this year and another

or that, and then back again, on matters their convenience or their finances, does not look much like it! Why could not Mr. Stickney be permitted, as quietly to retire? Why not let him as peaceably preach to the little independent church of seceders at Canastota, without arraigning him on such a charge?—Why have not such churches and ministers the same rights as are recognized in Congregational churches of the ordinary stamp?—Is it because they have come out of the ecclesiastical bodies that are connected with slavery or that uphold it? Would bro. Pettibone, who is an abolitionist, admit that he considers this a good reason? For no other fault, ought ministers and churches to be proscribed, and ministers solemnly deposed from the Christian ministry, on no other specification than that they disapprove of Presbyterianism and wish to leave that connexion? Is it proper to depose men from the Christian Ministry (allowing such a power to belong rightfully to Presbyteries) because they renounce Presbyterianism? Or because they leave a church on account of its connexion with slavery?

If a minister on leaving a Presbytery, for some Congregational body, does not therefore become obnoxious to the charge of schism, and is not to be arraigned and deposed, why these proceedings in relation to Mr. Stickney?—Was it because he explicitly stated his objections to Presbyterianism? And if so, shall the Congregational laity infer that their ministers are shielded from similar treatment by the circumstance that they seldom or never express similar objections? And is this clerical silence the condition of Congregational intercourse with Presbyterians? How long will Congregationalists purchase the privilege at that price? Or how long will abolitionists cling to Presbyteries, by whom abolition ministers are deposed from the Christian ministry because they signify their unwillingness to retain ecclesiastical connexions with slavery?

Had the Presbytery simply performed an act declaring that Mr. Stickney was no longer a Presbyterian minister, or had they only "suspended him from the functions of the" Presbyterian "ministry" or deposed him from it, the case would have been a very different one. But it was a "suspension from the ministry" and then a solemn deposing of him from that ministry! A judicial act, professedly depriving him of the right to officiate—not as a Presbyterian minister, simply, but as a minister of the gospel!

*The ostensible charge is, dissent from Presbyterianism; but the real ground, we take to be, secession from a pro-slavery sect. But whether one or the other, or both combined, the proceedings of the Presbytery present a most painful, yet instructive picture, and the moral is, that neither Presbyterianism nor pro-slavery can safely be held in fellowship by the friends of Christian freedom.

And how long is it, that Presbyterians have claimed the power of deposing from the gospel ministry those who are not Presbyterians, and who have publicly seceded from the sect?

Much as we disapprove of Presbyterianism, we should have thought it impossible that it could be so absurdly arrogant as this. Yet we cannot suppose that such a man as bro. Pettibone mistakes its requisitions—or that any thing but an apprehension of his duties to Presbyterianism, could induce him to take such a course. We have long known him as an out-spoken abolitionist—contending with the pro-slavery ministers of his sect—a Liberty party abolitionist—an attendant on Church Reform Anti-Slavery Conventions—and, on one important occasion, standing by us, in aiding us to procure the adoption of the strongest measure we were then desirous of urging—a measure looking in the direction of secession in case the churches and ecclesiastical bodies could not be induced to take anti-slavery ground. But the experiment has proved that the Presbyterian connexion as a body, cannot be abolitionized. And so the most zealous abolitionists among Presbyterian clergymen remain where they were! If the mountain will not come to Mohammed, Mohammed can go to the mountain! To the Presbyterian church they must, at all events, cling, let it float where it will! And consequently they must crush, if it be possible, by their ecclesiastical anathemas, all those who do otherwise?

Are there no exceptions to these general statements? Yes! WASHINGTON STRICKNEY presents an exception! Let all clerical Presbyterian abolitionists ponder the price of fidelity, and count the cost of adhering to their principles! If they love the praise of men, or desire to make a fair show in the flesh, or think a Presbytery can depose them from "the gospel ministry," the sacrifice will be a costly one.

CASE OF THE CHURCH IN LEBANON.

LEBANON, Oct. 9, 1845.

BROTHER GOODALL:—The development of the spirit of pro-slavery and of Popery, among those high in ecclesiastical standing and authority in this section has led me to address you at this time. If you can subserve the cause of truth, by this communication, you are at liberty to use it. The Congregational church in this place, (to which I am now preaching) has been for many years connected with Oneida Association. That body have a standing rule which requires that "no church employ any preacher not belonging to their body, more than three Sabbaths, before he shall have been examined and approved by this Association, or by a committee appointed

for the purpose of examining such preachers." In consequence of not obeying that rule, both the church and incumbent minister have been pronounced by that Body "disrespectful."—Further, two individuals (in 1811) withdrew publicly from this church because, when the subject of slavery had been brought repeatedly and fully before them, they refused to take anti-slavery ground. The Association was called together for counsel. They deplored that the seceding brethren were "disorderly" and advised to labor with them according to Mat. 18th, and proceed to suspend and finally cut them off, unless they repented of their disorderly conduct. One was dealt with and excommunicated. But within two or three months past, a revolution, to some extent, has been effected in church action. The friends of liberty, civil and ecclesiastical, have, in some measure come up to their duty, and the tables have been turned. When the case of the *other* seceder came before the church, they refused even to suspend him, believing he had acted conscientiously. Next, an effort was made to send the minister to Association for examination. This the church refused to do, believing the rule requiring it an assumption of arbitrary power. The next step was to withdraw from Association. Notice was accordingly sent by the delegate. Association appointed a special meeting here last week, (Oct 2d,) on the invitation of the aggrieved minority of the church, to examine the matter. "After due enquiry and deliberation they came to the conclusion that the majority of the church, have, in the case of the seceding member last referred to, not only disregarded the advice of Association but also trampled under foot the discipline of Christ's house, disregarded the opinions and aggrieved feelings of their brethren and set an example subversive of all good order in the household of faith; that in their vote to withdraw from Oneida Association, without the consent of their brethren, and in opposition to their oft repeated and ardent wishes, and without asking Association to dismiss them, they were cruel in their treatment of the dear people of God, and deficient in Christian courtesy to this Association—that they have manifested great want of kindness in charging Association with pro-slavery views and practices, in opposition to their declarations, prayers, preaching and the published proceeding of N. Y. General Association, of which this Association is a member; that they have and support a minister who preaches the doctrine of *entire sanctification* as held, preached and published at Oberlin, and the majority sympathize with him in these views—that he denies that ordination confers any authority upon a minister to

preach the gospel; and he declares that all Christians have an equal right to administer the ordinances. On these grounds, those acting in the majority are fundamentally erroneous, that they are, and therefore must be considered a secession from the fundamental doctrines and usages on which the church was built; and that the minority and those sympathizing with them are fully entitled to be regarded and treated in all respects as the *first Congregational Church of Lebanon*; and in full fellowship with this Association."

This action, I regard as a long stride towards Rome. First, they virtually deny the principle, that the majority should govern—a principle which is essential to the very existence of all voluntary associations. They complain of the majority acting "without the consent" of the minority, disregarding the "opinions and feelings and oft expressed and ardent wishes" of the minority. How else could they act? Should the majority not in accordance with their own opinions and feelings, their own views of duty and obligations to God and man, or in accordance with the views and feelings of the minority whom they believe to be in the wrong? Does the Oneida Association act on the principle that the majority shall in all cases, or in any case, yield their own judgment, their own views and feelings to the views and feelings of the minority of that Body? Was such a principle ever heard of, in the annals of voluntary Associations?

Again, they make their own advice a fundamental rule of Christian morality, and compliance or non compliance with this advice, a condition of fellowship. The "disregarding" of "the advice of Association," is enumerated as one of the *fundamental errors* of the majority of this church! Again, they virtually assume the infallibility of any and every church—the impossibility of its becoming corrupt, by maintaining that the act of withdrawing from a church on the ground of its being corrupt, is an act, "trampling under foot the discipline of Christ's house, subversive of all good order in the household of faith." Let them remember the seven churches of Asia, and the church of Rome.

Again, they assume that something else besides Christian character is a condition of Christian fellowship—they maintain that "the discipline of Christ's house," "good order in the household of faith" requires that "disorderly persons," notwithstanding they are conscientious Christians, having a conscience void of offence before God and man—persons of great moral worth and unblemished integrity, against whom not an immoral act has ever been alleged—persons of self-denying activity

in the cause of God and humanity—such persons shall be accounted heathen men and publicans. "Take heed that ye offend not one of these little ones which believe in me."

Further, they virtually deny the doctrine of inalienable rights. They complain of the church for withdrawing from Association without asking that body to dismiss them, thus virtually denying the right of the church to withdraw without leave! If churches have not this right, and it is considered a want of Christian courtesy to use it, decently and respectfully, they are certainly in a state of vassalage greatly to be deplored. Again, they charge the majority of this church with "cruelty to the dear people of God," in the act of withdrawing from Association without the consent of the minority. But wherein does the cruelty consist? In the fact that the church have acted on the principle that the majority should govern? Then certainly the people of the United States were cruel in not having Henry Clay for President rather than James K. Polk. Then the majority are always cruel in acting against the views and feelings of the minority. But does the cruelty consist in refusing to continue as a church, under the sheltering wing of Association? In depriving the dear people of God of her fostering care? Of her paternal regard and paternal authority? Show me that the church needs any master but Christ, that she needs any authority but the divine authority, that her purity, peace and prosperity are best promoted by throwing herself into the arms of an ecclesiastical body, that this is consistent with Christian liberty—that the Bible any where authorizes any such thing, and I will admit the dear people of God have been treated with cruelty.

But the majority felt that their Christian liberty was abridged by their connection with Association—that it would be an act of kindness to themselves and their brethren to dissolve that connection—that they only throw off the authority of Association, and removed from under her protection, that they might hold themselves more immediately and directly amenable to the great Head of the church and thus might claim more fully His counsel, His protection.

Again, the Association deny that they are a pro-slavery body and charge the majority with unkindness in regarding them as such, in opposition to their declarations, resolutions, &c. &c. I admit, they have declared themselves opposed to slavery, passed anti-slavery resolutions, but that they are a decidedly anti-slavery body, I do not believe. The sentiments thrown out at their recent session in this place, by leading members, and tacitly endorsed by the body are sufficient proof of

this. The position taken was this. The great cause of disturbance in the churches and in this church in particular, has been the introduction of something besides Jesus Christ and Him crucified. (That "something" has been the subject of American slavery.)—They gave it as their decided advice to the church, not to introduce such subjects into the church, i. e. don't meddle with slavery in the church! This is the anti-slavery taught on the floor of the Oneida Association. Judge ye, whether that body is anti-slavery or pro-slavery.

And last, but not least, in these fundamental errors, is the fact that the majority have and support a minister who preaches the doctrine of entire sanctification, as held at Oberlin, and the majority sympathize with him.—The fact then, that we really hope and expect to live holy, obey God's commands, have the spirit of Christ, and glorify God in body and spirit, is an error too gross to be fellowshiped in the church of Christ, a heresy demanding the infliction of the highest ecclesiastical penalty, viz: excommunication. Because we believe it is our duty and privilege actually to keep the covenant into which we have solemnly entered before God, angels and men, because we believe that covenant is not a mere sham, but a practical and practicable reality, therefore they, (the majority,) "are and must be considered a secession from the fundamental doctrines and usages on which the church was built." Let the world and posterity judge and decide how much such reasoning amounts to.

To cap the climax, the minority, the dutiful, the orthodox minority are declared *the church, the 1st Congregational church of Lebanon,* and in full fellowship with the Association. The majority are cast out as orphans upon a friendless world. "And they cast him out of the synagogue." We are not then the first that have been cast out. May the Lord show the dear brethren of the Association what they are about—what spirit they are of, that they may escape the curse of those who "lord it over God's heritage."

Oct. 14th.—For the last two Sabbaths strenuous efforts have been made to thrust or crowd minister and church out of the house! But I trust there is enough at least of the show of justice left, to show that human rights may not thus be invaded. But what will be the result God only knows. Popery now is the same in spirit that it was in the days of Jerome and Huss. It only wants the power.—But God is on the throne. His cause is onward and will prevail.

Yours, respectfully,

J. COPELAND, Jr.

We cannot forbear a remark or two on these proceedings. The facts stated, illustrate, in a striking manner, the nature and tendency of those Associations which are so common among those claiming to be Congregationalists in this country. All the distinctive principles and features of Congregational Church Independency disappear in the presence of such arrangements, and few seem to be aware of the fact, so long as the churches retain a Congregational name. We wish it to be noted that these remarks would be in place, whatever might be the merits of the controversy in the church at Lebanon, concerning abolition, perfectionism, or any thing else. So long as the church may thus be controlled by the Association, church independency is at an end. Suppose "the tables turned" in full. Suppose the Association were abolitionists, or perfectionists, and suppose the Lebanon church, or a majority of it, were of the opposite views. Ought the majority of the Lebanon church to be controlled by the Association? We say no. And we hope abolitionists will wield no such powers, and sustain none of the arrangements that recognize them.

DISINTERESTEDNESS AND IMPARTIALITY.

Among the strong arguments of the Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, in favor of the innocency of slave holding, is the consideration that the great majority of religious people in this country, northern and southern, have never yet been convinced that the practice is criminal! The writer admits that men may be blinded by self interest, but then he denies that this concession should apply in the present case. These are his words:—

"It is hardly possible for a man whose interests are deeply involved in any question, to avoid allowing his mind to dwell unduly upon those considerations which favor the decision which he desires, nor is he qualified to give the opposite considerations their proper weight. But we deny that the great body of intelligent and good men in this country are under the bias of interest, in the judgment which they give concerning slavery.—They have no selfish interest in the matter. Those dwelling in the non-slaveholding States, might arrive at the conclusion that slave holding is sin, without endangering any of their personal interests, or disquieting their conscience in the least. They are just as free from selfish bias in the case, as though sitting in judgment on the despotism of Russia. The unbiased judgment, therefore, of the great mass of intelligent and pious men in the country, that slaveholding is not a crime, given after due consideration, is itself an argument, not to be gainsayed, against the primary doctrine of the abolitionists."—[Supplement to the Princeton Whig, pg. 6.]

What an opiate for slave holders' consciences have we here! What a comment on the position of the same writer, that the northern churches are not responsible for the slave laws of the South! What a comment on the pretension of many others that the northern

"The Princeton writer evidently forgets, here, his boasted distinction between "slavery" and "slaveholding," together with his complaint that abolitionists represent him as being the defender of "slavery."

churches and ministry are as much opposed to slaveholding as the abolitionists!

And then look at the cool assertion that religionists at the North are no more under the "bias of interest" in the matter of American slavery than in respect to the despotism of Russia! Could any thing exceed the impudence of a statement like this?

Why! What is the shape, the scope, the drift, the main object of the article in the Biblical Repertory, from which the above paragraph is copied? The question under discussion, as he himself states it, is this—"Are the professed Christians in our respective connexions who hold their fellow men as slaves, thereby guilty of a sin which demands the cognizance of the church, and after due admonition, the application of discipline?" To this question, our author gives a negative answer, declaring that an affirmative one would "rend the church"—as doubtless it would—since "three fourths of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians, in eleven States of this Union," are slave holders! And yet he denies that he is under "the bias of interest," occupying as he doubtless does, a high post among the clergy of the Presbyterian church, and is speaking through its principal periodical, which emanates from the chief seat of Literature and Theology sustained by the patronage of that sect, including that of the slaveholders themselves!—As well might Dr. Eck, and the richly endowed clergy of the Romish church have gravely attested their own impartiality, and freedom from any "selfish bias," in their pending controversy with Luther!

We might concede to him that the members of his church might "arrive at the conclusion that slaveholding is sin—without disquieting their consciences." But this is only because his own Biblical criticisms and researches must have failed, after all, to convince them that the Bible is in favor of slave holding. If they could believe that doctrine, and retain their reverential regard to the Bible as being God's word, their consciences would not be very quiet while believing that slave holding is sinful. They would be self-convicted of that opposition to their Maker with which the "fanatical" abolitionists stand charged, by this writer.

"The great body of intelligent and good men" [church members] in this country, under no bias of interest, in the judgment they give concerning slavery! What point or pith was there, then, in the title page, and in the leading idea of one of the books which our author so commendably "reviews"?

"The integrity of our national Union, versus abolitionism." Here is a theological ou-

dorment of the political objection that the attempt to abolish slavery would snap asunder the political cords of our idolized "national Union"! To this worldly and selfish cry, the ecclesiastics at Princeton can respond with hearty huzzas, through their *Biblical Reporters* and their Princeton *Whigs*, notwithstanding all their pious horror at permitting the smell of politics to pass upon their sacerdotal robes. How happens it that Doctors of Divinity urge their political appeals against abolitionism (the abolition of slavery) upon the ears of "the great body of the intelligent and good men in the country," and join in the clamor that such abolition would hazard their political interests? How is this, if "they are just as free from selfish bias in the case, as though sitting in judgment on the despotism of Russia"? Would our author wish us to infer that our American clergy would interpose, just as zealously, with their Bible arguments, to arrest the abolition of feudal bondage in Russia, or of aristocracy and class legislation in Great Britain, as they do "in the case" of American slavery? What would be said of our "malignant fanaticism"—if we should ascribe to them no gratuitous advocacy of despotism as this? Can charity itself put a more favorable construction upon their conduct than that, (in the words of our author) "if a man is personally interested in the decision of a question, he is not a fair judge in the case"?

"No selfish interest in the matter," forsooth! And are there no Northern church members, exerting a controlling influence over the masses of their brethren, who are scrambling at, even contending with each other for the high seats of power which the votes or the signatures of slave holders alone can bestow? Has New Jersey furnished no Presbyterian statesmen, receiving Southern votes for high federal offices, and solicitously disclaiming, through the public journals, while the elections were pending, the least sympathy with those who are seeking the abolition of "the wicked slave laws" within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government? Is it quite prudent or modest for the Doctors of the Presbyterian sect, in that State, to claim, so soon after developments like these, that their communion is free from all "selfish bias in the case"?

Are there not, in the bosom of our northern churches, princely merchants and capitalists, along with busy artisans, mechanics, manufacturers, operatives, and even farmers, who reap, or seek to reap, their annual incomes or their daily bread, from the direct or indirect favor and patronage of the slave holders of the South? What has been the testimo-

ny, and what the appeals of our commercial journals, and their religious editors, on this point? How is it with professing Christians at Newark, in New Jersey, the author's own State? What portion of those church members, including Presbyterians, look earnestly towards the markets of the South, and tremble at the reduced prices of cotton and of Presbyterian slaves—men, women, and their babes? Is it quite certain, and may it be affirmed, that among the numerous manufacturers and vendors of those thousands of dollars worth of *slave whips* with which New Jersey supplies the slave States, there are no church members and no Presbyterians to be found?

Are there no mortgages on slave property held by northern professors of religion who have commercial intercourse with the South? Does slave property never pass through their hands? Or is it a rare case? Will it be denied that northern professors of religion removing to the South, or residing temporarily or periodically there, frequently become slaveholders, and still retain their religious standing at the North? With ministers of religion, too, is this not this a well known and common fact? In a large portion of our local churches and congregations, even in the interior of the country are there not cases of this kind? And are there not representatives from some of the Christian families in almost all our northern neighborhoods, who are residents at the South, and who become slaveholders there? Is it decent, is it honest, to say of a religious community in such circumstances, that they are under no temptations of interest to look favorably upon the practice of slave holding, especially when their learned religious teachers are at such pains to establish and vindicate the innocence of the practice?

Slave holders at the South, religious slaveholders, too, are not backward to remind northern people that *they* have as deep an interest, political, commercial and ecclesiastical, in the suppression of all agitation on this subject, as the people of the South have. And northern religionists, in abundance, respond to, and re-echo, their appeals. The northern churches are reminded, too, by their brethren at the South, that the African slave trade, while legalized, was chiefly in northern hands, that church members were engaged in the traffic, and that a large portion of northern ministers, sixty or seventy years ago, were slaveholders, and many of their sons are in the ministry now. That Northern Colleges and Theological Seminaries, with few exceptions, vie with each other in seeking the patronage of the South is too notorious to need even a passing remark. Worldly men as

well as others, speak of it as a matter of course, that the Faculty and Trustees of a College or Seminary will be averse to the agitation of the subject, and the exceptions are rare. And a few years since, an Elder in a Presbyterian church in the city of New York was reputed to be the owner of more slaves than any other man in the United States. Was it strange that his minister should be an apologist for slave holding? And prejudice against colored people, according to southern testimony, is stronger at the North than at the South.

Illustrations might be indefinitely multiplied, but it is needless. Sufficient to our purpose is the one outstanding fact, known throughout Christendom, that our northern ministers and churches, of the prominent sects, are bound up by ecclesiastical and religious ties in close fraternity with large masses of men whose practices would subject them to criminal indictments and penal inflictions, if the sheltering wing of the "wicked slave laws" were only removed from them! To say that church members thus situated, are in a position to judge impartially of slave holding, is as absurd and as ridiculous as it would be to say that the slave holders themselves are.

GUILT AND RESPONSIBILITY of the THE CHURCH and MINISTRY, in respect to Slavery.—Testimony of ALBERT BARNES.

We are not aware that Albert Barnes has ever been identified with the anti-slavery movement—that he has ever openly sympathized with active abolitionists, or countenanced anti-slavery measures. It is not long since we first learned that he had ever written or spoken against slavery. He is in connection with the New School Presbyterian church, and his testimony comes at a time when most of the prominent clergy connected with that body, and who ever had been accounted abolitionists, have pretty nearly or quite given up the agitation of the subject, and swan down with the current. Whether this testimony against slavery should be considered as enfilading him to the credit of being accounted an exception to the degeneracy which he describes, must depend upon the fidelity, perseverance, and consistency with which he adheres to the sentiments he has here expressed, and honors them in practice. Up to the present hour, none of the opposers of abolitionists who complain of their bad spirit, and charge them with hostility to the church and the ministry, ever think of including Albert Barnes in the number of such disorganizers. Hear the testimony of Albert Barnes, respecting the course and the present position of the church and the ministry of the country in

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, NOVEMBER, 1810.

PLEA FOR SECTARIANISM EXAMINED.

When Christians connected with sectarian organizations and thus sustaining them, are charged with promoting and abetting schism in the body, the church of Jesus Christ, they not unfrequently resort to a mode of defence, which, if it could avail to excuse them, would prove that it is utterly impossible for any schism ever to take place among Christians, and thus render nugatory all the repeated and varied apostolic admonitions against the danger of that sin and calamity in the church.

The plea they commonly make is, that since all real Christians, being united to Jesus Christ, are consequently united with one another, there is, as a matter of fact, a substantial unity of all Christians, with all other Christians, notwithstanding the sectarian barriers of division which are set up, so that there is no division or schism in the case; and the whole complaint of it is an unfounded calumny and unnecessary clamor.

Now if this statement be correct, the Christian church never yet suffered a schism. No such thing ever took place among Christians. Paul's direction to mark and avoid those who caused schism, was gratuitous and needless.—And his charge against the Corinthian Christians was unfounded and abusive.

For the plea goes the full length of affirming that real, living Christians never can be, and never are so divided from each other as to justify the charge of an existing schism between them. The very fact of their being Christians is adduced as being evidence of the fact of their unity. And the fact of their unity is held to be identical with the fact that there is no schism!

This fallacy is very near akin to that by which another class of Christians excuse themselves from the disagreeable duty of turning wicked men out of the church, because, say they, no wicked man can by any possibility be in the true church of Christ, and so there can be no possibility nor occasion for turning such characters out of it. Both these fallacies arise from confounding the outward and local church visible with the spiritual church invisible and universal. It is true that no ungodly person can be in the true church spiritual and invisible, and none of that character can therefore be "put away from" it. But wicked men, like Judas and Hymeneus, may and do creep into the best churches local and visible, and hence, such churches are admonished to "put them away"

whenever they detect them. So likewise there is, in fact, a real and substantial unity between all the true and living members of the church spiritual and invisible. But this does not prevent the churches local and visible from maintaining such arrangements as authoritatively and wickedly separate the living members of Christ's body from each other, forbidding them to co-operate together and share equally in the common privileges of Christ's house. These arrangements are schismatic and sinful—otherwise no such sin as that of schism can possibly exist.

So far from its being true, (as this plea for sectarianism assumes) that there can be no schism between the living members of Christ's spiritual body, the truth is, there can be no schism in the church, the body of Christ, except between the living members of that body. For there can be no schism in separating the true members of Christ's body from those who are not members. It is no "schism" in the church when a "wicked person" is "put away" from it, according to Paul's directions in 1 Cor. v. It is no "schism" when the people of God separate themselves from an apostate and corrupt church, according to Christ's requirements; (viz.) "Come out of her my people that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." In the very nature of the case there can be no "schism" except between the living members of the body.

The fact of the spiritual unity of all true Christians, as members of the body of Christ, so far from proving that sectarian arrangements are not schismatic, is the very fact that proves them to be so; since those arrangements do forbid and prevent their mutual co-operation in church relations, and do exclude Christians from the privileges to which they are all and equally entitled, as members of the same spiritual body.

All those excuses, therefore, for sectarian arrangements (or such as exclude acknowledged Christians, from any of the local churches) are evidently self-condemnatory and futile which are drawn from the alleged spiritual unity of the members of those rival sects.—The more clear and indisputable you make the evidences of their spiritual unity, in so much the stronger light do you exhibit the sin of the ecclesiastical schism, which practically denies that spiritual unity, and does its best to render it ineffectual and powerless.

The excuse under consideration resembles likewise one of the defences of slaveholding, which, it is alleged cannot chattelise human beings because it cannot, in fact, reduce men to brute beasts! It nevertheless regards and treats them as such! And just so sectarianism treats Christians, (and makes them treat each other,) as though they were not members of the body of Christ.

general, including the sect to which he, himself belongs: To this impartial testimony we all confidently appeal when charged with having slandered the Ministry and the Church.

Finally Brethren, whatever things are true, whatever things are honest, whatever things are just, whatever things are pure; whatever things are lovely, whatever things are of good report; if there be virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.—Phil. iv. 8.

Advert for a moment to the efforts which are made to remove slavery from the world, and to the hindrances which exist to all efforts which can be made to remove it, in consequence of the relation of the church to the system. Reflect how many members of the Christian church, and how many ministers of the gospel are owners of slaves: how little effort is made by the great mass to dissociate themselves from the system; how many there are, even in the pulpit, who openly advocate it; how much identified the system is with all the hopes of gain, and all the views of comfort and ease of domestic life among many members of the Church; and how faint and feeble is the voice of condemnation of the system, uttered by the great mass, even of those who have no connexion with it; and how often the language of apology is heard, even then; and it easy to see how ineffectual must be all efforts to remove this great evil from the world. The language of the ministry, and the practice of church members, give such a sanction to this enormous evil as could be derived from other sources, and such as is useless to attempt to remove the world of the evil. Against all this influence the church in favor of the system, how hopeless are attempts against it; while yet no one can doubt that the church of Christ, in this land, has power to revolutionize the whole public sentiment on the subject, and hasten the hour when, in the United States and their territories, the last shackles of the slave shall fall. I shall have occasion to revert to this in the other part of the discourse.

In the latter part of the discourse he thus alludes to the same subject:

"What is it that lends the most efficient sanction to slavery in the United States? What is it that does most to keep the public conscience at ease on the subject? What is it that renders abortive all efforts to remove the evil? I am not ignorant that the laws sustain the system, and that supported interest contributes to it, and that the love of idleness, and the love of power, and the love of base passions which the system engenders, and that a show of argument, opaque and inconclusive on the side of a certain line, but bright as noon day on the other, does much to sustain the system. But after all, the most efficient of all supports—the thing which most directly interferes with all attempts at reformation; that which gives the greatest quietus to the conscience, if it does not furnish the most satisfactory argument to the understanding, is the fact that the system is countenanced by good men; that bishops, and priests and deacons, that ministers and elders, that Sunday School teachers and exhorters, that pious matrons and hearers, that the holders of slaves, and that the ecclesiastical bodies of the land address no language of rebuke or entreaty to their consciences. That will be a slow work of reformation which will be undertaken against any thing that has the sanction of the church of the 'Living God.' For God meant that the church should occupy a prominent place in every effort to deliver the world from sin.

"Were all the ministers and members of the churches to do as simple a thing as the Society of Friends, after such toll and effort, have done; to remove from themselves the sin of slavery, and to stand before the world in the sublime and noble attitude of having no connexion whatever with the system, how soon would the system come to an end! Could it be proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of this land as it can be of that society, that no minister or member of the church is the owner of a slave, is there a man who believes that the system could live? Would it not, must it not die? Could the world, in this century, hold up the system in the face of a frowning church? and would this unknown, continuing to rot on out land, in the midst of a bright light that would shine, then, in every State and Territory of this Union? No man can believe it, and, if so, on whom then rests the responsibility of propagating this system from age to age?"

"Dr. Bacon says: I should like it if the Report declared that slaveholding is not intrinsically a sin, and that we shall NOT be coerced into action as if it were." Rev. Mr. Green remarked that he believed the sentiment alluded to was EMBODIED in the Report." Mr. Green is one of the secretaries of the Board, and wrote the report himself, chiefly; hence no one better knows its meaning than he did. On the principal vital point of the case there is entire agreement with the Presbyterian Assembly. Both say that chattel slaveholding is NOT in itself sin.—[Emancipator.

All true living members of Christ's spiritual body are *equal brethren*, and no portion of them have a right to lord it over the faith of those whom they acknowledge as Christians. They have no right to demand any terms of recognition or membership, except evidence of Christian character, nor to construct their churches upon such a model or put them under such supervision that Christians *cannot get in to them*, without coming under usages or institutions which, it is admitted, Christ and his apostles never established. To do this involves *sectarianism*, which always includes the sins of spiritual despotism and of schism.

We do not say that the sin of schism always assumes the specific form of sectarianism, but we do affirm that sectarianism, as here defined, always includes the sin of schism.

Divisions, jealousies, rivalries and unholy contentions between Christians, though they may belong to the same church, are of the nature of schism. Thus it was among the Corinthians to whom Paul wrote.—One was of Paul, another of Apollos, and another of Cophas," though they did not carry the matter so far as to divide churches and found distinct sects, as do the Lutherans, Calvinists, Armonians, and Wesleyans of modern times. They were rather like the rival parties now found within the bosom of the same sect.—Even this, Paul reprobated! How much more would they have deserved it had they gone farther in their "schism" and actually set up rival churches!

Sectarianism, as exhibited in modern times, includes "schism" and "ecclesiastical despotism" combined. It may properly be defined as church authority enforcing and perpetuating schism—compelling those to treat each other as aliens who nevertheless believe themselves to be fellow citizens and members of the household of faith.

We are glad to notice an increasing attention to the religious aspects of the slave question. The theological discussion is starting up afresh. The late action of the American Board has given it a new impulse. Dr. Edward Beecher and Prof. Stowe are writing out their arguments for the Boston Recorder, and A. A. Phelps is writing in reply to them. Liberty papers are giving unusual attention to ecclesiastical movements and positions.—The Missionary question is coming up, and Conventions are to be held. The new distinction originating at Princeton, and essentially adopted at Brooklyn by the American Board, cannot but be attended to, by all who would meddle politically or ecclesiastically, with American slavery. It constitutes the new platform on which Whig and Democrat, as

well as Old School and Now, are preparing to rally. It was in anticipation of this, that we gave the Princeton article so large a share of attention. The doctrine of "organic sin" is but a phase of the Princeton doctrine.—The following, from the Emancipator, gives some striking views of the present shape of the contest. For Dr. Bacon's Letter, alluded to, we have not room.

THE TWO SINS OF SLAVERY.

There are numerous indications that a considerable portion of the religious community are about taking a new position on the subject of slavery. The defence of slavery itself, which was formerly quite common, is given up, and a sort of "two seed" theory is adopted, or a "double sense" method of exegesis, by which slavery can be unequivocally condemned as sinful and abominable, and yet hold that the slaveholder is not to be censured for the act of slaveholding, because slavery is the fault of society. The various modifications of this "new theology," such as the more or less violent denunciation of slavery itself, and the more or less stringent rules for bringing up the slaveholder on the charge of abusing the power he has, and the greater or smaller concessions of responsibility or right on the part of Northern Christians to express their opinions on the subject, or to do anything for the removal of "the system"—these constitute the material points of difference among the leading ecclesiastical influences of this country. Some are trying to see how far they can carry their concessions in favor of slavery, without absolutely awakening public indignation against themselves at the North. Others are with equal assiduity trying to see how far they can carry their condemnation of slavery, without actually cutting themselves off from religious association with the South. The former class are seeing how near they can come to the justification of slaveholding without being actually identified with slaveholders: the latter, how near they can come to its condemnation without being actually identified with abolitionists.

These latter gentlemen profess to hold the same views of slavery that they have always held. Nothing magnifies them so much as the having it thought or said that the agitations and discussions occasioned by the abolition movement, have carried them forward, or occasioned an advance in their anti-slavery sentiments. And perhaps, in many cases, they may be able to show where, ten or fifteen years ago, they expressed the same condemnation of slavery that they do now. The difference is, that formerly they came reluctantly to the expression of these views, lest they should be taken for abolitionists—now they do it eagerly, lest they should be deemed apologists for slavery. Formerly, they put forth their anti-slavery sentiments as an apology for acting against abolition; now, they put forth their excuses for slaveholding as an apology for speaking against slavery.

Of this class of theologians, no one has from the beginning come nearer to abolition without hitting it, than the Rev. LEONARD BACON, D. D. of New Haven. And he seems to retain the same relative position at this time. His speech before the American Board was more force than that of any other supporter of the bifronted report adopted by that body: and he elicited out of all the possible meanings of that remarkable document, one more decidedly anti-slavery than could be found in it, by any other person.

Dr. B. once made a speech before the General Association of Connecticut, in June last, which almost left out the requisite drawbacks and disclaimers necessary to keep it from being an abolition speech. This was reported in the Christian Freeman, and has in some way attracted attention at the South; and a slaveholder calling himself "a Puritan at the South," has fiercely assailed him therefore, in the columns of the "Christian Observer," a paper published at Philadelphia, as the organ of the New School Presbyterians, and edited by two ministers, one brought from Richmond and the other from Charleston; for that purpose.

To this attack, Dr. B. wrote a response, which the Southern editors very naturally refused to publish, on the allegation that "the merits or demerits of slavery were not allowed to be discussed in that paper." Whereupon, the communication was transferred to the N. Y. Observer, where it readily found admittance, for the countenance it gives to the present continuance of slavery, and the cordial tolerance of slaveholders as such in the church. For this, the Observer easily overlooks the strong anti-slavery language, as bold and bitter as was ever used by Cassius M. Clay, or even by Goodell or Garrison.

The importance of the agitation in the ecclesiastical world, which has evidently taken a fresh start, has led us to give this letter of Dr. Bacon's, in full, together with the introductory remarks of the Observer. At the time, we do not care to offer many comments on Dr. Bacon's positions. The whole foundation of his error is comprised in a single phrase, which means nothing.

"THE RELATION OF MASTER TO ONE WHOM THE LAWS AND CONSTITUTION OF SOCIETY HAVE MADE A SLAVE."

There is no such thing in existence. It is all moonshine. A man is made a slave by being seized by some manstealer, and held and treated as property. He is born free. His right to liberty is unalienable; can neither be parted with nor taken from him. Every man who buys the claim to him, buys stolen property, and by establishing ownership becomes himself a manstealer. Slaveholding is the act of an individual. In no other way can "the relation of master" possibly exist, but by his own act of ownership. He buys a claim which every human being knows to be a nullity; or he takes a child which he knows belongs of right to the father that he got and the mother that bore it; or he follows in the footsteps of his father, by continuing the perpetration of the same wrong for which the latter has gone to answer at the bar of God. This is the whole of it. And the man who does it, is the man to answer for it. Take away this "theological fiction," about a "relation," established by the State, and the whole fabric of apology falls to the ground.

Another fallacy is in the phrase—"who buy, and sell human beings, like cattle, for gain." No man holds a slave but for his own benefit or gratification in some way. Why limit your answer to him who does it "for gain"? Is not he who buys, sells, or holds a slave for his convenience, for his pride, for his popularity, as worthy of condemnation as he who does it for gain?

Topics for Discussion.—Recent events cannot fail to give importance to the discussion of the following topics. We hope to give some attention to them.

1. The doctrine of "organic sin" as maintained by Edward Beecher and others, before the American Board.
2. The propriety of establishing Missions on Bible principles, as held by abolitionists, and ceasing wholly to sustain the American Board.
3. The proper principles and modes of operation, in supporting Missions. The character of class corporations—Superintending (or Episcopal) Committees, &c. &c. as now practiced by those professedly opposed to Episcopacy.

"Payments and Donations," for the Christian Investigator, up to November, 1845.

W. Gilbert, Wolf-Creek,	Mrs S. Beebe, Manlius, 50
Michigan,	\$2.00 R. Hall, Sullivan,
A. Sedgwick, Ogden,	1.00 C. Morris, Jorah,
J. Keep, Hartford, O.	1.00 J. R. Mann, Adams,
P. R. Pitts, Hancock,	1.00 J. Van Wormer, do,
H. Jewett, Dayton, O.	67 A. Smith, Whitesboro,
Des. Ingraham, Bristol,	1.00 W. H. Chandler, do,
A. W. Riley, Rochester,	1.00 H. Holster, Westfield,

☞ The friends of this publication will see that we need additional support.

☞ Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Hancock, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting. 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling. (Both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, \$0.52 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GODELL, Editor and Publisher.
HONOLY, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office; Perry, N. Y.

Where may be had
Cards, Blanks & Handbills
Together with every description of Book & Job Printing

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. III—No. 12. }
WHOLE NUMBER, 44.

ONEVOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. DECEMBER, 1845.

{ WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 19.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Papers, per dozen, 80 50 | Sixty papers, 8 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

TOO CHARITABLE! WERE WE?

While most people think us "*too severe and denunciatory*," there is another class of readers who complain of us for being *too charitable and lenient*. And we frankly confess that, on a review of our labors for eighteen years, we can find a dozen instances in which our estimate of men and of associated bodies of men have proved, by after developments, to have been too favorable, for one instance in which we have found ourselves wrong in thinking or speaking more severely of men than the case demanded. And not unfrequently somebody or other is rapping us over the knuckles for our over confiding reliance on professions and appearances which our monitors consider fallacious, and which, in our mortification, too frequently turn out to be so, though in some instances, this does not prove to be the case.

These thoughts are suggested by a Letter we have recently received from a correspondent in New England, who takes us in hand, pretty sharply, for our favorable notice, and extract, from the Green Mountain Freeman, of Church Reform Conventions in Vermont. He alludes to the "*Call*" for Conventions at Morrisville and Ludlow, and to the commendatory notice we made of it. That the full extent of our error may be apprehended, we copy the objectionable matter from our paper of August last.

Our readers will be gratified to see the close of the "*Call*" with some of the names annexed. Something must be done to revive undecified religion.

"Zion is desolate." "How shall Jacob arise?" "I will be inquired of for these things, saith the Lord."—We who abhor slavery, must not, will not, fail to do what we can, to drive him from his strong hold, the church of God. Is there not enough of the spirit of Moses yet upon the earth, to lead us to throw ourselves in the gap and save, a polluted, rebellious church from the deserved wrath of an angry God? Our object in calling these meetings is not to *destroy* or *disorganize*, but to *save*. We wish to convert, and pray, and act, as the spirit of Christianity demands. Again we say, Come—Come not to see and hear, but come to pray, and to be "*doers of the word*." Our common Savior, in the persons of his despised followers, is suffering in prisons, and in sickness, yea, and in slavery, too, in this land of Bibles—a legalized system "the vilest that ever saw the sun." A host of his professed followers are consenting unto his death. How long shall we hold our place and thus give our consent also?

Upon this, our Correspondent remarks.

"As one of your readers, I wish to say that I am anything but "*gratified*" with the extract you have given from the "*Call*."

* * * That the American churches are the *BULWARKS* of American slavery has been proved by James G. Birney, William Goodell and a host of others. Why then, this feverish anxiety, on the part of certain abolitionists, to save from destruction an acknowledged abomination, which shelters "the vilest system that ever saw the sun"? Why not "*come out*" of these "*rebellious*" organizations and leave them to "the deserved wrath of an angry God." Is it true that a corrupt "*polluted and rebellious*" church acknowledged to be "*the strong hold of slavery*" can possibly be "*the church of God*." Nay, verily.

So writes our Correspondent. Now we confess we did not stop to criticize very closely the language of the "*Call*." Nor did we notice, particularly, the apparent implication that a pro-slavery church might be a "*church of God*." The churches profess to be such, and are called by that name. We were "*gratified*" with what seemed to be an earnest effort to abolitionize those churches and presumed our readers would be. The churches, right or wrong, have great power, for good or for evil. Why then should we not wish to see that power used on behalf of the slave? Whatever we might think of the churches, we should be "*gratified*" with any movement in this direction. Mr. Garrison himself, who is not liable to the suspicion of any undue "*feverish anxiety*," to save the American churches, publishes, with apparent "*gratification*," (as we understand) the recent protest of 170 Unitarian ministers against

slavery. That document so far from being up to the tone of the "*Vermont Call*" justifies continued religious fellowship with slaveholders, as does the American Board, and in no respect, we believe, in advance of the resolutions and declarations of the General Associations of Congregational Ministers in New England, years ago, whose general course has nevertheless, like that of the body of Unitarian ministers, very awkwardly contrasted with their professions. The earnest tone and active aspect of the Vermont Call led us to place it far in advance (in our estimation) of any of the ecclesiastical documents, Unitarian or orthodox, that had reached us from New England, and which have nevertheless been published, by all sorts of abolitionists, as evidence of the progress of our cause. In this view we shall indulge, and be "*gratified*" with it, till we see the evidence of our mistake.

As to the consistency or propriety of denominating pro-slavery churches, "*churches of God*," that is another matter, and one in which we expressed no opinion, when we published the "*Call*." We do not vouch for the consistency and propriety of all that is said by those with whose progressive movements we are "*gratified*." At this rate we should be "*gratified*" with very few publications of the friends of the slave. For we seldom sit down to an hour's anti-slavery reading, without meeting something from which we dissent. We are, all of us, a little like the good French lady who wondered that she could never find any body *exactly* right, about *every* thing, but *herself*. We have our own standard of consistency, and mean it shall be understood, without stopping to notice *every* departure of our friends from the standard. If the signers of Vermont "*Call*" do not see every thing as we do, they may, nevertheless, be on the right track, in the main. They may see some things to-morrow, that they do not see to-day. Tell me not, said Montesquieu, that the people are not to be trusted, because they sometimes reason *incorrectly*. It is sufficient that they *reason*. Show us men honestly and earnestly intent on purging the churches from the sin of slavery, and we can afford to let them differ from us, without refusing to be "*gratified*." Let us all work on, and we

shall differ less, by and by. Our trouble with the great body of ministers and religionists, especially the leading ones, is, not that they differ, somewhat, from us, about expressions, and measures, but that their settled course of conduct and deceptive manoeuvres, plainly show that there is no honest and hearty love of humanity in them. We are not ready to think thus of those who originated the Vermont "Call." Some of them we know, and others of them are in good repute among good men.

When we say "the American churches are the bulwarks of American slavery" we mean to state a *general fact*, but we do not intend to foreclose ourselves from making all such exceptions to the general statement, as the truth of the case warrants and requires. There are churches, and an increasing number of them, now, that, so far from being "the bulwarks of American slavery" are among the most consistent and efficient of the organizations wielded against it. They neither hold fellowship with slave holders nor with pro-slavery men, nor with those who vote for them. Some of these churches have been formed by coming out of the old churches, and organizing anew. Others of them consist, for the most part, of the same members who were once pro-slavery but have now become converted to abolition, and being a controlling majority of the local church have succeeded in disconnecting it from all other ecclesiastical bodies, in consequence of which the pro-slavery minority have left them, and worship elsewhere, leaving the abolitionists in full possession of the old church, which is thus "saved." In other churches this process is going on. The pro-slavery minister is exchanged for an anti-slavery one. The connexion of the church with the pro-slavery Association, Presbytery, Synod, &c. cut off, or this process is in contemplation, or in train of accomplishment. Instead of a pro-slavery majority there is an anti-slavery majority, and the pro-slavery party is dwindling away, by the conversion of some and the disaffection and quitting of others. At what precise point in this process, the church may properly be considered, on the whole, as giving evidence of being already, a "church of God," a "congregation of faithful men," it may sometimes be difficult to determine. We are "gratified" with the

process, nevertheless. Such cases are not as common as we could wish they were, but while we have no hope of reforming any of the existing denominations, as such, nor of the extended ecclesiastical bodies connected with them nor of more than comparatively a few of the local churches, now existing, yet we do not consider it improper nor out of place, to call upon church members, and churches, along with the rest of the community, to repent, and do works meet for repentance, and thus be "saved." We are more "gratified" when we see an entire local church "come out" from its pro-slavery sect, and erect the standard of a pure Christianity than we are to see a few scattered individuals do so, especially if they "forsake the assembling of themselves together" (in local assemblies or churches, for religious purposes) "as the manner of some is."

And few as the cases are, our own familiarity with them, in central and western New York, in some of the forms that have been described, led us to suppose that something of the kind was in process of accomplishment—or, at least of endeavor—in Vermont.—Whether we were mistaken, time must show.

How our C respondent views these matters, we know not, but, for our own part, while we cannot admit that a pro-slavery or apparently neutral church, at this late day, can give evidence of being Christian, while they continue in such a position, yet we do not think it too late to "show the people their transgressions and the house of Jacob (i. e. the church) their sins." God himself repeatedly calls his people "rebellious," and calls upon his "Zion" to "shake herself from the dust," and be "cleansed from her filthiness," and "forsake her idols." The Savior called on the seven churches of Asia to repent and do their first works, and had they heeded the warning, they would have been "saved" from final apostasy and ruin. He is now warning the churches in this country, (whether they are in reality his or no) and it is our duty to re-echo his warning, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. If they are what they profess to be, Christ's churches, they will hear his voice, and repent and be saved. If they are not, at present, entitled to the name of being his churches, they may, nevertheless, even now, be "saved" and become his churches, in very deed, if they will only hear and repent.

We have no "feverish anxiety" to save either churches or political organizations, while remaining pro-slavery, from the condemnation they deserve. We have no idea of saving

them in their sins. To "save" them from their sins, and thus preserve them, as means of doing good instead of evil, is altogether a different affair. In such an enterprise we think it commendable to be zealous. And we shall not be found among some, who, to manifest a "feverish anxiety" for the destruction or abandonment of all civil and religious organizations and institutions, whether free or despotic, whether composed of good and bad men, whether wielded in favor of right or against it.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, DECEMBER, 1845.

ORGANIC SINS.

"Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." Prov. xi: 21.

At the late meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Brooklyn (Sept. 1845,) a Report was presented and, after discussion, unanimously adopted by the corporate members of that body, defining its course and policy in respect to the practice of slaveholding in the Mission churches gathered by its Missionaries and sustained by its funds. "Both masters and slaves," was admitted, had been received into the churches, among the Choctaws and Che-lokes. And the Report proposes the continuance of the same policy. "Yet it explicitly admits 'the unrighteousness of the principle upon which the whole system [of slavery] is based.'" And Dr. Leonard Bacon, one of the members who advocated the Report, made of the language that follows.

"What is the point in question? Not the evil of slavery. We all hold slavery to be the greatest abomination in all the earth. But the point is this. What evidence of piety? The memorialists say that slave holders do not give evidence of piety. To this I do not agree. The New Testament shows that in the churches that were addressed by Paul there were believing slaves."

So then, the habitual, determined, impotent, incorrigible perpetrators of "the greatest abomination in all the earth," may give evidence of piety! For if the Missionaries properly reprove "the greatest abomination in all the earth" such must be the position of the slaveholders among their hearers.

Mr. Phelps, and others, who opposed the adoption of the Report, in that form, and proposed amendments, did not insist upon nor occupy the ground that no slave holder, in any possible case, could be a Christian. The

* Report of the debates in the Boston Recorder of Dec. 18, 1845.

* Should any of the members of these churches, that they will not even co-operate in those Anti-Slavery Societies, the majority of whose members vote for slaveholders. This has been imputed to them as a fault, by those who are most sweeping in their statements concerning the pro-slavery character of the churches, and what is still more strange, the policy of organizing distinct anti-slavery churches has been condemned by them, because analogous to that of distinct political action. We cannot satisfy such persons without injuring civil government and church organization both.

claimed that the fact of his slave holding would be held as *prima facie* evidence of not being a Christian, unless he could show a special reason why his case should be allowed an exception to the general rule. He asked that the practice of slaveholding should be placed on the same footing with drunkenness and other practices admitted to be wicked. But to this the Board would not assent, and rejected the proposed amendment of Mr. Phelps, of that import.

There, then, is a remarkable position assumed by the Board.

The unrighteousness of the principles" say they, "on which the whole system is based, and the violation of the natural rights of man, the debasement, wretchedness and misery it involves, and which are, in fact, a curse to a greater or less extent, wherever it exists, call forth the hearty condemnation of all possessed of a true feeling and sense of right, and make its speedy removal an object of earnest and prayerful desire to every true friend of God and man."

Yet this "unrighteousness" so heartily to be "condemned" by all Christians, is received, without hesitancy, into the bosom of the Mission churches! Its practice is to be regarded as any impediment to membership in those churches. On account of it, the question of Christian character is not even raised, when a man wishes to join the church, any more than on account of his being a lawyer! "As to the question"—said Linus Child, of Massachusetts—"whether a slaveholder can be a Christian, it reminds me of the question once asked, whether a man could be a good man? The answer was, 'That depends on how he behaves'!" This illustration, which placed the avowed slaveholding upon the same honorable footing with that of the Hon. gentleman himself, a legal profession, the countenances of the honorable Board responded, with approving nods, and not one of their number expressed dissent from it. Dr. Bacon himself, the gentleman who declared "slavery to be the greatest abomination in all the earth" went as far as Mr. Child in pouring contempt upon the doctrine of abolitionists, that slaveholding is essentially sinful. Like Prof. Stowe, he rested on the distinction (first discovered in the case of the *Amos*) between slavery and slave holding. And as for excluding men from church membership on account of slaveholding, he merely said, "people won't stand that nonsense." To the statement there was witnessed the result of a general laugh from the members of the Board.

On the problem, before the Board, evidently the Recorder of Sept. 25. The N. Y. Observer of Sept. 25 contains a similar report of this remarkable meeting. "With reference to slaveholders, he said, he was as a friend of his old, when asked, can a slaveholder be a Christian, and the answer was—'It depends very much upon how he behaves himself.'"

And so the grand argument of the Report, drawn from the independent rights of the Mission churches, had to be given up, in the very beginning of the debate! And well it might, since the Report itself had inadvertently done the same thing, by undertaking to specify certain offences, (distinct, in its view from slaveholding) on account of which, in its judgment, the Mission churches ought to be expected to exercise discipline—thus plainly showing that if the Board had only considered slaveholding to be inherently sinful, it could have said so, and shaped its course accordingly, without any fear of invading the rights of the Mission churches.

"We are their employers (i. e. of the Missionaries) they are our hired men, our employees. It is a relation of giving and receiving—a relation such as exists in any civil contract, and may be dissolved at the discretion of either party. If the Missionaries are doing what we disapprove, we can recall them; if they dislike the conditions on which we send them, they can return. Now the Memorialists say that some of these hired men, these employees, are doing that which is not right. They call on us to require of them a different conduct or recall them. The Memorialists are right in this. They have a right to demand this, and we are bound to consider the complaint."

And so the grand argument of the Report, drawn from the independent rights of the Mission churches, had to be given up, in the very beginning of the debate! And well it might, since the Report itself had inadvertently done the same thing, by undertaking to specify certain offences, (distinct, in its view from slaveholding) on account of which, in its judgment, the Mission churches ought to be expected to exercise discipline—thus plainly showing that if the Board had only considered slaveholding to be inherently sinful, it could have said so, and shaped its course accordingly, without any fear of invading the rights of the Mission churches.

But, whatever might be the rights of the Mission churches, or the restraints which a due regard for those rights might impose upon the action of the Board, there was certainly nothing in those rights nor in those restraints that could help the Board to reconcile with each other its two diverse doctrines, the innocence or almost innocence of slave holding, on the one hand and the "unrighteousness of the principles upon which the whole system" ("the greatest abomination in all the earth") "is based," on the other.

As little to the point of solving this problem, was that other favorite argument of the Report, (involving a principle so little honored by the churches sustaining the Board) based on the imperative duty "of receiving to their churches, all those and only those, who give satisfactory evidence of repentance and faith

in the Lord Jesus Christ." For the problem just mentioned must first be solved, and so solved as to leave the practice of slaveholding unimpeached of flagrant "wickedness" before it could appear that incorrigible slaveholders do give the "satisfactory evidence" required.

It became evidently necessary, therefore, for the advocates of the Report, to go out of the document itself, for the arguments by which its doctrines were to be sustained.—This was manifestly felt, and this accounts for the marked gratification and relief expressed in the very countenances of the members corporate, when Dr. Edward Beecher of Boston, in the first place, and Dr. Leonard Bacon and Prof. C. E. Stowe, afterwards, brought forth and expanded their doctrine of "organic sin." This was obviously hailed as a new discovery of incalculable value. As such it was afterwards spoken of, by the members.—No member present, perhaps, was more grateful for this new light than Dr. Joel Hawes,* who was evidently troubled to reconcile his anti-slavery professions with his sanction of such a Report.

The doctrine of "organic sin", therefore, becomes the main hinge of the entire debate between the memorialists and the Board. If that doctrine be sound, the Board are sustained in their course. If it cannot bear scrutiny, then the Board are left without any valid defence—none upon which the members, while assembled for discussion, dared to rely. We proceed, therefore, to a consideration of that doctrine.

THE NEW DOCTRINE OF 'ORGANIC SIN' STATED.

We will state this "important distinction" in the language of its discoverers.

Rev. Dr. Beecher said the point on which this question turns is brought out by the enquiry, "Why do we not treat this subject of slavery, as we do theft, drunkenness, or any other sin?" The reason is easily given. The reading of the New Testament has produced the impression that there were slaves and slaveholders in the Apostolic churches. He had made all researches in his power into the history of the early churches, especially the writings of Ignatius, and all history is unanimous in confirming the fact. There can be no question about it? The Apostles did admit slaveholders to the church.

*Dr. Hawes said, "The Report might have been more complete in some particulars. When speaking of the principles upon which Missions should be conducted, I should be glad if there were a clause stating that it was not to be understood that this institution is to be permanent, but that the gospel is to be so preached as to eradicate it, in the briefest possible time."

The reader will notice and remember Dr. Hawes' testimony that the Report did not take ground against the permanency of slavery in the churches, nor insist on such preaching as would eradicate it. Yet Dr. Hawes voted for that Report, and probably because he felt relieved by the doctrine of "organic sin" as explained by Dr. Beecher, &c. For he added—

"I could have wished too, that the important distinction between personal and social sin, had been enlarged upon. It is one of great value.—[Vide N. Y. Evangelist, Sept. 18, 1845.]

The reader will here observe the idea that "social" sins are not "personal" sins! A doctrine "of great value" truly, to those who wish for impunity in "following a multitude to do evil!"

*We were utterly amazed at the cool repetition be-

Prof. Stowe of Cincinnati, endorsed, fully, this doctrine, and said he "would include concubinage, polygamy, war and slavery in the same category."

The learned Professor might have included idolatry, infanticide, and the burning of widows on the funeral pile, "in the same category," if he had pleased. For they are equally "sins of the body politic, the creatures of law," and "interwoven" (as some of the speakers expressed it) "into the institutions, framework and structure of society"—in the countries where they prevail.

Mr. A. F. Williams, a layman, from Farmington, Conn., in the course of the debate, inquired of the members of the Board whether they were prepared to carry out this principle, by admitting into their Mission churches, the Turkish Sultan, if he should profess faith in Christ, and yet continue the practice of "concubinage and polygamy" by retaining his harem of a thousand wives? He paused for a reply. But neither Dr. Beecher, Dr. Bacon, Dr. Hawes, Prof. Stowe, or any other member of the corporate Board, either then or afterwards, adventured to answer the question! They could not have answered "NO" without casting their "important distinction" to the winds!

We have not convenient room, here, for the extended remarks, by which Dr. Bacon, as well as Prof. Stowe, endeavored to illustrate and maintain the wide distinction between organic and personal sins. Enough has been quoted to show what the doctrine is, and the uses for which it was introduced.

IN THE DOCTRINE A SOUND ONE?

Does it accord with the truth? With the principles of fundamental morality? With the doctrines of natural and revealed religion? With the dictates of conscience and of right reason? With the teachings of the Bible?

For the Board, at this day, of this gratuitous assumption of the pro-slavery school. Just as though President Green had not, years ago, in his Review of Professors Hodge and Stuart, demolished their castle, at a blow, and scattered the fragments beyond the hope of recovery. How happens it that no Biblical critic will risk his reputation in an attempt to answer that work of President Green? And what is to be inferred from this inveterate habit of repeating exploded absurdities and fictions, so long after any one will even attempt a decent defense of them?

It is evident therefore that God has treated this subject differently from that of stealing or other vices, and if we could not find any philosophical reason for this fact, there is the fact, which cannot be disputed. And here is a reason for it. Slavery is an organic sin, while other sins are individual and personal. There is no system that makes a man a liar or an adulterer. Slavery is a sin of the body politic, the creature of the law; involving sin in the community, but not necessarily in every person sustaining the relation of master. Now a person may be so involved in slavery that he cannot throw so off; but no relation can make a man a liar or keep him

With the moral government of God as witnessed in this world, and as predicated to be revealed in the world to come? Does it agree with the nature and responsibilities of man as an accountable being? And can it be a trustworthy guide, in the work of declaring the whole council of God, and showing the people their sins? Does it put a difference between the clean and the unclean—between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not?—Is it adapted to be the sword of the Spirit, in convincing the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment to come? Can a world lying in wickedness and cherishing allegiance to the god of this world, be reclaimed from its vassalage and restored to the sway of Jesus Christ, by such teachings?

The very questions should carry their answers along with them. To thousands of unsophisticated minds, they will do this. And to thousands and tens of thousands more, the questions will not need to be asked. The doctrine, as stated by those who hold it, will only need to be heard in order to be loathed. We ask such to bear with us while we present to another class of readers some considerations which may, at least, induce them to examine before receiving this doctrine of teachers in whom they have been accustomed to confide.

If the doctrine maintained before the American Board by Doctors Beecher and Bacon, and Prof. Stowe, be a sound one, it must be so on either one or the other, of the following grounds, or considerations, viz:

1. That organic sins are less heinous, less aggravated and less virulent and mischievous than other sins;—or

2. That the individuals participating in such sins are, in some way, absolved from the blame, or from a large portion of the blame, of committing them.

Under each of these two general heads of inquiry, a number of particulars may be embraced. We shall endeavor to look at them, in their order. And in the first place,

ARE ORGANIC SINS LESS HEINOUS THAN OTHERS.

Are they less aggravated, less virulent, less mischievous?

We maintain that they are not, and that, on the other hand, if a difference is to be observed, they are peculiarly aggravated and involve the deepest degrees of guilt.

Organic sins are social sins, public sins, national sins—sins in which an entire community, with few exceptions, are involved. In the fullest sense of the term, and as explained by those with whom we now contend, they are sins committed by a people in their public

and organized capacity. They are sins which affect and which press into their service, the essential organs, instruments, and indications of man's social existence and social action on a large scale, the existence and the action of communities of men. Now what is the peculiar in this class of sins? We answer

1. They are sins on the largest possible scale; sins superlative in magnitude, in extent, in degree. The mischief and the guilt of such sins must be in proportion to this magnitude, extent and degree.

2. They are public sins, not only as being committed by the public, but before the public. Surrounding nations, the whole world, posterity, to the end of time, so far as history extends, and so long as it continues, are injuriously affected by the evil example of such sins, and that in proportion to the rejected greatness, wisdom, and goodness of nations or communities committing them. *more individual sin might be a private sin, known beyond the life time of the perpetrator, and the narrow circle of his acquaintance*

If "one sinner destroyeth much good" much more ten or fifteen millions of sinners acting together, and thus giving an universal presence and a perpetuity to the contamination. Sin is a moral pestilence, comparably limited while isolated and in secret, but limitable when it breaks over private boundaries, and becomes every where diffused.

3. Organic sins, in distinction from isolated, private sins, are direct and like conspiracies in rebellion against God. they are described in Scripture. Witness second Psalm. Now such public conspiracies are more aggravated than any more isolated individual acts of disobedience to law. They are more dangerous to the public tranquility and order—to the maintenance of good government, and to the welfare of law-abiding and dutiful subjects. And accordingly, in all civil governments as well as under the vine government, they are held capital offenses and treated with marked rigor.

4. Organic sins are more deliberately planned than more private individual offences mostly are. At least there is more method and undeniable evidence of such deliberation and planning. A single act of injustice or oppression, or of violence might be the result of momentary impulse, of passion, of thoughtlessness, or want of reflection. Or it might be committed under the pressure of personal necessities, or the force of unusual temptations. But nothing of this kind can be pleaded in extenuation of public, social, or national injustice and violence, where thousands and millions of minds and hands

involved, with evident skill, deliberation, perseverance to the accomplishment of success. If "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety" or the evident means of learning and devising the true course of action, then, in the iniquity planned by a multitude of counsellors, all or nearly all, consenting and conspiring, there must be great and inconceivable guilt. And this truth is the more evident, because,

5. It follows, that organic sins, in comparison with more private sins, involve a far stronger and more inveterate determination of sinning. Organic sins are systematic sins—and include systematic arrangements for sinning. If it be sinful to kill a man, in a fit of passion, how much more sinful must it be, to construct and put in operation, in cold blood, a machine for the express purpose of murdering men.—And this suggests another consideration.

6. Organic sins, in distinction from ordinary personal sins, involve the settled purpose of future sinning. A man might rob the laborer of his hire, to day, without indulging the thought of doing the same thing by him to-morrow, and next day, and next month, and next year, and so on to the close of life. But when this sin becomes, as in our country, an organic sin, it becomes not merely the sin of to-day; but, in purpose (with few exceptions) the sin of every future day, while life lasts. And thus, in organic sinning, the sinner is enabled to compress into a single day, the sins of all the days in a half century to come, if he expects to live so long, and in the sight of the heart-searching Judge, he becomes in reality guilty of the sins of all those thousands of days, in which he intends and calculates to commit the same sin, over and over again, whether he lives long enough to consummate the outward action or no. Thus does organic sin increase instead of diminishing personal sin! But this is not all. For,

7. Sin, in an organic form, is an attempt to perpetuate the sin, whatever it may be. Not only, (as a general fact) do those who sin organic sins, make their calculations to continue in the sin as long as they live, but they commonly calculate to fortify and intrench the sin in the usages and institutions of society, in such a manner as to transmit it to generations yet unborn. And this justifies the additional remark that,

8. Organic sin is a device and an attempt to draw every body into sin. Suppose a rich man to withhold, by fraud, the hire of the laborer who reaps down his fields. Suppose him to task, torture, brutalize, and heathenize his victim (were it possible for an isolated oppressor, unaided, to do so) as completely as is

now done, in this country, by means of organic oppression. So long as this remained a mere individual act, disconnected with the usages and institutions of society, it remains his act alone, and he cannot be charged perhaps, with seeking to draw every body else, his own children and children's children, into the same sin, along with all in his own life time, who help him sin, by making his sin an organic sin. Thus, the mere private individual oppressor, however intolerable his exactions and his inflictions may be, is but one oppressor, after all, and has but one oppressor's guilt, to weigh down his soul into the pit. But only make the sin organic, connect it with the very frame work of human society, and by consenting to be an oppressor, to the same degree, in connexion with the fearful machinery of this organic sin, and at once he multiplies himself into millions of oppressors, whom he draws into the same sin, and thus multiplies his guilt by the untold number of their names. He sins the terrible sin of "Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin."

9. Whenever any sin becomes organic, it assumes its most inveterate form, fortifies itself against all the appropriate means of cure, and becomes most difficult to be removed. Moral disease is, in this respect analogous to physical disease. Diseases that become organic, that affect the very organs of life, that vitiate their action, and make them do the very reverse of what the framer of the human body designed them to do, are the most fatal with which human beings are assailed. And the same holds true in respect to moral diseases that war against the life of the soul. Organic sins do not merely, like other sins, pollute the inner man. They transform into sin or into instruments of sinning, the very frame work of social life, designed for benevolent and holy ends.

Now this feature of organic sins is not unknown to those who contrive and who sustain them. This is the very feature or quality that recommends them to toleration and favor. No one would oppose the efforts now making in this country to overthrow those arrangements by which the sin of oppression has been made organic—nay, all men would heartily welcome and sustain those efforts—were it not for their knowledge that the overthrow of these organic arrangements would tend to overthrow the sin itself, and render the practice of it impossible in the age and nation we live in. The abolition of the slave laws would wipe out the foulest blot on our national escutcheon, would honor the American name,

*Difficult, we mean, for those who would persuade men to abandon their sins. The difficulty in the way of repenting of sin, has been greatly magnified, and its nature mis understood. It is a difficulty defined by, and proportioned to, the obduracy and guilt of the sinner.

enhance the public security and augment our national wealth. No one disputes this. But then, the abolition of those laws would terminate the practices of slave holding, from which some derive their gains, others their power, and by which others retain their idolized caste, or their cherished ease; or gratify their beastly lusts. It is the practice of slave holding that gives value to the slave laws. The practice of slave holding is the cherished good.—[And hence too, it is the practice of slave holding that our ecclesiastics must hold to be innocent, Bible sanctioned, and worthy of a place in the Church, however they may affect to deplore and condemn the Slave laws.]—Thus certain is it that sins are made organic and continuously kept so, to shelter them, and keep them from being disturbed.

To sustain an organic form of Sin is therefore to incur aggravated guilt. It is seeking to entrench and fortify sin, against God's own appointed means for its overthrow. And on this account the participant in an organic sin, is more blameworthy than the isolated individual who, without resort to organic devices, commits a similar act.

10. Organic sin enable many men to live in Sin which they could not otherwise begin to commit. And they tempt and enable many others to sin to a greater extent, and in a greater degree than they would otherwise sin.

If slave holding were not an organic sin, in this country, who, among our millions of citizens could commit it! at least in its present aggravated form? Who could reduce his neighbor to absolute chattelhood? Enforce labor without wages? Forbid Christian education? Separate families like brutes? Or hunt flying fugitives with blood hounds?

Let Slave holding cease to be organic, and if it did not cease wholly and at once to exist it would become a totally different thing, and would bear a better comparison with patriarchal servitude than it does now. It is because the Slave holder has made his Sin an organic one, and still keep it such, that he is enabled to wield irresponsible, illimitable, despotic power, and perpetrate, with impunity, such cruelties, and enforce such exactions, as human nature could not, otherwise, be made to endure.

11. Organic sins are peculiarly atrocious, because they are perversions of our Social nature and wield in favor of sin that public sentiment (whether embodied in statute laws or otherwise) that was designed by the Creator to be wielded against it.

Our social natures were given us to be guardians of our virtues. But by devising and upholding organic sins, we have made that

same social nature the guardian and defence of our wickedness!

12. By the aid of their organic sin, men contrive likewise to escape, so far as is possible, the operation of those natural laws by which it is made for their pecuniary interest, even in the present life, to obey God, and do good to man. The modes of oppression practised in this Country, are so destructive of individual as well as public wealth, that they would soon fall into disuse, were it not that the arrangements by which the sin has been made an organic one, are such as to throw the pecuniary losses of the practice, to a great extent, from off the shoulders of the immediate actors of the wickedness, (comparatively few in number) on to the shoulders of the millions of this nation, who have consented to become partners in the sin.

Let the 250,000 claimants of Slave property in the United States pursue (if they could do so) their present personal practices, as individuals, and maintain their present habits of prodigality and idleness, without any of the organic arrangements, political, commercial, and ecclesiastical, by which Slave holding is made a system, and maintained as a national, a public, an organic, a consecrated sin! Let them attempt to do this, and how long could Slave holding endure? Probably not for two years. Certainly not for ten.

There is deep guilt involved in sustaining organic arrangements, that thus withdraw Heaven's own ordained restraints and boundaries from oppression and Sin. The laws of the commercial world are God's laws, and no man may be guiltless who attempts to subvert them and turn them aside from their holy mission. These laws are out against oppression and prescribe its bounds. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further" is their mandate. The giant sin stands abashed in their presence. But gathering up itself, it assumes an organic form, (Hell's deepest game) and taxes empires for its support, and lives on, where nature's God had destined it to starve! Can there be guilt beyond that of sustaining "organic" iniquities like these? But consider still further.

13. Organic sins, such as were described, before the American Board, "sins of the body politic, the creatures of law, involving in sin the Community," are perversions of a divine institution, wielding for purposes of wickedness and of human destruction what God, who instituted them, designed and appointed for precisely opposite ends.

Civil government is ordained of God, for the express purpose of protecting human rights.—But the "organic sin" discussed before the American Board makes use of civil govern-

ment, (or of what pretends to be such) for the purpose of abrogating human rights, and trampling them in the mire.

The "authorities ordained of God," are defined by the sacred penman who challenge our veneration of them. They are "a terror to him that doeth evil" a "praise to him that doeth well." They are "God's ministers, attending continually to this very thing." And "for this cause," we are commanded to "pay tribute." They are to "execute judgment between a man and his neighbor, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor."—They are to "proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof." And hence the divine admonitions "Judges and officers shall thou make thee in all thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and they shall rule the people with just judgment."—"When the wicked bear rule the people mourn"—"He that ruleth over men must be just ruling in the fear of God."

This is God's own institution of Civil government. And this is its mission, its sole mission, beyond or beside which it has no errand among men or authority over them.

When it has secured to every human being all his original natural rights, unimpaired, when it has effectually restrained each individual oppressor and put a stop to his oppression, then, its whole work is performed.

Now it is by seizing upon this very institution, or upon that which is exalted in its stead, and by making it the protector of oppressors, and the terror of their innocent victims, that the "organic sin" discoursed upon before the American Board, comes into being. This is the description of the Sin itself, in its "organic" form.

Is it credible that the individual participating in this sin is less guilty than he who commits similar oppressions without attempting to pervert God's own institution of Civil government into the service of the Sin? Common sense answers No! The reverse of all this fact. A further statement, accordingly, needs to be made.

14. Organic sins, wielding civil government (or that which should be such) for purposes of oppression involve impious and audacious attempts to force even God himself into a conspiracy against his own throne, and in favor of the supremacy of sin, and the ruin of mankind!

This is strong language, but not stronger than the case requires nor stronger than the inspired writer's use, on this very subject.—They emphatically enquire of God "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship, with

thee, which frameth mischief by a law?"

Translated or paraphrased, into modern phraseology, the inquiry may be repeated thus:—"Can it be true, Oh thou God of righteousness (assuredly it cannot!) Can it be true, that the apologists of organic sin would persuade us, that wicked men have succeeded in pressing thee into the service of wickedness against thine own glorious nature? Can it be true, that thou dost regard with comparative lenity this mischief framed by a law, and permit it to place in the sanctuary of the faithful?"

15. Whenever a particular class of Sin assumes an organic form, and thus receives the Sanction of the Community in which they are committed, (and especially when this sanction is continued from one generation to another, the sin however despicable and disgraceful in its isolated form, becomes stripped of its infamy and meanness in the estimation of men and unfrequently, puts on the airs of peculiar respectability and the reputation of its successful commission is prized as an honorable badge.

Let a person, under common circumstances, subsist on the avails of unpaid labor and riot upon the hard earnings of defenceless females, let him tear infants from the breasts of their mothers, and claim them as his property or sell them by the pound, and the detestation of a civilized community would light upon and seethe the head of the perpetrator of such foul and mean deeds. But only make the sin an organic one, and how suddenly the case is changed! The man becomes an object of envy who boasts his coffers filled with the earnings of hundreds of Slaves who counts the increase of his human herds at the rate of scores every year! Is there not incomparable guilt in a device that thus removes merited infamy from crime nay, rather, that binds guilt around the brows of the criminal as a garland, that transforms into glory what God, and nature, and conscience, and Christianity, have designated as a burning shame!

16. Organic sins, long persisted in, are more inexcusable than many other sins, because their malignant character and dreadful effects are more fully, more extensively, more publicly, and more undeniably manifested.

When this African Slave trade and the holding of Africans as slaves, by Europeans and Americans, first commenced, the practice was with little or no public sanction, in the form of statute law. The usage sprang up first, and the corresponding legislation afterwards. Before the slave laws were enacted, the practice was rather an individual than an

individual act, the character of slaveholding is more mild than it has since been, because individual power was incompetent to the Commission of the despotic system. Not only so, but it was impossible for any one to have foreseen, at that time, the barbarities and the abominations, to which the Slave System, as an organic form of the Sin, would give rise.— Queen Elizabeth tolerated the Slave trade, as the professed view of Christianizing the heathens, and with the special proviso that they should not be colonized to America without their own consent! The organic form of the sin for two centuries, has now put it out of the power of any persons to commit it under any mistaken notion of that kind, and the effects of the chattel principle are now developing as they never could have been, if slavery had not been an organic sin. The sin of the Egyptians, in oppressing the Hebrews, was the more systematic, mature, and developed, for its being an organic sin.— The iniquity of a people becomes "full" and they become ripe for divine judgments when they have systematized their sins, by giving them an organic form. While any sin exists among a people in an isolated form, and is only the sin of scattered individuals, here and there, less is known of the wickedness and destructive tendencies of the practice. Men might be in the sin of ignorance when led into such practices, not being fully apprized of the real nature and consequences of their acts. But in most cases of organic sin, where the whole structure of society and its institutions are shaped into a conformity with a prevalent sin and in subserviency to it, the nature of the sin and the results of it are so public and so well known that there is comparatively little room for such an excuse.

On all these accounts, it is manifest that organic sins are the most extensive and aggravated of all sins, involving peculiar atrocity and guilt.

DO "ORGANIC SINS" REST UPON ANY INDIVIDUAL? AND IF SO, UPON WHOM?

If the facts are as has been stated, how can it be true that the individuals involved in the commission of organic sins are less guilty than those who are involved in the Commission of isolated, individual sins?

There can be no Sins without sinners, nor

*Little did Queen Elizabeth imagine that the time would come when the American Slaveholders would send their Colonies back to Africa, the free people of color with their own consent in order that they might be Christianized!

great sins without great sinners. The more heinous the sin, the more aggravated the guilt.

It was admitted, before the American Board by those who pleaded this doctrine of organic sin in behalf of the Slaveholders that the sin of American Slavery involved great guilt somewhere. But they evidently intended to teach, (what their cause required, and what their arguments implied) the comparative or the absolute innocence of the great mass of the slaveholders or of such of them as might be members or wish to be members of the Churches. For they refused, and the American Board deliberately and unanimously refused to consider the practice of slave holding any presumptive evidence against a man's Christian character, any more than the practice of law pleading in our civil courts, which comparison was brought forward to illustrate their views.

Now, who are they that are guilty of this great sin? This "organic sin"?

Does the guilt lie in the organic arrangements which authorize the practice? But how can those arrangements involve more guilt than is involved in the practice, as thus authorized and systematized?

Can the aggregate be greater than the sin of all the parts of which it is composed? Can the sin of the community be greater than the aggregate sins of the individuals of whom the community consists?

Is the sin transferred from the individual to society, to the community, to the Nation?—What is society? What is the community? What is the nation? Nothing more nor less than a great number of individuals acting together. To say that society is guilty, is only saying that those individuals are guilty, of whom society is composed! Instead of absolving any one, it involves all in one common guilt. And guilt is not frittered away to fractions by subdivision between the partners in it.

When society, or the community, sanctions and thus adopts an individual or private sin, it doubtless takes upon itself the full weight of that sin and becomes responsible for it. But does this take the guilt off from the individual or in any degree diminish his guilt? By no means! Society is no Insurance Office, to take off from individuals the risk of their sins, or to divide the risk with them. It may impudently undertake this, but the attempt only contracts new guilt without transferring or di-

*If the slave holding existing among us be not sinful how can it be proved that statutes authorizing just such slaveholding are sinful?

minishing that which existed before. Instead of a few sinners only, as at first there are now a vast multitude of sinners each one of them guilty of a greater sin than had been committed before, because organic sins, (for the reasons before adduced) are more aggravated than more isolated sins. The person originally guilty of the practice which it was sinful for Society to sanction, protect, and authorize, remains, just as guilty for that practice as he would have been if society had not authorized it. And being himself, one of the community that thus sanctioned it, and at least as much implicated in the act of sanctioning it as other members of the community! he takes upon his own shoulders in addition to all the original guilt of the practice, the full weight of all the organic sin of which Society is guilty. The public sanction and protection of that practice is as much his act as if he committed it alone: just as a man's committing a murder in company with others is his own act as fully as if he committed it without any assistance.

To say that organic sin is the act of society and therefore individuals are absolved, is to say in effect, that nobody is guilty, since there is no such thing as society, aside from the individual persons that compose it. According to this theory, (as has been justly observed) an entire nation might stand on the left hand of the Judge, at the last day, for its organic sins, the individuals composing the nation might all stand on the right hand, absolved from blame, because it is only an organic sin for which the nation, and not individuals, are responsible! On this theory, too God, could never punish nations for national sins, because there would be no individuals (and consequently nobody) to punish! And this very nearly resembles the notion of some among universalists, that God punishes the sins of wicked men, and burns them all up in the flames of the pit, without scorching a hair on the head of the sinner. An unexpected position in which to find the orthodox American Board! There seems no way of escape from this conclusion, unless it be pleaded that the guilt of organic sins rests only upon the civil rulers who frame the laws, so that all the rest of the community are absolved from blame. According to that rule Shadrack, Meshack, and Abednego might have obeyed the command of Nebuchadnezzar, and remained guiltless; and men may, with impunity, commit any wickedness that the civil government sanctions.

However plausible such a plea might have

been on behalf of the people of Egypt in the time of Moses, (when God everthrew them with sore plagues, and cut off in their sins) it is evident that such a plea can avail nothing for the citizens of our free republic who are in fact, as well as in theory, and of inherent right, the sovereigns of the nation, and actually shape the laws as they please. Those who are so very precise in their discriminations between organic and individual sins, should not have forgotten to make a distinction between the organic sins of a nation subjected to the despotic sway of a single individual like Pharaoh, and the organic sins of a people whose government is shaped by their own hands and administered by the men of their own free choice.—When slave holders and their apologists in the American Board shall wield their civil powers against the organic sin of American oppression instead of wielding them in its favor, there will be some thing more of decency in their plea.

If it can be shown that there are individual cases of slave holders who wield all the lawful powers they possess, against the slave laws, it will be in time then, to set up a plea, in behalf of such, that the community alone are responsible for their sins, so that they are absolved. We shall be ready to consider such a case, when it occurs, and to examine the consistency of the man who holds slaves and opposes the laws that sanction the practice. Until such a case is presented to us, we shall claim that the plaster spread by the American Board is too narrow to cover the sin of a single American slave holder.

But were there scores of such cases, they would only be exceptions to the general rule, even granting, for the argument's sake (what is by no means true) that such slave holders would be free from all blame. The Board were repeatedly reminded of the distinction between a general rule and the exceptions under the rule. And they refused to consider, and treat slave holders in general, with all their known zeal for the continuance of the slave laws (in other words, of the slave system) as being justly liable to Church censures or scrutiny on that account, any more than on account of following the profession or business of a lawyer! And all because the sin, enormous as it is admitted to be, is only an "organic" and not an individual sin!

If there be any thing in the annals of Jesuitism that goes beyond this, in apologising for

known sin, we should like to be pointed to the page of history on which it is written.

The moral government of God over nations and over individuals, is completely set aside by this doctrine in the case of "organic sins."—The nation, as already remarked, cannot be punished, on this theory, because there are no guilty individuals to punish! Neither individuals nor nations, therefore, can be called upon to repent of "the greatest abomination in all the earth!" To such absurd conclusions are we driven, if we follow out the doctrine of the American Board! And is this the doctrine that is to "evangelize the world" to "cast down the thrones" of iniquity and awe the nations into obedience to the king of Righteousness?

OBJECTIONS—EXCUSED.

We know not what objections can be urged against the conclusions to which we have arrived, unless it be said that the reason why organic sins do not involve individual guilt is because they are sins of ignorance, which God winks at or because the persons committing them are beset with stronger temptations, or are compassed with difficulties in the way of their repentance from which it is impossible or almost impossible to escape. We will devote a brief space to each of these points.

1. *Ignorance.* It has already been shown that organic sins from the very fact of their publicity, their prosecution on a large scale and the notoriety of their pernicious and deadly effects are less likely to be committed ignorantly or inadvertently than more private and isolated sins. Public sins are the subjects of public attention and public animadversion.—Eminent statesmen, jurists, theologians, poets, and moralists are wont to treat of them, and their condemnation becomes interwoven in the literature of the nations in which they exist.—This is pre-eminently true of the organic sin of slavery, which has been, for centuries, most strongly and pointedly reprobated by a host of the very men who are most venerated and honored, in all lands. How can it be said that those implicated in this sin are sinning in ignorance? Their own abundant condemnation of the system "in the abstract" (which means a condemnation of it in general) is strong proof that they are not ignorant of the wrong. The McDuffies and Prof. Dows furnish only exceptions which prove the general fact, and nobody, perhaps, gives credit to the sincerity of even these few. Our own nation, in its incipient movements towards a separate existence, acknowledged, publicly, the wrong, and made the most solemn promises of amendment. In the very act of assuming an independent stand, among the nations

of the earth, it declared, as self-evident, its binding on all civil governments and on their powers, the very principles which philosophically deny the innocency of slave holding. For the establishment of institutions on these principles, and for the purpose of carrying them into practical effect, the founders of the republic, appealing to Heaven for the rectitude of their intentions, pledged their fortunes and their sacred honor. This act, by the representations of the people, the entire nation concurred, and to this day glories in the act. Nor is there so much to lean minority, even among slave holders, repudiate and abjure it. The National Convention stands unimpeached and unrepentant. Courts of law have decided that the declaration of those self-evident truths, by one of the states, [Massachusetts] was equivalent to a legal abolition of slavery.

(Concluded next Month.)

"Payments and Donations," for the Christian Investigator, up to December, 1845.

A. Johnson, Rupert, Vt. \$1.00	S. Bishop, Honeoye, N.Y. 1.00
Dr. W. F. Shelton, W. Bloomfield, 2.00	R. Wright, Cuylerville, 1.00
G. Thayer, Livonia, 1.00	A. Raymond, Plattskill, 1.00
R. Dixon, do 0.44	J. H. Rees, New York, 0.50
papers sold 0.50	O. Adams, Williamson, 0.50
W. T. Coddling, Bristol, 1.00	(by J. H. Rees, S. W. Stewart, 3.00)
S. Lyman, Rose, 0.50	A. F. Hanna, Cadiz (O) 1.00
L. Griswood, do 0.50	G. Smith, Peterboro, 10.00
L. & D. B. Pitts, Honeoye, 3.00	J. O. Babcock, Phelps, 1.00
A. F. Hanna, Cadiz (O) 1.00	H. Truesdell, Cuylerville, 1.00
G. Smith, Peterboro, 10.00	L. Blackmer Jr. Kalama-zoo (Mich) 1.00
J. O. Babcock, Phelps, 1.00	
J. Casey, Powersville, 1.00	
L. Blackmer Jr. Kalama-zoo (Mich) 1.00	

The friends of this publication will that we need additional support.

DEB. In this village (Honeoye) Nov. 25th Mrs. Deborah Hawke, wife of D. E. Hawke, Esq. a lady beloved for her many virtues, and whose tongue was the law of kindness.

THE REV. GEORGE BOBBS, long known as a true earnest friend of the slave, died suddenly, on Thursday November 20th, in the office of the Christian Intelligencer in this city. About twenty five years since, he was from Virginia, and virtually from the Presbyterian Church in consequence of his faithful and fearless opposition to slavery. It was his case, more than any other, that was the occasion of striking from the Presbyterian Confession of Faith and Discipline, the note to the commandment in which the holding of slaves was declared to be man-stealing. He had promised to write out the whole history of that important proceeding. But gone. His "Picture of Slavery" will be read with interest, and he will be long remembered as one of the earliest and most faithful pioneers in the anti-slavery cause in this country. [A. S. REPORTER]

Information Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. First and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's Calling, (both on one sheet.) 2 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Aries and Bull. 4 pages, \$0.50 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honeoye, Ontario County, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series, Vol. IV—No. 1.
Whole Number, 44.

ONEVOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JANUARY, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODRICH, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, 12, 19.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS, IN A VOLUME.

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, \$2 00, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows:

Per dozen, \$2 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
Per single paper for, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

ORGANIC SINS.

(Continued from last No.)

Though hands join in hand, the wicked shall not be punished.—Prov. 11: 21.

"sin of ignorance," is it? The Methodist Episcopal Church, from the beginning, knew its wickedness, and still continues to do so, though she revels in the sin! The Presbyterian Church too, declared slave holding to be "man stealing," "the highest kind of theft," but recently blotted out "the red ink," because it did not correspond with her practices!

A sin of ignorance? How our own Hope and Edwards lived in vain! Are weangers to the literature of the language, in which Wesley wrote? But why, attempt to moderate names? Have we no Bibles? no ministers of religion? Are we in a health-land?

A sin of ignorance! And we do not know the wickedness of selling babes by the pound, of chattelizing the image of God, of embracing equal brethren of the Savior! Why then have we Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, clerical Association, American Boards? What is the value of them, if they cannot teach us the first principles of moral right? And why do we send Missionaries among the heathens and the Cherokees, if they can not warn them against "the greatest abomination in all the earth"? If the light that is within be darkness, how great is that darkness? Can such darkness excuse us? Especially can it do this, if we still cling to the conservators and dispensers of all this darkness, and call it light!

The nation, it must be confessed, should be

plified, that sits under such teachings as those admirably listened to, by the American Board. But is it therefore free from blame, and secure from danger? "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Spiritual blindness is only another name for selfishness, which is sin. It is the essence of guilt, and cannot be pleaded in excuse.

"A sin of ignorance" is it? But in what particular can the ignorance be detected?—What is it, that the slave holder does not know? He knows, and he admits, that "THE SYSTEM" is wicked "the greatest abomination in all the earth." Thus much, the Doctors of the American Board stand ready to teach them, if there be need! They have taught it, and it is their boast that they have done so.—Nay, they glory in the declaration that their teaching is every where received, while neither Churches, nor people can "stand the nonsense" of their fanatical opponents! See then how much, and what kind of light, a people can have on the subject of slavery, and yet, by the dispensers of that light, be complimented as being in total darkness, insomuch that they must not even be visited with Church censure, for practicing and upholding "the greatest abomination in all the earth."

The slave holders have all the light that can emanate from the proposition that "the system" of American Slavery is thus abominable! And yet their teachers say they are in utter darkness! Even that darkness which so far as this subject is concerned suspends their moral accountability, and frees them from the blame of their actions! What is it then, that they do not know? And the knowledge of which shall elevate them to the condition of moral agents properly amenable to an intelligent Christian Church? What can the needed "light" be, but the doctrine that slave holding is inherently sinful? Let the regular doctors try this medicine, next, and see whether that will not reach the case.

3. TEMPTATIONS.—In the case of organic sins, it may be said; men are placed under greater temptations, and therefore some allowances are to be made. Make whatever allowances you please, only remember that compliance with temptation does not take away sin

nor the capacity of sinning, nor divorce the union between sinning and guilt. Did any one ever learn that Church discipline is to be annihilated, in cases where men yield to great temptations? Did Paul say so to the Corinthians? [1 Cor. v.] Let all due allowances be made, in apportioning Church Censures. But do not say that the sin shall not be noticed at all any more than the practice of the law in a civil court! And all on the score of temptations! The truth is, temptations do not compel men to sin. God's Providence in appointing the bounds of men's habitations, is not to be charged with the sin, in order that the sinner may escape. "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God is not tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man. But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed!" The Slave holders hug the "organic" arrangements that tempt them, and which they have themselves contrived.

3. DIFFICULTIES. The organic form of a sin may render it more inconvenient to abandon it, and involve a greater sacrifice on the part of the penitent. But it cannot oblige any one to continue a wrong practice or absolve him from the guilt of it. American Slave holders have woven the web of these organic arrangements, with their own hands and wrapped themselves in it. They refuse to cut the cords themselves and are angry when others attempt to do so. And there is nothing in these arrangements that can prevent any individual slave holder, who chooses, from quitting the practice of slave holding. The examples of a Birney, a Brisbane, and scores of others, within a few years, sufficiently proves this. It may cost more than selfish men think they can afford, to quit a practice thus systematically entrenched.

But Christianity teaches us to cut off the right hand, and pluck out the right eye, rather than do wrong. The greatest sacrifice the penitent slave holder commonly has to make is the loss of caste and standing among the great men of the Church and the state, who exert so controlling an influence over such bodies as the American Board. While they continue slave holders they may occupy unquestioned and unimpeached, the highest seats in the synagogue, as well as the highest posts

of civil power. But let them become so singular and fanatical as to reprove, by their example and their testimony, the sin of slave holding and they become outcasts from, political favor, and "disturbers of the peace of the Churches." A formidable obstacle to those who "love the praise of men more than the praise of God!"

To say that difficulties like these may be urged in excuse of slave holders, is to proclaim impunity in sin, to bid a premium upon aggravated transgression. The more deeply sinners plunge themselves in sin, the longer they indulge themselves in it; & the more strongly they fortify themselves against conviction, the more difficult it is for them to repent. But the difficulty is a moral difficulty, self induced & self cherished, and aggravating instead of removing their guilt. To say otherwise would be to make men excusable in proportion to the enormity of their wickedness, and absolve the bonds of the pit in whose community all sin has become organic.

Of all these excuses it may be remarked that they can avail nothing for the "individual" participant in the "organic" sin of slavery, because, all the weight you may please to give to these considerations, goes into the opposite scale the moment you come to inquire after the persons responsible for the organic sins! If spiritual darkness, if temptations, if difficulties become thus formidable in the case of organic sins, how aggravated must be the guilt of those participating in and sustaining them! And where lies this guilt, if a large share of it does not rest upon the slave holder? If in order to ease *them*, you lay the blame on the northern apologists of the practice, (and where else shall we look?) whose shoulders must bear more of that burden than the members of the American Board—the authors of their Report, the framers of the arguments by which it is sustained?

"ORGANIC SINS."

No. II.

POPULAR FALLACIES.

In every view we can take, the position of the American Board, and especially of Messrs. Beecher, Stowe, and Bacon, is a most anomalous, untenable one. We are led to inquire what there is, existing in the public mind, that could give the least plausibility to such considerations as they have urged? We have

been ruminating on this question, and can find no other solution than this. Their argument, untenable and absurd as it is, comprises the essence of several popular fallacies more or less distinctly apprehended seldom or never fully avowed not even impressing a consciousness of their existence on the minds most controlled by them, and yet exerting, unperceived, and unsuspected, a most powerful influence, upon the decisions and actions of most men.—They may be called sentiments, rather than opinions or impressions, perhaps, more properly than sentiments. Instead of ever calling them impressions, we might indeed be more exact, in calling them the *absence* of any *con- trary* impressions. They are negatives rather than positives. They are vague, coy, shy, and disappear if you would put your hand on them, or even steadily look at them. They are present, nevertheless, and have power.

THE FIRST FALLACY.

Brutish and stupid as the thought is, there is the highest authority for saying, that even in communities most favored with the lights of science and of divine revelation, there is a hidden, latent impression, that in the case of public national sins, individuals may escape distinct detection and cognizance, in the midst of so vast a crowd. Few minds, perhaps, except those most habitually devout and cherishing a constant and abiding sense of the divine presence, are wholly free from the influence of this delusion. We are familiar with the fact that men escape human detection among crowds of their own species. And most men's ideas of God are shaped, mainly, by their ideas of themselves. They think their Maker is "altogether such an one as themselves,"—And hence, their secret thought is "the Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard." The error may lie in the heart rather than in the head, and so much the worse! The theory of the man may be orthodox enough, and he may contemptuously repel the opposite thought, should it be attributed to him. The creed of the heart predominates, nevertheless, and controls the man. It is in the heart rather than in the intellect, that the fool says "no God"!

Nor can it be truthfully said, that there is nothing in the philosophy, and even in the theology, widely prevalent at the present day, that favors the fallacy under review. What elaborate speculations have we, contrived, as Cowper would say

—"—to save a God

"The vast incumbrance of his own concerns!" The scriptural and strictly theological conception of an every where present, ever living, acting, energizing Deity, has almost faded away from even the religious mind. Our modern Doctors, in their panic to escape the ghost of Fatalism have well nigh leaped the gulph of blind chance. Who dares express in Bible language, and without explaining away, his full, unwavering belief in the universal purposes, presence and all controlling agency of God? No! we are philosophers now! Omnipotence, if there be any such attribute pertains not to God, but to persuasion to the "laws of nature" or to "the laws of the human mind." God has indeed established these laws, but has left them to execute themselves! Like a human mechanist, he has adjusted his springs and weights, wound up his clock work, to run of itself, and has gone his way, to some other part of the universe or indulges in repose! What great danger in such a state of things, that an *obscure individual* will be particularly scrutinized or arraigned, on account of an "organic sin? The law is a general and not a specific one! It expounds its force on *society*" and leaves the individual untouched! And hence, the popular proverb that "Corporations have no souls!" They may comprize a thousand individuals, but upon no one of them can you impress the consciousness of guilt, for any corporate act, however atrocious! This is a well known fact, and how could such a fact exist, if it were not true that men secretly imagine they shall escape individual detection in an organized crowd? Where such a delusion exists the doctrine of the doctors at Brooklyn gains easy access. It strikes its roots into a kindred soil. It gratifies an appetite already formed. "Like people, like priest." So long as men love to indulge in the dream of individual impunity, in organized or corporate sins, so long they will find prophets who will prophecy to them smooth things, and cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before them.

SECOND FALLACY.

Very nearly akin to the preceding, and growing out of it, is the notion that it cannot be otherwise than safe to do "as other people do!"

And here, again it would be easier to find a million of men who would discard the proposition, than half a dozen who are wholly free from the influence of the impression!

The eagerness and confidence with which men will openly appeal to the popular voice as the exponent and standard of truth, the horror they daily express at the idea of being singular, are sufficient evidences of the fact that most men think themselves perfectly justified and safe in doing precisely as the masses of men are doing around them.

Yet, in establishing this fact, we confirm, on the verity of the fact before insisted on, viz. that most men think they shall escape individual scrutiny and detection, by acting with a great crowd. For on no other ground can freedom from detection could men base their confidence of safety when acting in company with the multitude; unless it be on the ground, either that the popular vote is the residence of rectitude, or that it has the quality of transforming the wrong into the right!—And neither of these considerations would be less brutish and stupid than the one first named. The proverbial and well known wickedness of mankind, to say nothing here of Christ's own statements concerning the broad gate and the narrow way, stands in strange contrast with the notion of impunity in swimming with the popular current. And the hope of escaping detection accounts most rationally and scripturally for the fact. Hence the emphatic demand, "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" Men need constantly to be reminded that God sees them and notices their acts.

How perfectly the Brooklyn doctrine as expounded by the Rabbi Beecher and Stowe, chimes in with this popular notion of security to individuals; amid national delinquencies, it is not difficult to see. Take away from the community this delusive impression, and all their learned arguments are uttered to no purpose. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Could the community be made to see and feel, as in the light of eternity, the individuality of their accountability at the Divine tribunal, all efforts to confute the champions of the American Board might be spared.

THIRD FALLACY.

A large portion of the people cannot be convinced of the wickedness of any practice that has the sanction of the public authorities and is protected or licensed by human enactments, however wicked such practices might otherwise be admitted to be. Thus, multitudes justify themselves and their friends in the sale of intoxicating liquors, on the sole ground that

the practice is a *lawful* one that is in accordance with the laws of the land, and under express licence from the state and municipal authorities. Intelligent men, literary men, and even devout men, are, with the greatest difficulty, driven from this hiding place.

And in the same way, there are many who cannot be made to realize the inherent wickedness of *slave holding*, so long as the practice is sanctioned or even permitted by the laws of the state. Let those laws be repealed and every slave holder attempting to commit or to continue the practice would be guilty of a capital offence, and liable to be punished for kidnapping, or piracy. Nobody, not even at Princeton Theological Seminary, nor in the American Board, assembled at Brooklyn, would have any doubt of the inherent sinfulness of *slave holding* (as well as the *slave system*) then.

Dr. Beecher and Prof. Stowe would doubtless think it a needless task, if we should attempt, by a course of grave arguments, to prove that practices are none the less wicked, because sanctioned by human laws. They would hardly be willing to admit that such an argument was directed against the position they hold. And yet, if we could but remove from the popular mind, the last vestige of this fallacy, we could afford to lay down our pens, and not write another syllable against the Brooklyn Report, or the arguments by which it was sustained. The public would scarcely see any thing approaching to the plausible, in either of them, and would never be tempted to imagine that *slave holding* is any less "the abomination of all the earth" than the *Slave system*.

There is nothing in the laws of the slave states that compel a man to be a slave holder. No man can be compelled to be a slave holder against his will, any more than he can be compelled to be a rum seller. So that the slave holder is none the less guilty on account of the slave laws unless human enactments can make practices right which before, were wrong.

FOURTH FALLACY.

It is only a natural and almost necessary extension of the same idea, to conceive, as many evidently do, that God himself authorizes whatever is sanctioned by human laws. Thus the Psalmist, as cited in a former article, apparently has in mind those who seemed to imagine that the "throne of iniquity, that frameth mischief by a law, has fellowship with God" [See Psalm 94. 20.]

Our popular expositions of Romans, 13th chapter, very manifestly favor this idea.—

"The powers that be" and that "are ordained of God" instead of being restricted by them to the limits of Paul's own definition, as a "terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well" are extended to all the despotic governments on the earth, because the Epistle happened to be written in the time and under the reign of the persecuting Nero! Quite remarkable is it that the masters of the English common law, in order to maintain and preserve the least particle of either civil or religious liberty in the island of G. Britain, have been obliged to explode these Rabbinical expositions and to adopt the opposite conclusions of a natural exegesis and of common sense. [Vide Bracton. Common Law.]

A distinction, we are aware may be claimed, between the divine recognition of a government, or of its legitimate authority, and a divine sanction of its wicked acts.—Unfortunately, this distinction whatever its merits may be, has either been overlooked, by most of the expositors just mentioned, or has proved unequal to the task of restraining them from advocating the sentiment that a civil government, founded in violence and wrong, and perpetuated by the same means and for the same ends is nevertheless approvingly sanctioned by God with its unrighteous acts. Drs. Wayland and Tucker, maintained distinctly, that although the moral right of the case was originally on the side of the free suffrage men in Rhode Island, yet the fact that an admitted minority of the people of the state were enabled by brute force, to maintain contrary arrangements, arrayed the authority of God on their side, and against the original rights of the people! Dr. Bushnell, in his otherwise excellent discourse on "politics under the government of God" is betrayed by the current theological literature of the times, into a similar view. He even goes so far as to maintain that a government in what soever manner established, or for whatever purposes or however administered, is nevertheless *God's* civil government, so long as it can retain its ill gotten and abused power!

That Dr. Beecher's doctrine of individual irresponsibility for acts committed in accordance with the enactments of the state, should find favor in an age and nation whose venerated religious teachers hold that the throne of iniquity, that frames mischief by a law can hold fellowship with God, need excite no surprise. It would be marvellous indeed, were it otherwise.

If God does not authorize whatever is sanctioned by human laws then assuredly, he does not authorize *slave holding*. And if he does not authorize *slave holding*, then (40

far as God's moral government "is concerned") it is unauthorized. And "whatever is not of faith," and cannot be practiced as an act of obedience to God, "is sin."

The practice of slave holding, in the absence of human laws in its favor, is admitted to be wicked. Morris, Beecher and Stowe, with the Doctors at Princeton, would feel themselves wronged, if we should represent them as holding the opposite of this. Well then does the sanction of civil government alter the case? If it does not, then slaveholding remains wicked still. If it does, then we arrive at the doctrine that God sanctions an act that is otherwise wicked, because human rulers (by an act of wickedness) have sanctioned it!

Whenever this popular delusion disappears, the Brooklyn doctrine of "organic sin" will vanish into thin air, or be found only among the curious speculations of a by-gone and dark age,

FIFTH FALLACY.

Another popular fallacy, alluded to, in a former number, is the notion, vaguely entertained, either that there are sins without any responsible sinner, or that the sin may be punished while the sinner escapes. Other theologians, besides those of the Universalists School, have been known to indulge in speculations which lead the public mind to similar results. Some speak of original sin, or of innate sin, as though nobody committed it, or as though there could be a sin without a transgression of the law, or a responsible sinner.—On such a foundation the structure of organic sins, without any sinners, could very easily be built.

And yet the Old School and New School builders must have needed no little skill to shape their rival theories into the harmonious result witnessed in comparing the Brooklyn argument with that so recently promulgated at Princeton.

If "Old School" holds each member of the human family guilty of the "organic sin" of their first parents, committed thousands of years before they were born, how comes it to pass, that they can exonerate us innocent of any wrong doing the individual slave holder who voluntarily participates in the organic sin of the nation to which he belongs? Are men to be held guilty of ADAM'S sin, because of its public, federal or organic character, and yet excused from the blame of THEIR OWN sins, for the same reason?

If "New School" cannot admit that the acts of one man may be imputed or transferred to another, by what logic can it make "society," or the nation, or the civil ruler, exclusively responsible for the acts of individual

slave holders? If it can conceive, of no sin without a voluntary action, and a guilty actor how can it conceive of a wicked system of slavery "the abomination of all the earth" without wickedness in the slave holders?

It would seem as though rival theologians could vie with each other, in devising excuses for slave holders and those who elevate them to power; and that in this service, their theological systems could either be used or thrust aside, as convenience requires.

Could we fully eradicate, from the public mind the imagination, that there is something sinful aside from free voluntary, individual exercises, or acts of wickedness, the notion of a sinful system of slavery without sinful and guilty slave holders would need other defenses than have yet appeared.

SIXTH FALLACY.

Another widely prevalent delusion is, that the guilt of a national sin, however great, will be reduced to a mere fraction, or a very alarming magnitude, when once subdivided among so many millions of inhabitants as our great nation contains. If the sin be a great one, yet it is a great nation upon which the burden will fall, and so many shoulders will make the load light!

This notion may be in bad keeping with that which wholly frees individuals from the blame of national sins. It has great power over men's minds, nevertheless, and seems to be resorted to, when the idea of absolute personal innocence fails. We are guilty, to be sure, and even our "Christian citizens" ("as citizens") among the rest. But on these Church members rests only a proportionate "share" and a very small share, too, of the guilt! Who then, shall lay any thing to the charge of the Church? Thus reasoned the learned Rabbis at Princeton, in the article we have recently received. And thousands of men, less learned, and who might never think of reasoning in this manner, are controlled by an indefinite impression of that kind. Or rather, if you please, they are not controlled by any deep and abiding sense of the truth to which this vague fallacy is opposed. It never occurs to them that each one of these millions must stand alone, in the judgment, and bear the weight of the entire sin, just as much as he would do, if all the rest were innocent or blotted out of existence!

If this weighty truth were fully impressed upon all minds, the distinction set up at Brooklyn, between individual and organic sins, would make little impression upon the community, unless it could be made to appear that the sins of the individual are so transferred to "society" or changed by the public

sanction, from sinful to innocent acts, that the individual actors are released from every particle of blame, or unless it could be forgotten that God does not overlook individuals in vast crowds, or unless it could be shown that it is safe, always, to swim with the popular current and act as we see others act, or unless it could be fully believed that there are great public sins without any individual sinners or that the sin could be condoned and punished, while the sinner is justified or escapes.

The fact probably is, that neither of the first five fallacies that have been considered nor all of them combined, have power to prevent men of reflection from feeling, at times that some degree of guilt must attach to them and hence they resort to the arithmetical process of frittering away, by division and subdivision, the vast mountain of guilt that they know must be compressed in "the greatest abomination in all the earth."

And then, if they cast their eyes upon their idolized statesmen, whom they wish to support in the high places of power, they find a difficulty in attributing to them, the whole of this vast amount of "organic sin," rising, in mountains, towards heaven! And so, with a commendable public spirit, and on the republican principle of "sharing" equally in national burthens, they magnanimously set themselves at work, to distribute, in fractional portions, the sin of the nation, among the people of whom the nation is composed!

Is it doubted that this sentiment or impression, vaguely and perhaps unconsciously, enters into the apprehensions or conceptions of most men? Let us make the experiment and see. Suppose there were but a dozen Presbyterians in the United States, and that it were proposed to ten of these Presbyterians to hold the other two in a state of Chattelhood!—How would they shudder at the thought!—But vary the case a little. Suppose twelve millions of Presbyterians in the United States. The proposal to ten millions of them, to hold the other two millions in slavery, becomes a very plausible affair! It is only an "organic sin!" And why is this difference? Discarding the five "popular fallacies" first considered, what remains to give plausibility to the idea, but the notion that great sins become inconsiderable, by the process of division among multitudes?

To reason against absurdities which lie almost concealed in men's hearts and imaginations, rather than in their understanding, may seem too hopeless a task to be entered upon, with any expectation of success. Yet

nothing may, perhaps, be done, towards placing these vague impressions, by recalling and deepening the ideas and impressions that are opposed to them.

For this purpose, let us observe, then, that the very reverse of this popular delusion is the real truth of the case. So far from its being true, that a national sin can be subdivided and frittered away into small fractions, and distributed among the participants in the sin; the truth is, the sin of the individual is increased (as was shown in our former number) by its being committed in company with others.

Besides committing his own sinful act (of mere holding, for example,) he becomes necessary to others. He is a partaker in their sinful acts. He countenances them, and is the occasion of them. He endorses them. His sin becomes doubled, when he finds a partner in his sin and "consents with him."—He not only perpetrates a wicked act himself, "but has pleasure in them that do them." Without parting with a single particle of his own personal sin, by this connexion with his neighbor, he takes the full weight of that neighbor's sin on to his own shoulders, in addition (yet without diminishing the guilt of that neighbor) and thus doubles the amount of his own guilt. When he finds a third partner, he trebles his guilt. When he finds a fourth to associate with, his guilt is quadrupled, and so on. In a word, a slave holder, or any other transgressor of God's law, multiplies the amount of his personal sin of slave holding (or whatever the sin may be) by the numbers of the persons who are associated with him, and whom he encourages in the same sin. While each one of them, if impenitent, "shall die in his iniquities, his blood shall God require at the hands" of each one that consents with, and emboldens him!

And thus and therefore, it is that God "visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate him." He does not punish the children for the sin of their fathers. But he does punish them for approving their father's sins, and thus, in reality sinning their father's sins over again, in purpose and in spirit, in addition to all the guilt of their own personal and outward sinful acts.

Organic sins thus involve succeeding generations, (who remain impenitent, and hinders of God) in the sins of their fore fathers. Thus national guilt accumulates until the measure of the iniquity is full, and the weight of long deferred retribution falls on the last generation of the series, as being the most guilty. Thus it was with the Amorites, the inhabitants of Canaan. Thus it was with the generation of Jews who crucified the Savior, and upon whom, according to his prediction, God required, and exacted, in the terrible overthrow of Jerusalem, the blood of all the righteous martyrs who had suffered in all the preceding ages, "from the blood of righteous Abel, to the blood of Zacharias, the son of Baruchias, whom they slew between the temple and the altar."

And upon the same principle, God still governs and punishes the nations. Almost in our day, and within the memory of some among us, he visited the long accumulating iniquities of the profligate and oppressive royal family, the proud nobility, the corrupt priesthood, the atheistic philosophers and the brutal populace of France, particularly of gay Paris, upon the single generation, in whose persons the whole organic wickedness centered and culminated. Louis the 16th who suffered, was commonly accounted less guilty in his own personal acts, than his predecessor, Louis the 15th who died before the retributive bolt fell. But Louis the 16th allowed himself to retain "the legal relation" that marked him as "filling up the measure of his fathers" without loathing and putting away their essential sin! Instead of merely holding him responsible for what men counted his own individual acts, instead of *dividing* with all his co-temporaries and predecessors, the guilt in which they had mutually participated, God, (who knew how to meet out to each of them, either in this or a future world their just dues) regarded, as it would seem, the then reigning monarch, comparatively amiable and mild as he was accountable for the *entire amount* of the sins of his predecessors whom, on the whole, he had countenanced and sanctioned. With the sins of Louis the 15th and his predecessors thus on his shoulders, a less amount of outward visible, direct, wrong doing, than that commonly attributed to Louis the 16th might make him the guiltier man of the entire dynasty! To his own sins, he may have added all the sins of his predecessors, besides!

And this may give us some glimpse of another branch of the subject, to wit, "God's manner of dealing with organic sins," and with those involved in them. A full consideration of this topic we must, for the present, defer.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

The recent discussions in the religious papers concerning Puseyism and High Churchism in the Church of England, and in the Episcopal Church in America, turned very much, as our readers know, upon the question of *Baptismal Regeneration*. Such writers as Dr. Potts, Albert Barnes, and George B. Cheever, took it for granted that they had exposed the Anti-evangelical character of High Churchism and Puseyism, when they had shown that this doctrine of regeneration, or remission of sins by means of water baptism was involved in their creed.—Albert Barnes showed that the same doctrine was contained in the Episcopal liturgy, and he insisted that the evangelical clergy of that communion could never effectually teach the doctrine of a spiritual regeneration by the Holy Spirit, or prevent their hearers from running into the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and the Romanists, so long as they made use of such a liturgy.

All this we thought rational and Scriptural; for Paul abundantly insists that a scheme of religion based mainly on ceremonial observances, (even those appointed by God himself) cannot fail to subvert the doctrine of salvation by Christ alone.

But it may deserve inquiry whether, the Episcopal Communion is the only one in Protestant Christendom that was founded, in the first place, upon this same doctrine, as one of the pillars of the Sect, and whether the notion is wholly eradicated at the present time.

If it shall be found, on investigation, that the Protestant Reformers in general, (on the Continent as well as in England) retained, more or less distinctly, the same view, and embodied it in their standard writings or creeds—if the founders of most of our present Sects, or the authors to whom they constantly refer, held this doctrine, it would be almost incredible that the heaven has all been worked out, and that too, without any body's knowing when or how—without any stirring discussion or rupture in the Sects in which the doctrine

was originally taught. It is more common for Churches to slide insensibly from Evangelism to ritualism, than from ritualism to Evangelism.

If the standard writers to used by the dissenting Sects taught this doctrine, we need not wonder that Edward and Whelply found it in their Churches.

We need not wonder that so many who are educated by dissenters run into Episcopacy and Romanism; nor why, amid such developments so little preaching is heard directly guarding the people against the notion that Ceremonial observances can save them, nor why that feature of the recent discussion about Puseyism was so suddenly and abruptly snapt off, as though the Editors of Presbyterian and other papers had found themselves unexpectedly probing too sore a place in their own communions. We have heard of more than one devout lady and pious deacon in the non-episcopal sects who were sadly annoyed with that discussion and who thought the High Church Champions were in the right of the case.

For our own part, we have no hope of the revival of a truly spiritual religion, regardless of "the weightier matters of the law" till this subject is thoroughly reviewed.

For the present, we give some extracts from distinguished writers, justly in high repute, but whose views, on this question we consider unsound.—They were furnished us by a Lecturer of the Campbellite Sect, who used them in Confirmation of his own doctrine. We presume the extracts to be correct.

MARTIN LUTHER.

Extracts from Luther's Catechism:—Article Baptism.

1. What is Baptism?—Baptism is not common water alone, but it is a water of God's institution, and combined with the word of God.

2. Which is that word?—It is the testimony of Math: last chapter, where our Lord Jesus Christ says go ye out into this world and teach all nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

3. What gift is bestowed, or what advantage obtained by baptism?—By its effects our sins are forgiven, and our souls are delivered from the powers of Death and Satan and eternal happiness is to all who believe that God means to do what he has said and promised.

4. Which are these sayings and promises of God.—Our Lord Jesus Christ, says, according to Mark's record in the last chapter, he who believes and is baptised shall be saved, and he who believes not shall be condemned.

5. How can water do such great things?—Sure enough, it is not the water that does it, but the word of God which is with and by the water and the faith that believeth such word of God in the water is true; for without the word, the water is simply water, and no baptism, but with the word of God it is become a baptism; that is, a most gracious water of life, and bath of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, as Paul says in his Epistle to Titus, 3d chap.—God saves us through the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, that being justified by his favor we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. This doctrine is true.

6. Such water immersion then, what does it mean?—It means that the old Adam within us, through daily repentance and reform must be drowned and die with all the sins and bad affections, and that daily there must come out and rise up a new man to live in righteousness, and piety before God to all eternity.

7. Where is this written in Scripture?—Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans the 6th chapter, says, we have been buried together with him by an immersion into his death that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in a new life."

BAPTIST CONFESSIO.

"BAPTIST," CHAP. 30, SECT. 1. *By the Philadelphia Association [An old work.]*

"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptised a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection, of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to live and walk in newness of life."

[Remark.—The word "sign" might mean nothing more than a badge, an emblem, or representation. In this sense we should not object to it. But the association, probably, meant an evidence, as in the following. Ed.]

JOHN CALVIN.

"Baptism resembles a legal instrument

properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight or come into his remembrance or be imputed to us. For he commands all who believe to be baptised, for the remission of their sins. Therefore those who have imagined that Baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign, which we profess our religion before man, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which is the principal thing, baptism, which is that we ought to receive with this promise, that he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved."—Inst. C15, p37

JOHN WESLEY.

"Baptism administered to real penitents both a means and seal of pardon, nor does God ordinarily in the Primitive Church bestow this (pardon) on any unless through this means.—Comment N. Test. pg350.

DISCIPLINE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Baptism of adults. "We call upon thee for these persons that they coming to thy baptism, may receive remission of their sins, by spiritual regeneration. Receive these, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well beloved Son, saying—Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and the door shall be opened unto you—So give now unto us that ask; let us that seek find—open the gate unto us that knock" &c. &c.

"Give thy Holy spirit to these persons, that they may be born again, &c,

"O merciful God, that the old Adam, in these persons may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in them."

"Grant that they, being dedicated to thee by our Office and Ministry, may also be endued with heavenly virtues" &c.

"Grant that these persons now to be baptised may receive the fulness of thy grace.

REMARKS.

This is too explicit to be mistaken. The candidates come to be baptised that they may receive remission of their sins by spiritual regeneration." Of course they were not considered as previously regenerated. And their regeneration is in consequence of their being

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, JANUARY, 1846.

TO OUR READERS.

We find on examining our receipts for the *Christian Investigator*, for the year 1845, that the whole amount, including "Payments and Donations," is \$359,07

The cost of paper, printing, mailing, wrapping paper, transportation, &c. will amount to about 287,00

Leaving us for our Editorial labor; keeping accounts, &c. \$52,07

About one dollar a week! We mention this, because we understand there is an impression, even among some of our friends, that we are getting a pretty comfortable living by our paper; so that their continued help is not much needed. To distant friends who may wonder how we have lived, this year past, we say that the little Church at Honolulu, with whom we live and labor, are doing what they can for us—quite as much as could be expected from a congregation of Farmers, worshipping in a room of the size of a country district school house. On them, the burden, we fear, will fall rather too heavy, at this rate. Within the year past, we have received, likewise about \$200, from the publishers of our "Views of American Constitutional Law."

We have travelled, within the year past, attending conventions, &c. &c. about 1,500 miles,* and received from friends, during our tours (exclusive of the above "Payments and Donations" for the paper) not quite enough to pay our travelling expenses.

Of the 1,500 persons who have received our paper, the past year, some 300 perhaps, have generously contributed more than their own subscription money, to advance the object, and supply many who do not pay. Perhaps there may be 200 more who are not much in arrears, leaving about 1,000 who have paid us nothing for their year's reading.

If but half of these would now send us, promptly, the subscription price, 50 cents, (though many of them have paid nothing for two years) it would put us in possession of \$250, to begin another year with. And would it be too much for them to pay, or for us to receive?

If reasonable means are furnished we shall con-

tinue to print monthly, as usual. If not, we must resort again to our former method; and print only once in two months, or as often as we have means. We will not run in debt; for paper or printing. And we feel that we must have something for our own labor, or throw our efforts in the same cause into some different shape, so far as the Press is concerned.

W. G.

Honolulu, Jan. 1, 1846.

* This is exclusive of one journey of business into New England.

CONNECTION.—In our December number, the paragraph at foot of first column, on page 284, and commencing, "It is evident, therefore," should be read as a continuation of the remarks of "Rev. Dr. Beecher," commenced on the last column of page 283. In "making up" it was put in the wrong place.

CONVENTION IN BEHALF OF BIBLE MISSIONS.

To the Friends of Bible Missions in the State of New York.

BRETHREN:—The undersigned are friends of Freedom and of Missions. Heretofore, we have acted in support of Missions through the American Board, and kindred Associations. Numbers of us still do so. But we need not inform you that lately strange things have come to public knowledge. Slaveholders are in churches, planted and sustained by the American Board. They are there approved and regular members. They have been welcomed to, and continued in them, without question, without reproof, without discipline.—This has been done for more than one quarter of a century, and is still done. And, now that the thing has at least come to be generally known, the Board and those who direct its affairs excuse, justify and declare it apostolic and scriptural. They commend the Missionaries who have done, and still do it, as competent and faithful, and tell them, in terms, that they can not advise, much less require them to change their proceedings.—For aught that appears, the gospel we are to propagate though this agency is to tolerate, baptize, and welcome slavery to the church, wherever it meets it, in all the earth. Casto polygamy and other social wrongs are to have a like allowance, admission, and sanction.—And they who would have it otherwise are assured that they transcend "God's method,"

Mediated by Our Office and Ministry. The power of forgiving sins, as claimed by the Romish priesthood, can go but little beyond this: "nor did God, ordinarily," says Mr. Wesley "bestow this on any except through this means!"

All this harmonizes with that well known usage of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by which persons are admitted to membership in their societies, on profession, not of having been born of God by the spirit, but of a "sinner desiring to flee from the wrath to come."—The design is that the awakened sinner shall come into the society first, in order to be spiritually regenerated afterwards. And the process of that regeneration, the M. E. Discipline and the writings of Mr. Wesley describe.

Now we do not discredit the spiritual growth of such men as Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, on account of their having retained those erroneous views, in which they had been educated from childhood. The two former were emerging from the darkness of middle age Paganism. The latter was the son of a high church clergyman. We mention not the errors of such men to reproach them, nor to cast obloquy on the churches they have founded.—We mention it for the purpose of raising the enquiry, to what extent and in what degree these same errors are still current among us, deriving, as we do, in a great measure, our religious views, through the literature and the usages of the sects founded by those eminent men.

It will be borne in mind that the question of apostolic succession, clerical ordination, lay ordination, &c. are questions mainly interesting as involving the question of what is necessary in order to the validity or efficacy of baptisms, sacraments and marriages by clerical or laical hands.—If people in general did not retain some vague impressions of the reality of baptismal regeneration, it is difficult to see how such questions about succession and ordination could be gravely entertained, or excite the interests, or awaken the feeling that they are known to do. Show us a community that have no faith in the magic and we will engage that they will have no disputes about the pedigrees of the magicians.

and have not learned their "procedure from the Bible."

As friends of Freedom and of Missions, we accept the issue. We must do it. We rejoice to do it. It is the great question in the work of modern missions. To be silent in respect to it, as now maintained, is to confess judgment against the whole cause of Freedom—to admit that the Bible is not the charter of human liberty, and that Christianity is not the gospel of deliverance to them that are bruised having promise of the life that now is, as well as that which is to come. Plainly, the time has come to deliberate, to pray; to speak, to act. Why have modern Missions been so lean, both of persecutions and of triumphs? Whence come it, that with human nature unchanged, and the forms of religious superstition and social wrongs still the same, they have neither the conflict, nor the sacrifices, nor the successes of an apostolic gospel, propagated in apostolic method?—To the Bible be our appeal. We ask no other.

Brethren:—The undersigned invite all the friends of Freedom and of Missions, who have heretofore cooperated with the American Board and kindred Associations, or who now do so, to meet in Convention, at Syracuse, on Wednesday, the 18th of February next, for the purpose of considering generally the whole subject of the Bible methods of propagating the gospel; and particularly for the purpose of putting forth such a remonstrance against the practice referred to, in the Mission churches and the positions taken in justification of it, as the cause of Bible Missions demands; with the consideration of such practical measures as may seem best to give practical effect to the same.

NEW YORK.

Arthur Tappan, Lewis Tappan, Wm. Brown, S. S. Jocelyn, W. E. Whiting, H. D. Sturge, Ransom G. Williams, A. A. Phelps.

ALBANY.

Rev. Merrill Bates, P. Trainer, Alvan Stewart, Nathaniel Safford, W. L. Chapin, C. P. Williams, J. M. Ward, M. D., Wm. A. Tweed Dale.

HONEOYE.

William Goodell, Phineas Noble, Gideon Pitts, Cyrus Pitts, Benjamin Stewart, Hiram Pitts, Samuel B. Franklin.

SYRACUSE.

Rev. Silas Hawley, Jr., Wm. M. Clarke, Charles A. Whelan, P. Burns, Abner Bates, S. P. Dewey, W. H. Scrantom, C. Osborn, Curdland Bates.

CANASTOTA.

Rev. W. Stickney, J. A. Wilson, Henry Lewis, Willard Cotton, Warren Clarke, Young Lewis, Ambrose Hill, Stillman Spooner, Halsey Collins.

CAZENOVIA.

Rev. F. Hawley, T. F. Hardon, Pordyca Rice, M. D. A. Kingsbury, Charles D. Miller, Eliza Allen, Edwin D. Loomis, Cyrus Smith, J. Woodward, John Hunt, John Kingsbury.

ALBURN.

Abijah Fitch, John R. Hopkins, Daniel Conyer, H. H. Cooley.

WHITESBORO.

Rev. Beriah Green, Nathl J. Howard, Rev. J. J. Butler, G. H. Littlejohn, Rev. M. M. Smart, G. B. Campbell, Reuben Hough, H. L. Simpson, S. P. Hough, E. R. Arnold, Asa Thomson, E. W. Metcalf, David Y. Emerson.

SHERBURNE.

Wm. W. Chapman, J. C. Harrington.

CAMILLUS.

Rev. J. J. Ward.

POOLVILLE.

A. Tucker.

JORDAN.

Rev. A. Judson, Wm. Richards.

ELBRIDGE.

Charles Lombard, Jno. R. Richards.

WEST BLOOMFIELD.

Thimothy Stowe, Sylvanus Beckwith, Harvey Bushnell, Eliza Wurd, Wm. P. Sheldon, Titus Canfield, Isaac Ball.

CATO FOUR CORNERS.

Rev. J. T. Hough.

HAMILTON.

Rev. A. Scobell, C. M. Hawley.

LEBANON.

Ezra Campbell.

LIVONIA.

Wm. D. Babbitt.

N. B. Persons in other places, approving of the above Convention, and wishing their names appended to the call, are desired to send in at once, to A. A. Phelps, 118 Nassau street, New York.

DENUNCIATION!

The Journal of the American Temperance Union for July last reports a speech of Dr. Jewitt of Boston, before the N. Y. state Temperance Convention, from which we extract the following.

"We have been riddling through the Temperance riddle the rum-sellers this twenty years, and a great many went through at first very easy; but it does seem to me that those we have now would not go through, and they have all been emptied out upon us. Some of our brethren are very willing to speak harshly of the business but not of the men. We do not do so in other things. If a man breaks into our house with false keys, we do not go about the next day, talking against false keys and house-breaking. The key is nothing without the man. It is the man, and not the key, who does the mischief. And so it is with the rum business. It would do no harm without the rum-seller. We should, and if we would ever do any good, we must call things by their right names, and tell our fellow-citizens who are doing wrong, the whole truth. Father Hunt said last winter in Faneuil Hall, he had converted from the error of their ways about 200 rum-sellers; but he had never converted one without first convincing him that he deserved from man a halber, and from God a hell. What if the Apostle Paul had said, Mr. A—, the man who was engaged in business not far off, had injured him considerably, he wished him no harm, &c., &c. That would not have been like Paul. No. He spoke out the truth. 'Alexander, the copper smith (no, mistake about the man,) hath done me much harm. The Lord reward him according to his deeds.'"

How would "Father Hunt" relish the same language as applied to slave holders and proslavery law makers, instead of rum sellers? When Prof. Humphrey wrote his "parallel between intemperance and the slave trade" he must have taken for granted that the cruelties and abominations of slavery were better known to the community than those of

rum selling. All he sought was an equal condemnation of the latter with the former. We need now another "Parallel" to be written, which shall prove to us that the guilt of the slave trade is equal to that of the rum-seller!

EXPENSIVE WORSHIP.—The Chinese expend, annually, \$800,000,000 for incense burnt before their idols; about one dollar for every man, woman and child in the empire.

MARTYRDOM, in the past sense, is modern in the present. So thinks society—and it is society should not think so, martyrdom was coarse to be what it is. The martyr belongs to history, not to passing life. It takes an interval of one whole generation before a reputation for obstinacy mellowed down in firmness. Time canonizes him—and the circle of glory which environs his head can be discerned only at a distance. When a man's self-sacrifice flashes unpleasant conviction on the eyes of his contemporaries he is a troublesome fool—but when he and they have passed off the stage, and his character is submitted to others for judgment, he is recognised as a martyr.—[The Nonconformist.]

"Payments and Donations," for the Christian Investigator, January, 1846.

A McNeill, Ovid,	\$0.60	E Fish, do	1.00
E Mandeville, do.	1.00	G P Price, do	1.00
A A Sackett, Franklinville,	1.00	H Delaway, do	1.00
R W Hewitt, Hermitage,	50	G Pease, do	50
Dea Beecher, Livonia,	2.00	L M Wells, N. York,	2.00
S Darling, Somerset,	2.00	Con Church, Whitesboro,	2.00
S S Sheldon, Brockport,	0.50	H Groatrich, do	1.00
E D King, do,	0.50	E Clark, Pulneyville, L.	1.00
B Snow Jr., Fishburg Mts.	1.00	S Lathrop, Cambridgeport,	1.00
C F Gorton, Libon, Ill.	1.00	C Pitts, Honeoye,	1.00
J F Clark, Sandwich, N.Y.	2.50		
S H Allen, do	1.50	Total,	\$20.10

The friends of this publication will see that we need additional support.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting. 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian; and the Christian's High Calling (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, \$0.62½ per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.

Honeoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.

Where may be had.

Cards, Blanks & Handbills

Together with every description of Book & Job Printing.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series, Vol. IV—No. 2.
Whole Number, 45.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. FEBRUARY, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 40 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the volume, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

One dozen, . . . \$0 50 | Sixty papers, . . . 92 00
Eight papers for, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

"ORGANIC SINS," No. 3.

(Continued from last No.)

Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be punished."—Prov. xi: 21.

GOD'S METHOD OF DEALING WITH ORGANIC SINS.

It was strongly urged by Dr. Edward Beecher and others, at the meeting of the American Board, that God did not treat organic sins as he did personal sins. Much was laid on this supposed fact. Dr. Beecher said,

"The apostles did receive slave holders into the church. It is evident, therefore, that God has treated the subject differently from that of stealing and other sins, and if we could not find any philosophical reason for this fact, there is the fact which cannot be disputed. There is a reason for it. Slavery is an organic sin, and other sins are individual and personal."—(N. Y. Mirror, Sept. 13, 1845.)

It was also said by Prof Stowe, that Christ did not speak out against the sins of civil government.

To these statements, we had intended to reply by adducing some portions of scripture history and prophecy, which seem decidedly at variance with such representations. But Mr. Phelps, in his Letters to Prof. Stowe, published in the Boston Recorder, has done up this part of the work, to our hands, and we therefore present to our readers, some extracts from his remarks.

A. A. PHELPS TO PROF. STOWE.

You, as an evangelical believer, will agree that before Abraham was, Christ was; and that the "Angel of the Covenant," the "Voice of the Lord," the "Jehovah" of the old dispensation—David's "Lord"—was none other than the "Head over all," the "Word," the "Christ"—"God over all" of the new. At all events, you will agree, that Christ did

not come "to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil;" that he did not, therefore, come to take back his own, or his servants' former instructions; much less, to teach a lower morality and be satisfied with a looser life than they; and still less, to welcome to his church in quities that they had continually denounced and he repeatedly doomed in the State. But agreeing then, what, I pray you, are the overthrow of Egypt, the prohibitions by Moses of all oppression even of the stranger and the Egyptian, the repeated judgment and captivities of the Jews because of their oppressions, the doom of other nations for the same, the bold and unceasing denunciations of them by the prophets, the predicted destruction, by Christ, of all governments and nations that will not obey and bow to him—what are these but so many forms of speaking out against governmental, as well as other oppressions and oppressors?

It would take a volume to arrange and fully exhibit the proof from these sources on this point. In truth, a large portion of the entire Old Testament is little else than such proof. Go we then a moment to Egypt, and "study," first—

GOD'S LESSON OF PROVIDENTIAL RETRIBUTION.

Slavery is not there. For the Hebrew (Ex. x' 9.) has his family, flocks, and herds. It is only oppressive government, severe and terrible indeed, but made so for aught that appears, (Ex. i, 9, 10) by the "organic" necessity of self-preservation. It was but one of "those various forms and degrees of oppression, whether of law or usage, prevailing under arbitrary governments;" the individual practice of which, on suitable evidence of piety, you and the Board would by all means gather into the fold of Christ.—Now, brother, what was "God's method" as there unfolded, and Christ's testimony as then uttered?

When, (Gen. vi, 3,) by his new and covenant name, the Great Deliverer came, and in the execution of his purpose, (Ex. iii. 20) stretched out his hand and smote Egypt "with all his wonders," plague following plague and judgment treading on the heel of judgment, until a baptism of blood and wail of death rolled over all the land, and its pride and strength were buried in the sea, and the shout of delivered millions on the other side rose up to heaven, was not that speaking out

in respect to governmental oppression, and its organically-instituted taskmasters? Was it not a clear, full, fearful, world-wide, unobscured testimony? And in fore-warning Egypt of it and bowing her beneath it, did the Great Deliverer put in exceptions, and stay his judgment, lest, perchance, the proclamation of the general truth, the maintenance of the general law, and the execution of the general justice, should bear too hardly on some poor, purblind, weak-principled, and possibly innocent organic offender? Or, did he not rather stand by and rigidly enforce all these, and thereby make his government then, what Christ said his church should be, not the grand leazar-house of individual infirmity, and the great license-shop of individual iniquity, organically induced and piously done to be sure, but "THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH?" And now, according to your theology, and mine, was not He, who did all this, none other than Christ himself, coming, as the "Angel of the Covenant" with "the government on his shoulders," to deliver and lead forth his "plighted people?" Or, if not so, did Christ come long centuries after to unfold another method, to take back this testimony, and welcome to his church, what God, with all his wonders, damned and doomed in a heathen State—and not in his alone, but a score of others?—And this too, as the opening chapter and distinctive feature of the great era of human progress?

We will "study God's method of proceeding" farther, in my next.

Yours for the truth.

A. A. PHELPS.

In a subsequent letter bro. Phelps, proceeds, as follows.

"BROTHER STOWE:—In my last, I re-stated the issue pending in the present discussion, and resumed my examination of your argument in respect to it. The general argument is this—God does not treat the individual practice of such social wrongs as war, slavery, polygamy, and the like, as he does that of falsehood, adultery, theft, and the like, and therefore we are not at liberty to do so.—Your first specific illustration of the argument is, that of oppressive civil government—Christ, you allege, did not "speak out" against this in the particular case of the Roman Government, but on the contrary, directly avoided doing so. I have shown that

the texts and facts you cite to prove this, do not do it; and in my last I began the proof, that Christ has spoken against this in every age, and did do it in regard to the Roman Government in particular. We began our "study of God's method of proceeding" on this subject "as unfolded in the Bible," of which you and the Board so solemnly speak, with his "Lesson of Providential Retribution."—Let us "study" now,

GOD'S LESSON OF PROPHECIC DENUNCIATION.

What ails God's chosen people? They are not idolaters; they are not contemners of religion; they are not breakers of the Sabbath; they are not neglecters of public worship; and much less, are they despisers of religious ordinances. So far from it, see Isaiah 1st, they abound in "sacrifices." God is "full" of their offerings. But it is to no "purpose." Their oblations are "vain."—Their incense is "abomination." Their new moons and Sabbaths, and calling of assemblies, God "cannot away with." The solemn meeting even is "iniquity." Their new moons and appointed feasts, God "hath"; they are a "trouble" to him; he is "wary to bear them." And when they spread forth their hands in prayer, he calls them plainly, "I will hide mine eyes from you." Yet when they grow importunate and make many prayers, his terrible rebuke is, "I will not hear." Strange indeed. Surely they are a devout, orderly, religious, God-worshipping people, and he a God-hearing prayer. What is the trouble? Ah! "Your hands are full of blood!" From some organic or other difficulty, they were not a God-obeying people. However correct in theory, and devout in worship, they had not learned in practice "What this meaneth," "I will have mercy and not sacrifice;" (Math. ix: 13); and much less this, "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifices," (Prov. xxi 31.) But God told them, as Christ told the Jews of his day, that they must learn it: that until they did it their religion was a loathing, and if they did it not, they should be a desolation. With no exceptions for organic impotents and innocents, "Put away," he said, "the evils of your doings from before mine eyes; cease ye to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; lighten (see margin) the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow." If ye do so, he added, it shall be well, "but, if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

In Isaiah 58th, we have a similar lesson.—"Thy people are equally religious; and their religion seems no drudgery. They seek

God daily." They "take delight in approaching to him." To all their other observances, they add seasons of special and earnest fasting. In their rigid and solemn observance of these, they "afflict" their "soul." And, when, in return, they see no tokens of divine recognition and favor they are perfectly amazed. They know not how to explain it. They are as much at their wit's end, in respect to this "strange and general suspension of divine influence," as are many of the "religionists" of our day. "Wherefore, say they, have we fasted, and thou seest not? Wherefore have we afflicted our soul, and thou takest no knowledge?" Because, is God's answer, of your contentions and oppressions; and he adds, "the fast that I have chosen" is "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke," &c.; and so fasting, "thy light," he says, "shall break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward; thou shalt call and the Lord shall answer; thou shalt cry and he shall say, Here am I; thy light shall rise in obscurity, and thy darkness shall be as the noon day."

These are God's instructions and warnings to the "people." Here him speak, now to king, nobles and people, (Jer. 22) "Hear the word of the Lord, O king of Judah, that sitteth upon the throne of David, thou and thy servants, and the people that enter in by these gates; Thus saith the Lord, Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor; and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place." If ye do this, well, "But if ye will not obey these words, I swear by myself, saith the Lord, that this house shall become a desolation;" or, as the previous chapter, v: 12 hath it, "lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings."

GOD'S LESSON TO THE HEATHEN.

And, lest you insist that God speaks in different style to these organic sinners, because of their greater light, "Study," now, his "method" with those of other and Gentile nations. The prophets are full of it—so full, that one is perplexed to know where to make selection. Turn we, as one illustration out of many, to the 1st chapter of Amos. Here, in thirteen short verses, we have grouped together the sin and the doom of five distinct nations—Syria, Philistia, Tyre, Edom and Ammon. It is not a single sin that dooms them: It is

three transgressions, yea, a fourth, fourth, as if it were the crowning, damning sin of all, is the only one that God notes, and that, in every instance, is some form of governmental oppression.

Thus saith the Lord, (vs: 35,) "For three transgressions of Damascus, (the city of government,) yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron"—(or, as 1 Kings, xiii: 17 describes it, "for the oppression of Israel, cause the king of Syria oppressed the sons of Israel, for he had destroyed them, and had made them like the dust by threshing")—"But I will send a fire into the house of Hazael, (the king,) which shall devour the palaces of Benhadad, (the successor.) I will break also the bar, (defence) of Damascus, and cut off the inhabitants from the plain of Aven, and that holdeth the sceptre from the house of Eden: and the people of Syria shall go into captivity unto Kir, (of the Medes,) saith the Lord"—king, successorship, people and city shall be made desolate or captive!

Thus saith the Lord, (vs: 68,) "For the transgressions of Gaza, (a principal city of the Philistines,) yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they carried away captive the whole captivity, deliver them up to Edom." Conquering and slave-trading were their crime; and for it God added, "I will send a fire on the wall of Gaza, which shall devour the palaces thereof, and I will cut off the inhabitant from Ashdod, and him that holdeth the sceptre from Ashkelon; and I will turn mine hand against Ekron; and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish"—all shall share the general doom for the general sin!

Thus saith the Lord, (vs: 9, 10,) "For three transgressions of Tyre, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they delivered up the whole captivity to Edom and remembered not the brotherly covenant." Theirs is the sin of selling men into captivity, or slavery, in violation of solemn treaties; and for it, God declares, "I will send a fire on the wall of Tyre, which shall devour the palaces thereof."

Thus saith the Lord, (vs: 11, 12), "For three transgressions of Edom, yea, for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his an-

tear perpetually, and kept his rath-
er." He is the sin, not of enslaving
but of hunting and holding his victims
in an unceasing grasp. And for
Edom equally with the oph-
el will send a fire upon Teman, which
devour the palaces of Bozrah."

With the Lord, (vs : 13 15 :) "For
transgressions of the children of Ammon
for fear I will not turn away the punishment
of; because they (by conquest and plun-
dered the mountains of Gilead;
ing themselves), that they might enlarge
border"—a true slaveholding, "oppressor-
ing, land robbing, Texas-plundering an-
on and iniquity! And for it, "I will
a fire in the wall of Rabbah (their cap-
and it shall devour the palaces thereof,
abouting in the day of battle, with a tem-
in the day of the whirlwind. And their
shall go into captivity, he and his prin-
ciples, saith the Lord."

A DISTINCTION AS THE BOARD AND
PROP. STOWE MAINTAIN.

And this denunciation is continued in the
next chapter, in respect to Moab, Judah,
Israel, in the same strain, and for the
same and similar sins, as the crowning and
late cause. Now surely, you will not
say that in all these cases, we have only the
denunciation of individual and personal sins, such
as theft and drunkenness." No. Here is
oppression in various forms, and at least
mental slavery. And, "war, poly-
gamy, and such like social wrongs,"
which are different from theft and drunk-
enness, and other individual, personal sins,
are treated in the Bible in a different way."
The American Board say the same. "So far as
civil and political oppression are concerned,
Beecher says it. But where, I pray,
in all these cases, do you find the differ-
ence, except it be in the greater severity of
the general denunciation? Where do you
find, in his prophetic denunciations, sin-
gling out lying, or drunkenness, or theft, or
such strictly personal sins, as the crown-
ing and damning sin of a whole people?—
do you not know, that in the doom of
the next chapter, (Amos II : 8 8,)
the fourth and crowning sin is a combination
of oppression, lewdness, drunkenness and idol-
atry—selling the righteous for silver and the
just for a pair of shoes;" "a man and his
going in unto the same maid;" and

"drinking the wine of the condemned in the
house of their God!"

Do you need to be told, that in the whole his-
tory of human experience, in every age and
nation, wherever idolatry and formalism are,
there is oppression, and with it, in equal
malignity and power, lewdness, lying, theft,
murder, and such like, and that these all are
but specific parts of the prevailing generic type
and expression of human degeneracy? And
in all your "study" of the Bible, have you
and the Board yet to learn, that the Bible is
true to nature; and therefore, that in instan-
ces many, it groups all these various sins to-
gether, while in others it singles out idolatry,
formalism, or oppression as the generic type
and synonym of all, and then, so far from a dif-
ferent, declares common condemnation in the
malediction of the Most High? Is it true, that
in your Bible, "Woe unto them that join house
to house and lay field to field," &c., does not
stand side by side, with "Woe unto them that
rise up early in the morning, that they may
follow strong drink?" (Isaiah IV : 7-12.)

Has your Bible, (Amos VI : 1-6),
one "Woe" for those "that put far away
the evil day and cause the seat of vio-
lence to come near," and another and different
for the luxurious, pleasure-loving and drunk-
en—those "that lie upon beds of ivory," and
"sent the lambs out of the flock," and "chant
to the sound of the viol," and "drink wine in
bowls?" Why then do you, in the general
denunciation of sin and sinners, separate
what God has kept together? Why set up
distinctions and make exceptions, that have no
valid existence in human experience, and no
recognition in "God's lesson of prophetic De-
nunciation" respecting it.

You surely, will not say, that in these, and
a score of similar cases, kings, nobles, officers
and people were all one way—all, voluntari-
ly, deliberately and from no organic necessity,
falling in with the general wrong: all there-
fore individually guilty and not one personally
innocent—one general rule of guilt, social
and individual, with no exception? But
where, in the general denunciation, does
God take cognizance of these exceptions?—
When, where, or how, does he modify, sus-
pend, or practically reverse the general truth
in deference to them? I cannot find it.—
And now, did Christ come to take all this
back, or to "fulfil" it? Did he come, the
usher and author of a brighter age, to un-
fold another method, to utter a truer testi-

mony, to give a more discriminating denuncia-
tion, and as the result of this new light and
justice, to baptize and cover in the Christian
church, what God for ages, had exposed and
blasted in Hebrew and Heathen states?

We cannot "study," as I intended and had
written,

GOD'S LESSON OF PROPHETIC PREDICTION.

Enough that the very last prophetic an-
nunciation of him is on this wise—"I will
come near to you to judgment; and I will be
a swift witness against the sorcerers, and
against the adulterers, and against false
swearers, and against those that oppress the
hiringling in his wages, the widow, and the
fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger
from his right, and fear not me, saith the
Lord." Enough, that here, as elsewhere,
personal and social wrong-doers are grouped
together in a common condemnation, and
that Christ never came to ungroup them, and
give the lie to this and other predictions of
himself, by unfolding them in the bosom of
his church. No. Even John's heralding of
him (Matt. iii : 10), as nigh "at hand," was
on this wise—"And now also the axe is laid
unto the root of the tree: therefore every
tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is
hewn down and cast into the fire." How
much more so, his actual coming and his
kingdom!

A. A. Phelps.

In the remainder of this letter, which we
are obliged, for the present, to omit, Mr.
Phelps shows that "Christ did speak out" on
this subject: and that "there were no slave
holders in the primitive Church." We hope
his letters will be, extensively circulated as
an antidote to Dr. Beecher's "organic sins."

The position of the American Board involves
evidently, the belief, either that God
does not punish nations for the organic sin
of oppression, or that, in punishing a nation
for this sin he does not punish the individuals
of whom the nation is composed: or that he
admits into the Church, a sin which he will
not tolerate in the state, and indulges Chris-
tians in crimes for which he miraculously
exterminates ignorant heathens!

It is indeed, gravely maintained, by
Messrs. Beecher and Stowe, that providen-
tial retributions on account of a particular
practice, so far from furnishing an argument
against the tolerance of that practice in the

Church, in an argument on the other side and go to prove that God leaves them to be corrected in that manner, rather than by immediate denunciation and excision! The overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, and of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, according to this logic, should lead us to suspect that very probably, the practices for which these divine judgments were inflicted, are not to be considered disciplinable offences in the Church!

THE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

Testimony of ROBERT J. BRACKENRIDGE, D. D. We presented, some time ago, the testimony of ALBERT BARNES (not an active abolitionist), to the fact that the Churches in general are implicated in the guilt of Slavery. We add, now, the testimony of Dr. Brackenridge, of Baltimore, a zealous Colonizationist, and a violent opposer of "modern abolitionism." For his self-consistency we cannot indeed vouch. But we shall repel the charge of having *standered the Churches* about slavery, by citing such authorities as Barnes and Brackenridge, and the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, concessions which cover the whole ground of debate; and fully justify all that we have ever said on the subject.

"Its political aspect, we grant, is bad enough and fairly bolles our high sounding professions of republicanism, but its evils in a moral point of view, may truly be termed *LESION*. The church has cherished it in her bosom, and sustained it by her example, until it has reared its head so high in sanctuary as almost to *bid defiance to her authority*. This is evidently one of the worst signs of the times. But if we must wait for the civil authorities to take the lead in opposing this sin, what is it but an acknowledgement that *politics are purer than religion*."

We are truly in a woful plight, if the church must abandon her contest with sin and lean for support upon the arm of the world. Perhaps nothing tends so much to perpetuate this monstrous system, as the acknowledged fact that *men truly pious support it by their example*. This hallows it in the eyes of the world. Would the church only see to the removing of such props, the *unsightly fabric must soon totter and fall*."

Such is the testimony of Dr. Brackenridge, one of the great men of the Presbyterian Church. It may be asked why this testimony produces no more effect among Presbyterians and why he is not as obnoxious among them,

as the "ultra abolitionists" are. Perhaps the reason may be that Dr. Brackenridge believes that "men truly pious support Slavery by their example." While the Doctor continues to fellowship incorrigible slave holders as Christians, he will not greatly disturb pro-slavery religionists, nor trouble their consciences, nor provoke their ire. We would suggest to the Doctor, a slight amendment of one of his sentences, so as to make it read thus, "Perhaps nothing tends so much to perpetuate this monstrous system as the concession, that those may give evidence of being truly pious men, who, in despite of all remonstrance and entreaty, persist in supporting it by their example."

DENUNCIATORY LANGUAGE.

Judge, Heath of Maryland, in giving judgment, recently, in the U. S. District Court, at Baltimore, against Jason L. Pondleton, for fitting out, and selling a vessel in Africa for the slave trade, describes the crime, in the language that follows.

To these enormities, which would not be believed but for the facts before us, the members of civilized, a gallant and a christian people, lend themselves, and prostitute the flag of their country—a flag that should never protect the deceiver, nor give strength to the oppressor, that should never be unfurled except in defence of human rights, or the promotion of human happiness.

The act of which you stand convicted is one in a moral point of view of great enormity, y r, if it be possible, more heinous still is the crime of him who applies his wealth to fit out these unhallowed expeditions and to tempt you and others in like situations to engage in such enterprises. There are no words in our language, copious as it is, that would adequately describe the enormity of his conduct. Such a wretch should be hunted down and driven from society as an enemy to the human race.

We hear of no complaints against Judge Heath, for the severity of his language.—Now put the testimony of another Southern Judge by the side of it. Judge Cranch, of the District of Columbia, in a petition to Congress against the domestic Slave trade carried on from the Federal District, "under exclusive jurisdiction of Congress," a petition signed in 1828 by 1100 citizens of the District, declares that traffic to be, "in every respect as cruel and in many respects more demoralizing than the African Slave trade."

"There are no words, then, in our language, copious as it is" (according to Judge

Heath) "that would adequately describe enormity of [this] conduct."

To whom, then, shall this language be piled? As this is a "delicate question" as "fanatics" ought to be distrustful of their own impressions, we will sit at the feet of Gamaliels of the law and learn wisdom. We will make a pilgrimage to Brooklyn and Princeton. Thus instructed we learn that those who frame wicked laws are to bear most exclusively the sin of those who act in conformity with them and perpetrate the crimes they legalize. The slave trade of the District is an "organic sin" and the true moment of organic sin is to be very lenient towards the individuals who fall in with it; after they are organized, reserving all anathemas for the organizers, the law makers themselves.

Very well. The buyers and sellers of slaves in the Federal District, alien, mixed and church members, are to be excused, the present, as the Princeton and Brooklyn Doctors intended they should be. But "is guilt some where" and that guilt, in present cases, lies evidently (according to Princeton and Brooklyn logic) at the door of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, together with the Magistrate himself, who holds a share of legislative power.

May we say, then, that there are no words in our language, copious as it is, that would adequately describe the enormity of their conduct? Alas! There are Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, in abundance, among numbers of the delinquents!

Shall we, then, go a step back, and pile this language to the voters, to the sovereign people, who elect these men to office, and who, virtually, are the framers of these laws, refuse to repeal them? Here again, ministers and brotherhood of the same name, and a majority of them all over the free world, come in for a full share of the guilt! "Are there no words in our language, copious as it is, that could adequately describe the enormity of the conduct?"

If Judge Heath, Judge Cranch, the Bible Repository, Prof. Stowe, Dr. Edward Beecher and the American Board, may be followed implicitly, as safe guides, to what other conclusion can we arrive?

And now we demand, in sober earnest, who, among abolitionists, has ever excelled in the severity of his denunciations, the language of Judge Heath, which according to the other high authorities just quoted, might rightfully be applied to the great body of religionists in the non-slave holding states, especially their ecclesiastical leaders and the honored and titled laymen?

Unless the language of Judge Heath is abusive and unwarrantable, unless the testimony of Judge Cranch and the eleven hundred petitioners be a libel, unless the logic of the Brooklyn and Princeton Doctors be sophistry or something worse, there are

words in our language, copious as it is, that could adequately describe the enormity of their conduct."

Christian Investigator:

HONEOYE, FEBRUARY, 1840.

HOW MEN MAY MAKE INFIDELS, AND PROVE THEMSELVES HYPOCRITES.

The N. Y. Observer, some time last May or June, gave an account of the N. E. Anti-Slavery Convention (old organization) at Boston. Such men as Garrison, Phillips, and Douglass, it seems, had arraigned the Clergy, for their pro-slavery position. Very possibly they may have made their censures somewhat, too, indiscriminate, forgetting the proper exceptions necessary in general statements.—A number of persons present, took up, in defense of the Clergy—among whom was Rev. J. B. Pinney, formerly missionary (1) to Liberia, and then Governor of that Colony.—The N. Y. Observer says he "attempted to pour a little truth into the Ocean of falsehood." He defended them, as we are led to infer, from the charge of being pro-slavery, which charge the N. Y. Observer indignantly repels.—But yet, the champion of the Clergy, could not close his speech without an attempt to prove that God is in favor of Slavery! The following we clip from the Christian Freeman of June 12.

"In several of the Boston papers we find reports, more or less complete, of Mr. Pinney's remarks. The Christian Watchman says, that Mr. Pinney replied to the wholesale charges of corruption against the church and the ministry, and in the course of his remarks 'he quoted Scripture to show that slaves under the Mosaic dispensation, were called property, and proved from several texts, that God had established the relation of master and slave, and authorized buying and holding men as property; and argued therefore, that the affirmation of the abolitionists—that to hold men as property, was universally and always sinful, was to deny the authority of the Bible.'"

And this is what the N. Y. Observer calls truth, is it? A "defence of the Clergy" that repels as a slander against them, the charge of their being pro-slavery, and then labors to make out the Bible to be a pro-slavery Book! The same article in the N. Y. Observer, claims the Northern Clergy as Anti-Slavery, and says, "the Anti-Slavery Cause, is a righteous cause, dear to God," &c.

Now we bring against such "Clergy and defenders of the Clergy," the charge of being hypocrites, if not infidels, and we present

to them a dilemma, upon either horn of which, they may swing, at their leisure.

If they are "Anti-Slavery," as they profess to be, then they are hypocrites in pretending to believe in a Bible which they say is in favor of Slavery!—But if, on the other hand, they really do believe the bible to be the word of God, and believe it to be in favor of Slavery, then they are hypocrites in pretending to be Anti-Slavery, and in pretending to believe that "Anti-Slavery is a righteous cause, dear to God."

Whether such men are, in reality infidels, choosing this a droit method of bringing the Bible into disrepute, is a grand question, which has puzzled many wiser heads than ours.—But of their downright hypocrisy, upon any supposition that can be made respecting them, there can be no reasonable doubt, unless they are to be set down as decidedly the greatest dunces under heaven, and incapable of putting two ideas together.

But whether we account them hypocrites, infidels, dunces, or all three combined, it is manifest that infidelity must take deep root in any community in which such creatures are honored and accredited, by the devout, as trust worthy teachers of the Christian religion!

HEAR CASSIUS M. CLAY.

No man has been more lauded than C. M. Clay, by certain leading men at the North, who oppress northern abolitionists, on the ground of their severity towards the church. The following is a scrap from his pen.

NARRATIVE of the anti slavery experience of a minister in the Methodist E. Church, who was twice rejected by the Pha. An. Conference, and finally deprived of license to preach, for being an ABOLITIONIST. By Lewis C. Matlock. Pha.

Such is the title of a little work of 24 pages, which we have read with great interest. The caption sufficiently explains the substance of the narrative. This great Church, which in 1833, unanimously refused a poor preacher license, because he was constrained by conscience, the love of God and man, to denounce slavery, was in 1844 rent in twain by the same sentiments then denounced.

Let no man say the progress of Liberty is not onward, and truth mighty in battle. If the 'Church South' does not see the hand writing on the wall, in this simple fact, she is more blind than the reveller of Babylon, whose power perished in a single night!—[Clay's True American.

INGRATITUDE.

The Christian Index, printed in Georgia, contains the report of a Rev. Mr. Jones, who,

it appears, has been laboring as a sort of missionary among the slaves. By the following extract, it would seem that his services were not held in the highest estimation by those whom he sought to make contented in their happy condition.

"Allow me to relate a fact which occurred the spring of this year, illustrative of the character and knowledge of the negroes at this time. I was preaching to a large congregation on the *Epistle of Philemon*; and when I insisted upon fidelity and obedience as Christian virtues in servants, and upon the authority of Paul, condemned the practice of running away, one half of my audience deliberately rose up and walked off with themselves, and those that remained looked any thing but satisfied, either with the preacher or his doctrine. After dismissal, there was no small stir among them: some solemnly declared 'that there was no such epistle in the Bible;' others, 'that it was not the gospel;' others, 'that I preached to please the masters;' others, 'that they did not care if they ever heard me preach again.'"

This is indeed a very extraordinary disclosure. See the effect even of a little instruction! Nature taught those noble-souled men to despise the pitiful Jesuit, who would prostitute his sacred office and his pious pretensions to make them believe their own manhood. They knew he was dishonoring their Maker in attempting to besoul them. They knew he was slandering the Saviour, who came to preach, not the hunting of runaway slaves, but the deliverance of the oppressed. They expressed a proper sense of indignation, and set a worthy example to hundreds of white Christians here at the North, who are not ashamed to sit in their cushioned pews and hear learned doctors of divinity babble the same foul libels upon the Christian religion, in expounding the same portion of holy writ, in order to keep the judges, and magistrates, and statesmen of the North in due foulty to the overseers of the South.—[Emancipator.

This gentleman, we suppose, is the identical slave holding missionary, C. C. Jones, who recommended an increased patrol and a more efficient plantation discipline, to overawe the slaves, in the region of his labors, making this topic a prominent one, in his report to the Missionary Society that employed him. His piety has been loudly commended by northern ministers, of the Colonization School, and the Portland Christian Mirror

and kindred prints have given wide circulation and countenance to his learned arguments, going to prove that "oral instruction, without the Bible," is good enough for the Slaves, and all that we ought to ask for them.

A PRO SLAVERY CHURCH.

The editor of the South Western Christian Advocate has made a labored effort to prove that the M. E. Church South, is not a pro-slavery Church. This he does by explanations of the terms pro-slavery, anti-slavery, and abolitionism. These explanations are very peculiar. But after all he sums up as follows:

"If, however, the holding of men, women, and children in bondage, under the ordinary circumstances that connect themselves with slavery in the southern states, constitutes us a pro-slavery church, then we are a pro-slavery church, in this 'restricted or privately understood' acceptation; for we do not regard slaveholding as sinful, as it exists in the southern states, provided the master feeds, instructs, and governs his slaves according to the directions laid down in the word of God."

We have copied from True Wesleyan, the above paragraph, italicising a position, to which we would direct the attention of our readers. Slavery "under the ordinary circumstances" that attend it, in the Southern States, is here fully endorsed, as deserving a place in the Church!—That these "ordinary circumstances" include the domestic slave trade, the buying and selling of "men, women, and children," no one will deny, and Henry Clay has said that the right to sell them, from State to State, cannot be separated from the right to hold them as property, "goods and chattels personal."

The above paragraph, includes the admission that the Southern Church members do "hold men, women, and children, in bondage, under the ordinary circumstances that connect themselves with Slavery in the Southern States!" And it deserves notice that while the writer makes a special proviso that the master shall "feed, instruct, and govern his slaves, according to the directions laid down in the word of God" (1) he has nothing to say against "the ordinary circumstance" of separating families by sale, of selling children by the pound, and bartering the members of the body of Christ for brute beasts! And the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky attest that this practice is common among church members!

Yet, after all, the S. W. Christian Advocate has made quite as valid a defence of the Church South as is commonly made, or can be made of the Church North! It sounds, oddly enough, to be sure, in northern ears, to be told that the Southern Churches "are not pro-slavery, when they 'hold men, women, and children in bondage, under the ordinary circumstances that connect themselves with Slavery in the Southern States.'—But let us be impartial, and put this defence by the side of the plea that the Northern Church (in general) is not pro-slavery—when its members commonly vote for slave holders, sustain slavery in the District of Columbia, erect the negro pew in the Sanctuary, maintain Caste in their Seminaries of learning, build up Slave holding mission Churches, shut out the discussion of Slavery from their own pulpits, oppose all existing anti-slavery agitations and measures, and propose none of their own instead of them.

CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE IN MAINE.

The following, so far as it goes, is much to the purpose, and presents a striking contrast to the course taken by the General Association of Congregational ministers in Connecticut.—The Maine Conference, if we mistake not, has a mixture of the lay element in its composition; and is less under the control of such influences as reign at Yale and at Andover.

The subject of slavery was introduced by a motion for a committee to prepare a remonstrance to the General Assembly.

REPORT ON SLAVERY.

The committee appointed "to inquire as to the propriety and duty of any action on the part of this conference, in reference to the recent doings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church on slavery," recommend that the following minute be adopted by the conference and entered on their records.—The General Conference of Maine have seen with surprise and grief, the report adopted by the General Assembly of Cincinnati. The document appears in view of the conference, to be directed at variance with a former report made by the General Assembly on the same subject in 1818, and to be intended as a justification of the system of slavery now existing in the southern states, by an appeal to the scriptures, and contains nothing which looks, however remotely, to its overthrow; but is fitted to produce the impression that this system is justified by the word of God, and therefore not to be abolished. The conference deem it accordingly a duty, publicly to express their dissent from these proceedings of a body with

which they have so long maintained fraternal intercourse.

CHARLES FREEMAN,
DAVID THURSTON,
J. W. PEET,
Wm. T. DWIGHT,
RAY PALMER.

The report was adopted by a vote nearly unanimous.

How faithfully the members and constituency of the Maine Conference will live up to the tone of the above report, remains to be seen. It is to be hoped that they will not, after this, be found, voting, at the ballot box, on the opposite side, and in favor of pro-slavery law makers and slave holders. If they do, they will stand condemned by their own works.—We should like to know whether the above named W. T. Dwight is the Portland clergyman who made an eloquent speech, in our hearing, at Brooklyn, against the Report of the American Board, and then voted in its favor?

ECCLESIASTICAL HAIR SPLITTING—EVASION—MANAGEMENT.

In no part of the Country, perhaps, and by no Ecclesiastical body, has the Slave question been more adroitly handled than in Connecticut, by the General Association of Congregational Ministers in that state. At the meeting of that body, last summer, the following resolutions were presented by Mr. Perkins of Meriden.

Whereas, this Association has frequently delivered its opinions in relation to slaveholding—and whereas, recent events, such as the imprisonment of Christian Men, on the charge of aiding slaves to escape, and the late action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, seem to require the reiteration of our views, therefore resolved:

1st. That we consider slaveholding as an outrage on human rights, and at variance with the spirit of Christianity.

2nd. That no man is bound in conscience to obey slave law.

3rd. That while it may be matter of judgment and expediency what measures should be taken, and what risks incurred in aiding the colored man to escape from bondage, as once the like considerations should have been weighed in deciding how far we should have gone in aiding a white slave to escape from Algiers; yet the right to give such aid, we hold to be undeniable.

4th. That we recommend, to our churches, to give a place to the slave in their prayers and benevolent efforts, together with the usual religious objects of the day.

5th. That our delegates to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, carry from us to that body, a letter on its connection with slavery.

These Resolutions elicited a long debate.—They were not adopted, but the following were adopted in their stead.

Whereas, this Association has, at various times, adopted resolutions in relation to slavery, in the following terms :

At Vernon, in 1834. Resolved, that to buy and sell human beings, or to hold or treat them as merchandise, or to treat servants, free or bond, in any manner inconsistent with the fact that they are intelligent and voluntary beings, made in the image of God, is a violation of the principles of the word of God, and should be treated by all the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, as an immorality, inconsistent with a profession of the Christian religion.

Resolved, that this Association regards the laws and usages in respect to slavery, which exist in many of the States of this Union, as inconsistent with the character and responsibilities of a free and Christian people, and holds it to be the duty of every Christian, and especially of every Minister of the Gospel, to use all prudent and lawful efforts for the peaceful abolition of slavery.

At Norfolk, in 1836. Resolved, that in the judgment of this Association, the buying and selling of human beings, and the holding them for selfish ends, by the ministers and members of our Churches removing to the South, is a great sin, and utterly inconsistent with their Christian profession.

At New Haven, in 1840. Resolved, that American slavery, in the opinion of this body, is inconsistent with the principles of the Gospel, and its immediate abolition by those who have the legal power, is a duty in the discharge of which the blessing of heaven may be expected.

Resolved, that we recommend to the churches under our care, a prayerful consideration of this important subject, and the exertion of their appropriate influence for the emancipation of all the enslaved throughout this land and throughout the world.

Now, (1845) Resolved, that we again adopt these resolutions, as the expression of our sent views, and direct our scribe to transmit a copy of them to the stated clerks of each of the bodies, styled "The General Assembly."

A plain unsophisticated reader, uninitiated in the peculiar tactics of modern ecclesiastical bodies would be led to inquire, why the Association, that could adopt the latter series of resolutions, should be unwilling to adopt the

former. A close inspection, however, in the light of the recent discussions at Brooklyn, and of the previous publications at Princeton, will reveal to us the reasons of the course adopted in Connecticut.

The resolutions rejected condemn *slaveholding*. The resolutions adopted only condemn slavery and some of the slave laws. The former condemn an act, the latter an abstraction. The former were designed to hit somebody, and every reader would know who—the latter expend their strength, upon "usages" rather than upon persons—upon bodies incorporated rather than upon individuals—or, when the latter alluded to, it is in such a manner as to give them a chance to dodge.

The Resolutions adopted at Vernon, in 1834 were doubtless designed to be understood, at the South, as condemnatory of the Slave trade, but not of slave holding. They condemn the treating of slaves as merchandise, and the "treating of servants, bond or free in a manner inconsistent with the fact that they are intelligent and voluntary beings, made in the image of God." It is here taught, by implication, that slaves may be held by their masters and not treated by them as merchandise, nor "in a manner inconsistent" &c. &c.

The Resolution adopted at Norfolk, in 1836, condemns "the buying and selling of human beings for selfish ends" a manifest implication that human beings may be bought and sold for *beneficent* ends, and that, in such cases, there is no harm in the practice! Southern Ministers and church members who buy, sell, and hold slaves, always profess to do it from holy and benevolent motives not from selfish and wicked ends. And so the General Association of Congregational Ministers in Connecticut (like their predecessors, the Jesuits) admonish "the ministers and members of our Churches removing south" not to commit any such acts without having good and Christian motives for them! Certainly, they did not intend to censure the good Dr. Ely, one of their number, who went South, and bought slaves. The naughty abolitionists gave great offence by insisting that Dr. Ely, and Dr. Richards did wrong.

And the General Assembly in 1845, could go no further than it did in 1836. Its position in 1836 may be estimated by the fact that it adopted measures to keep Anti Slavery lecturers out of their Churches, and that, in the operation of those measures, the anti slavery agent, Rev. E. R. Tyler, one of their own body, could gain access to but few of the parishes, although he was so exceedingly courteous as not to lecture within the geographical limits of any Congregational parish without leave asked and obtained of the regular Congregational pastor! The result

was that he resigned his agency for want of the requisite clerical leave to prosecute it efficiently.

The rejected resolutions of Mr. Perkins, in 1845, expressed a sympathy for "Christian men, imprisoned on a charge of aiding fugitive slaves to escape." The association, it seems, had no such sympathy to express. They alluded likewise, to "the late action of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church" in favor of slavery. But the Gen. Association of Connecticut had nothing to say on the subject, though in fraternal correspondence with that body.

The rejected Resolutions contained likewise the sentiment that the laws of God are paramount to the wicked slave laws of the south, and that "no man is bound in conscience to obey slave law." To this sentiment, as it would seem, the General Association was not prepared to respond, notwithstanding its previous resolutions, now reiterated, had thrown the blame on "the laws" rather than on the slave holders. Neither could the General Assembly suggest anything in favor of the duty of giving aid to fugitive slaves, nor even in assertion of the right to do so.

The distinction, then, after all, between the resolutions adopted and the resolutions rejected, appear pretty strongly marked, when they are carefully compared. And yet the resolutions adopted are so artfully drawn up that simple minded abolitionists have been cheated into the fond hope that they embody views nearly approximating to their own!

The debates in the General Assembly, on these two series of Resolutions, as reported in the Christian Freeman for July 7, sufficiently illustrate our remarks. Mr. Humphrey, delegate from the General Assembly, of the Presb. Church; justified its course, and said it could not legislate where Christ had not legislated.

Rev. Mr. Andrews vindicated the course of the General assembly. Slavery (he said) existed in the time of Christ and his Apostles. They did not condemn it; he would vote for no resolution that did not distinctly avow that slave holding was not sin."

This was said while the resolutions of Mr. Perkins, were under debate; as was also the following.

Rev. E. Hall, of Norwalk, said that if he supposed there was the least danger that these resolutions would pass, he would make a strenuous speech. He abhorred slavery totally, and from the bottom of his heart, but these resolutions were rank Garrisonism and Dorrism. He could not think more than one or two persons would vote for them.

S. W. S. DUTTON was convinced that the Resolutions of Mr. Perkins would not pass. If they were disposed of, he would offer the following.

1. *Resolved*, That the buying and selling of human beings for gain; the forced separation of husbands and wives, parents and children: the permission, by masters, to servants under their control, to live in a temporary concubinage, liable to be ended at any time by the caprice of either party, or by the caprice of others; the withholding the Bible and the ability to read the Bible, by masters, from servants under their control and care; and in general, the treatment of servants by masters in any manner inconsistent with their nature as immortal beings, for whom Christ gave himself to die, are crimes utterly inconsistent with a standing and a name in the Church of Christ.

2. *Resolved*, That all those laws, whether of individual States or of the United States, which, instead of prohibiting and punishing these crimes, require, or encourage, or allow them, are a foul disgrace to a people who glory in the possession of freedom as God's inalienable gift to man, and are deeply to be deplored, by all friends of their country, as fitted to call down upon it the direct judgments of Heaven.

3. *Whereas*, There is a common fame, the cry of which has gone abroad to the ends of the earth, that these crimes are perpetrated by ministers and members in both branches of the Presbyterian Church in this country, therefore.

Resolved, That our delegates be directed to present a copy of these resolutions to each branch of the Presbyterian Church, with our fraternal request, that the truth of this common fame be publicly denied, or, if that be inconsistent with facts, that proper and effectual measures be taken to bring the offenders to repentance.

Here was an implication and allowance in favor of slave holders, and slave traders who did not buy, sell, and hold slaves "for gain"! Could not the General Association adventure to adopt so prudent and guarded a set of resolutions as these? It would seem not!—And why? There was, in the first resolution an inconvenient specification of particulars, which would criminate the great body, of religious slave holders, at the south, after all!—That would not do! In the third resolution there was a strong hinting at disgraceful facts.

The third resolution would convey the impression at the South that the Congregational Ministers of Connecticut were earnestly opposed to those prevailing practices, among southern Church-members, and really wished to have something done about it. An impru-

dence, equal to that of the abolitionists themselves. And so the resolutions of Mr. Dutton, along with those of Mr. Perkins, were set aside, for the *Old Resolutions* of the General Association already copied; and this, notwithstanding Dr. Leonard Bacon very earnestly advocated the resolutions of Mr. Dutton.

"The New York Observer, in its account of this matter, declares that the Resolutions, introduced by Mr. Perkins, were the most ultra and untenable ever heard of, in any ecclesiastical body."

In the course of the debate, Dr. Bennett Tyler (of the Theological Seminary, at East Windsor,) said that "Christ and his apostles did not condemn slave holders, nor command them to emancipate their slaves."—"Rev. Mr. Ely" repeated the old story of Paul's returning a fugitive slave to his master. He would seek the conversion of the slaves, first, and then seek their liberty in the Lord's way and in the Lord's time.

Such were the influences successfully opposed to the adoption of the resolutions of Mr. Perkins. Such were the influences that determined the action of the body. Yet Dr. Bacon thought "the ministers of Connecticut had been calumniated as defenders of slavery." This he said, in the very speech in which he labored, unsuccessfully (as he did before the American Board, at Brooklyn) to induce his associates to take any earnest and decided steps against even the "cruelties and abuses" connected with slavery. The final action of the association was a compromise (repented) between the opposers and the apologists of slavery in that body, and shows that its position is unchanged.

WHICH OF THEM?

"*Stop my Paper. A. White.*"—If A. White will tell us his Post Office address, we will do so. We cannot afford to cut off ALL the "A. Whites" from our subscription list, to accommodate ONE of them. Never return a paper for discontinuance without writing on it your post office address. For even if there should be only one of the name on our books we could better afford, many times, to send the paper a year gratis than to spend the time needed to find the name on our books without knowing what Post office it belongs to.

"And they cast him out," [i.e. of the synagogue.]—John ix. 34, &c.

The condition of these persons is very happy, who are thrust out to the greatest distance by impious persons, (glorying in the name of the Church) that Christ may approach still nearer to them."—Beza.

"The last refuge that false prophets have, to destroy the true prophets, is, to lay traps and addictions to their charge."—Beza.

"*Trust*—simple, unsuspecting, unswerving, affectionate trust—is the one pledge of fealty which truth requires of all her followers. It matters nothing what may be the accidents pertaining to a principle—if that principle be once ascertained to be an embodiment of truth, then must it be followed wherever it may lead you. Its external aspect may be singular—its features rough—its voice forbidding—its track may lie over the most promising and difficult country—but it were treason in a non-conformist, of all men, to doubt the prudence of accompanying it while it endures it would."

"As non-conformists, you have deliberately and by public profession chosen truth as your leader. See to it that you follow her, wherever she may conduct you—not merely as a matter of duty, but as an exercise of enlightened and unflinching trust." [London Non-conformist.]

"Payments and Donations." for the Christian Investigator, February, 1846.

J. H. Reed, Brockett's bridge,	\$1.00	L. H. Fallow, Durham	
M. M. Porter, Leray's ville,	2.00	A. Foster, Iryton,	
G. Pitts, Honeoye,	3.00	W. Carpenter do.	
D. E. Seward do.	0.50	J. R. Dawston, Litchfield,	
D. W. Hawke do.	1.00	A. Seymour, Utica,	
J. S. Douglas, Hamillon	1.00	A. W. Porter, Rutland,	
J. Parker, Utica	1.00	P. Field, Charlestown,	
J. Plumb, Lodi	0.50	do for S. Bennett, Henshaw,	
E. P. Rood do.	0.50	do for S. W. Dutton, Newfield, Mass.	
J. Pierpont, Troy	1.00	W. Dewey, Gaines	
J. Hawley,		O. W. Pitts, Honeoye	
N. Milford, Penn.	1.00	A. B. DeForest, Morris	
J. Butler, Bellville, (O.)	1.00	L. L. Nourse, Hume	
E. Chase, Amsterdam	3.00	J. F. Hamilton, Jersey	
G. G. Jessup, Palmyra	1.00	(Penn.)	
B. Strong, Hudson (O.)	0.50	G. F. Horton, Tenn.	
A. Kilburn do.	0.50	Mr. Penn.	
D. Thurston, Windrop	1.00	J. Safford, Cambridge	
W. D. Walcott, N. Y.	1.00	D. D. Safford, Jefferson	
J. O. Harrington, Sherburne	0.75	C. Arnold, Honeoye	
W. M. Chapman do.	1.00	J. P. Miller do. Argus	
A. S. Leaton, Johnstown	1.00	R. Dewey, Franklin,	

The friends of this publication will find that we need additional support.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y., No. 1, 2, and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build, 4 pages, 30,521 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness, 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honesdale, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.
Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills
Together with every description of Book & Job

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES Vol. IV.—No. 3.
Weekly Number. 47.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MARCH, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, 12, 19.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

ISSUED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, always in advance, and free of postage.

Persons who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from the volume, as follows, via:

By dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, 82 00
By papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00
Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosed for papers.

ON "REL ABOLITIONISM"—THE TABLES TURNED.

Readers are aware of the hue and cry raised by leading ecclesiastics, country, against any zealous and anti-slavery efforts, that they are a parcel of a systematic warfare on Christian institutions, Bible, Sabbath, organization, ministry, civil government, &c. In this connection, the name Garrison is commonly tagged in, with such reason or justice we need not stop to now. (And we see a copy of the *Observer* of late, that we do not at the present views of the Editor on the subject, may be.) And all the heresies or imaginary, of M. Garrison, are set to the account of that class of abolitionists who abjure them, and whom Mr. Garrison strenuously opposes and as unflinchingly denounces as do these same clerical gentlemen themselves.

It is not permanent to inquire how it came that abolitionists and abolitionism so violently opposed, and why emancipation was denounced by these gentlemen, as an incendiary measure, many years before any of these heresies obtained the least foot hold, in any ranks of abolitionists? We might inquire what hinders the co-operation of these pious gentlemen, (who say they opposed slavery), with that very increasing class of abolitionists who, without the feeblest calumny, be-

lugged with looking with the least degree of favor upon the peculiar views above mentioned, and which are attributed to Mr. Garrison, and his friends?

But we have adverted to the topic, just at this time, for the purpose of starting an inquiry or two, in a different direction.

What if the fact should leak out, by little and little, and become fully understood and established, in due time, that the class of abolitionists most strongly opposed to the views attributed to Mr. Garrison, (and undoubtedly held by many of his friends) concerning Sabbath, Bible, Church, ministry, and civil government, are altogether more odious to the gentlemen who have raised the hue and cry about *Garrisonism*, than is Mr. Garrison himself, and those associated with him?

Another question. What if it should come to be the well known and ascertained fact, of the case, that the anti-slavery measures of those abolitionists who sustain Mr. Garrison, as distinguished from those of other abolitionists, are, to a great extent, at least, identical with the anti-slavery measures of these same clerical gentlemen who proclaim so loudly against the "*Garrisonism*" of those abolitionists who do not co-operate with him?

A few glimpses at passing facts will serve to justify these inquiries, and show that they are not made without reason.

The N. Y. *Observer* of July 5th, contains a "Letter from New England" in which the writer holds the following language:

Garrisonism.—I would speak respectfully of the dead, and therefore shall treat gently of this disorder. Radical Abolitionism has had its day in New England. In the Association of Massachusetts there was not one, and in Connecticut not more than two, who were willing to speak out their ultraisms if they hold them; and radicals are never dumb, though usually deaf. And I presume there is not one pastor in connexion with either of the bodies I have visited, who has any Garrison sympathies. And the type of abolitionism of which Leavitt is the representative is in almost as bad odor as Garrisonism. Men whom I expected to find warmly in favor of

Leavitt's measures, regard him as more mischievous than Garrison. And there is no doubt that it is better for the peace of the Church that those who are of her should "come out" of her, than stay in, to vex and distract her. A good riddance—it is when a troubler in Israel takes himself away.

In a previous number of the *Observer*, the same writer had held the following language:

"I have often heard it said that the Garrison party has a monopoly of abuse, but I prefer their spirit, and their measures, and their words, to those of Leavitt and his associates. There is a desperation of wickedness, a recklessness in malignity about the Emancipator men, that leaves the non-resistant Liberator far in the rear."

Of this preference of Garrison, with all his alleged heresies, over the abolitionists who can not be charged with them, we shall see sufficient evidence, soon.

That there are pastors of Churches, in New England who fully co-operate with Mr. Leavitt is well known. How many there are of them, we cannot tell. The writer in the *Observer* must be understood as speaking of the majority of New England Pastors, and he is doubtless right in saying that they do not co-operate with abolitionists, either of the Leavitt or Garrison stamp, unless it be in the particulars to which we shall presently allude.

More than this is affirmed. Leavitt is regarded as more mischievous than Garrison, and for the reasons assigned. Let us analyze these reasons, supply the half expressed enunciation of them, and put them into shape for inspection.

1. The Garrison party of abolitionists, as compared with the other class, is growing relatively feeble. It is less formidable, less likely to effect any thing further, either in Church, or in State. It is accordingly looked upon with less alarm and disapprobation—it is, prospectively, at least, outnumbered among the dead. And whatever its heresies may have been, the surviving Pharisaism of the age can afford to commence incipient measures for "building its tomb and garnish-

*This quotation from King Ahab was doubtless thought quite felicitous and appropriate. See Kings XXVIII 12.

ing its sepulchre!" Who knows but the name of Garrison may have a place, in the Church literature of New England, along with Wilberforce and Clarkson, at least with Lay, Woolman, Bonzet, and Penn, whose heresies on some points, feel little short of his? But,

2. Not so with the other sort of abolitionists. They are living and still growing in numbers and strength. The statesmen of the south, and particularly the immaculate Mr. Clay, regard them as having developed the "disorder" in its most "dangerous type."—They have resorted to the ballot box. They "are more mischievous than Garrison." In some way, therefore, they must be met, and put down, and even, if need be, and if the thing be found practicable, by a truce, perhaps by an alliance, with the Garrisonians themselves!

3. The Church, too, will be more disturbed, by that class of abolitionists who demand a pure Church, than by those who desire to have no Church organizations at all. The writer, to be sure, complains that abolitionists of Mr. Leavitt's sort continue to "stay in" the Church, a pithy comment, by the by, upon the whining cant that sometimes conjures them not to "rend the seamless garment of Christ" by coming out from them.

But if the abolitionists who believe in Church organization shall "come out" and raise the standard of secession, they will prove greater "trouble-s" in the N. Y. Observer's "Israel" than they now are.

Thus far, if no farther, our own reflections upon this note-worthy paragraph may carry us. Existing facts may help us to expand the thought a little, and see how coming events cast their shadows before. There are some things, already existing, that make this hue and cry of "Garrisonism," from the leading clergy of the day, (and levelled against the abolitionists not co-operating with Mr. Garrison) sound a little unharmonious from their lips.

In their political predilections, they are, in nine cases out of ten, discovered to be in unison with a certain political party that claims to be "the true Liberty party" in opposition to that which those abolitionists support who do not co-operate with Mr. Garrison. They support that party, with the slave holding President of the American Colonization Society, at its head, as the best po-

litical measure against slavery, within their reach! In this anti-slavery measure, such as it is, they are joined by "probably nine tenths of those professed Garrisonian abolitionists who do not wholly decline voting, as he does, and the number of these latter are believed to be comparatively few. In 1838 the Liberator computed them to be less than one hundred, in all New England. We know not how rapidly they may have increased since. But we know that the Anti Slavery Societies, and the publications sustaining Mr. Garrison, disclaim their being non-voting societies, or of shaping their policy in accordance with the non civil government theory. They abound in political discussions, and among no men are political predilections more strongly marked.

Do the leaders of the political party supported by these clerical gentlemen malign and traduce the leading members and candidates of the Liberty Party? These clerical gentlemen repeat the slanders with eager credulity. And so do the majority of the "Garrison abolitionists." Do the former charge us with injustice to the whigs? With affinity for the so called democratic party?—So do the latter? Do the former taunt us with "throwing away our votes," and deride us because we are a minority? So do the latter. Do the former deny the practicability of infusing a pure morality into the ballot box? So do the latter. Do the former preach to us the duty of choosing the least of two evils, when we vote? So, in many instances, (and particularly by their example) do the latter. Do the former admonish us of "the dirty waters of politics" the incompatibility of spirituality with political activity, the superiority of more moral suasion over coercion, and the hostility between the two? So do the non-government portion of the Garrisonians, and show themselves honest men, and apt scholars, by practicing in accordance with their belief, and in conformity with the teachings of the Doctors! Whoever has occasion for a treatise against political abolition may apply, as he finds most convenient, to William Slade, or to William Wisner D. D. or to William Lloyd Garrison, and he can be equally well accommodated, at about the same price, & must wipe his spectacles to discover the difference between the three. One little page would suffice for them all, and this the D. D. has furnished, viz. "Christ's Kingdom not of this world."

During our tour to N. England, last autumn we fell in with some of these "pastors" (reiterating the language of the N. Y. *Observer*) "regarding Leavitt as more mischievous than Garrison," while, nevertheless, were ready, for popular effect, to add associates of the former with the latter! They were rabid whigs to every man of them. To one of them, who had been ranting about Garrisonism, in this and denouncing Liberty men as more dangerous than Garrisonians, we ventured the question or two. He had claimed the party as strongly tinctured with Anti Slavery principles, of the right stamp, and had Greeley's N. Y. Tribune, and its occasional spicy paragraphs against slavery, in proof of it. Our questions were these.

1. Suppose all the Garrisonian abolitionists were abstracted from your whig ranks, you spare them, and make out the anti-slavery claims of your party without them? How few political leaders you might boast, Seward, Giddings and, if you choose to him, John Quincy Adams, who says he is in favor of abolishing slavery, even in the Federal District. These are your anti-slavery chieftains. But where, without your Garrisonian abolitionists, will they look for rank and file? The voters who would follow them, in any anti-slavery action?

[The gentleman was dumb. He knew I knew that, in his vicinity, he could catch his hand on many of them.]

2. You boast the anti-slavery character of your leading whig organ, the Tribune. But do you know sir, that the abolitionism of the N. Y. Tribune so far as it has any is of the Garrisonian type? Do you know that the whig or of those spicy paragraphs is Mr. J.—the assistant of Mr. G. who has been assistant Editor of the Liberator? And do you that his views of Bible, Church, Ministry, &c. &c., are those that are attributed to Mr. Garrison? Do you know that the religious views of Greeley himself are so opposite to those esteemed orthodox, that if Mr. Leavitt held them, you would denounce the Liberty party as heretics if not infidels sustaining him?

* We enter not into the question, either here, or in preceding remarks, how far the errors alluded to serve to be designated as "infidel." We simply show these gentlemen on their own ground, and offer the views which they call infidel, and which wrongfully charge upon the body of Christian abolitionists, are chiefly to be found, as far as professed abolitionists are concerned, in their own political camp, and in ours.

gentleman's countenance, showed he knew all this, and he was silent.] The era of pending elections, there is a visible interchange of labor between abolitionists and those who raise the cry of Garrisonism against those who co-operate with him! Religious editing editors, and Garrisonian editors understand, perfectly, the parts they play, on such occasions. Whig Editors, some of them) will praise Garrisonian abolitionists, copy from their and quote Mr. Garrison's opinions as anti-slavery authority. Garrisonian, in turn, will copy political articles from Whig Editors, with obvious intent. Editors will deprecate mingling religion with politics. To crown the whole, they will give us their sick child parables, their pious exhortations to the Christian voting for the least of two Devils.—the ballot box, all these influences flow to the harmonious result. The whig party, the most religious party, the most orderly, the most conservative party, the most judiciously and prudently contrived anti-slavery party, and all this we suppose, best absorbs nearly all the voting portion of Garrisonian abolitionists, with all their radicalism, infidelity, disorganization, anarchism, &c. &c.!

religious matter, likewise, some very remarkable phenomena are beginning to be observed. "The Bible sanctions slavery. (the whig Doctor of Divinity,) Christ condemns it. The apostles received it in primitive Churches. Slave holders and Christians. But mark me! I am an anti-slavery man! Don't slander me, by saying so! Slavery is 'the greatest abomination in all the earth!' And I am using political power to 'put it down by the true anti-slavery whig party!'"

"expresses my mind exactly," responds another. "So, here goes my Bible into the stove, and my whig vote into the ballot box!"

will not slander William Lloyd Garrison by calling this person a Garrisonian. But we wish Mr. Garrison and his Whig Doctors of Divinity could know any whig voters thus manufactured, are and call themselves by his name, and swell the ranks of that sort of abolitionism which the N. Y. Observer regards as scholastic than Leavitt's!

And then in respect to Church Organization. Our Presbyterian Doctors, with many who call themselves congregationalists, insist upon it that Jesus Christ and the New Testament have never established nor exhibited any distinct, definite, and authoritative Constitution of Church order. And hence they infer that they have a right to be Congregational, Presbyterian, Episcopal (they might add Papal) in their Church organizations, without any departure from the requirements of Christ! "Then," respond the non-Church organization men, "since Christ has established no rules of Church order, we can do as we think fit about having any at all, for he could not have required us to have that which he did not define and describe.—If Christ and his Apostles thought Christians needed no Constitution of Church Order, why! we think so too, and will not trouble ourselves about any. And as for you gentlemen Doctors, your Church organizations, by your own showing, are not according to any divine pattern, but are of mere human device, and no higher authority than that of your sect makers can be invoked to sanction them!"

But we have not room to enlarge. Time is the great revealer of unexpected affinities. The two halves of a pair of scissors could not match each other better than do our "Conservative" Doctors, and the "disorganizers" whom they at once repudiate and receive into fellowship, in opposing any organized and orderly reformation. We do not deny that there is disorganization and infidelity, to some extent, among abolitionists. But we do say, considerably, and advisedly, that three-fourths if not nine tenths of it is now absorbed and embodied in those professedly anti-slavery movements, in which our leading ecclesiastics and their favorite statesmen bear rule, and which they direct.

ORLEANS COUNTY (N. Y.) BIBLE SOCIETY AND FUGITIVE SLAVES.

It was stated in the papers, some time ago, that the Orleans Co. (N. Y.) Bible Society had declined furnishing (or requesting of the Parent Society, to whom it sent funds) a supply of Bibles for the fugitive Slaves, in Canada West.—We have recently heard the statement denied, and have been asked to produce the evidence of its verity.—On searching over our news paper files we find in the Oberlin Evangelist of July 2, a letter from AMASA LORD, dated, Covington, May 7, 1845, addressed to the Editor of the Evangelist. In

this letter Mr. Lord complains of a previous article in the Evangelist, on the subject, as being "Calculated to convey the impression that our Bible Societies are averse to supplying the Colored race."—He therefore undertakes to give the "whole truth" of the matter.—And he says—

"At a meeting of the Society above referred to, a resolution was introduced that the O. Co. B. S. request the American Bible Society to make a donation of Bibles for the fugitive Slaves in Canada West.—This was opposed, and finally lost."

And so, Mr. Lord confirms the main fact, after all.—But he goes on to explain the reasons of this refusal. And what were they? He says—

"The point at issue was not whether those individuals should have the Bible—not whether the A. B. S. should be requested to make the appropriation, but whether the O. Co. B. S. should make the request, or leave it to be made by individuals."

Precisely as we supposed! The question was whether the Orleans County Bible Society should risk the opprobrium of making so unpopular and obnoxious a request, or leave it for individuals (that is, for the fanatical abolitionists) to do so! To be sure, "it was not a question whether some body should have the privilege of doing something about it!"

Among the reasons assigned by Mr. Lord for this course of the Orleans County Bible Society, we have the following.

"The request being made by the County Society, was still farther objected to, on account of the sensitiveness of many of the donors to the Bible cause on the subject of abolition. It was known that the Society was composed of individuals who entertained different views on this subject—some being anti-slavery and some pro-slavery men—that many of the latter class would probably think that they discovered abolitionism (5) in the action of the Society if the resolution was passed—and it was thought that the peace and welfare of the Society demanded that it should leave it to individuals to make the request."

The "whole truth" is here honestly told! It was a "pro slavery" influence, by Mr. Lord's own showing, that controlled the action of the Society. And they rightly judged it an "abolition" measure to furnish colored people with Bibles.

But Mr. Lord informs us that the Yates Bible Society, auxiliary to the Orleans Co. B. S. afterwards "voted to make an appropriation of one hundred dollars worth of Bibles and Testaments for the supply of the fugitive slaves in Canada West." Very good. And

the action of the latter Society was a practical reproach of the County Society.—There must have been a greater proportion of abolitionists, and a smaller proportion of "pro-slavery men" in the town Society than in the County Society.—And as to the question whether "our Bible Societies are averse to supplying the colored race" the action of each society, for itself, must answer the question. And it will be answered, in every instance, according to the comparative influence of abolitionists in the society. The New Orleans Bible Society denied that it was any part of its object to supply Colored people, bond or free, with Bibles. And the American Bible Society, in 1833, indignantly spurned the princely offer of Arthur Tappan to furnish five thousand dollars, if it would supply all the colored population of the country with Bibles. We are glad to know that the Bible Societies, in some towns, refuse to be auxiliary to such a Society.

THE MISSIONARY CONVENTION.—The convention in behalf of Bible Missions at Syracuse, the 18th and 19th of February, was a very interesting one. Among the brethren in attendance were Gerrit Smith (who presided) Beriah Green, Alvan Stewart, Hiram Wilson of Canada, Dr. Lafon, Amos A. Phelps, and many other active advocates of the anti-slavery cause. An elaborate, able, and thorough address, from the pen of A. A. Phelps, together with appropriate Resolutions, was read, discussed, and adopted, and funds were raised for circulating 10,000 copies of the address and proceedings. A committee was appointed, on the subject of a weekly religious paper, to advocate the views of the convention, and another was appointed to call a convention in August, to perfect a Missionary organization, adapted to the times. The address recommends appropriate domestic as well as foreign missions, the support of feeble Churches and of ministers who have been discarded on account of their fidelity to the gospel of good tidings to the poor. Letters in favor of this movement were read, from S. S. Jocelyn and Lewis Tappan. It was one of the best conventions we have attended, and its action was in advance of what would have been anticipated, a few months ago. The renewed persecution of faithful abolitionists, especially of ministers, all over the country, within a short time is rapidly bringing matters to a crisis, in Church affairs, and not a few are opening their eyes to the fact that the Church question is substantially one, whether among the Choctaws and Cherokees, or among ourselves; and that pro-slavery Churches will never support anti-slavery missions.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, MARCH, 1834.

CORRECTION.—In the February number, page 209, third column, 15th line from the bottom, instead of "portion of the American Board," read "position of the American Board."

Our January paper should have been numbered "whole number 43" and the February paper, "whole number 46."

HEAR PRESIDENT WAYLAND!

"I never could, without doing violence to my conscience, do anything towards the establishment, in a heathen land, of a Church into which slavery would, by any means, be admitted."

"Then, of course Pres. Wayland could not, without doing violence to his conscience, do anything towards sustaining the American Board, so long as it retains the position taken in the Brooklyn Report."

But if Pres. Wayland's conscience would not allow him to do any thing towards the establishment of Churches that admit slavery, in a heathen land; how can his conscience allow him to do any thing towards sustaining pro-slavery Churches at home? Is his conscience a matter of latitude and longitude?—Or does it tolerate vice in Christianized and civilized America, that must not be winked at in barbarous nations? Or how does he expect to plant a purer religion among the heathen, than that which he endorses and cherishes at home?

OLD AND NEW SCHOOL.

New School Presbyterians (like the whigs) claim to be "the most favorable party" in the matter of human rights, and charge upon their opponents, the Old School (what is commonly the fact) that they are pro-slavery to the core.

And yet, nearly all the thorough anti-slavery Resolutions in Presbyterian bodies that meet our eye, are from a portion of the Old School in the south west.—We have before us, at this moment, the proceedings sometime last August, of a "meeting of old school Presbyterians" at Mount Pleasant, Jefferson Co. Ohio, earnestly protesting against the action of the O. S. General Association, on the slave question, and appointing a committee, to agitate the subject and circulate Petitions to the assembly, within the bounds of the Old School Synod of *Wharling*. Wm. Wyllie was Chairman of this meeting, and A. F. Hanna, Secretary. Where shall we find even in the state of New York, an equal ac-

tivity among New School Presbyterians, relation to the General Assembly, who stand behind the Old, in servility to the powers?

SLAVE-HOLDING MINISTER.

According to the accounts we have, Vermont papers, there is a slave holding pastor of a Congregational Church, in that Mr. McGill, of Cornwall. He is (of course) one of those unfortunate gentlemen, of whom there are so many thousands at the present time, who were made slave holders against will, and who remain so, out of pure benightedness! "And so they wrap it up."

"THE IMPARTIAL COUNTRYMAN."

S. Cyprian Perry, N. Y.—This is a weekly, which occupies the important region of Western N. York, has been recently enlarged, and greatly improved in appearance. We heartily wish it an increased circulation, and a long term of useful service in the cause.

ORGANIC SINS.—No 4.

CONFUSION CONFOUNDED.

The princes of Zoen and the builders of Babel might congratulate themselves with prospect of regaining a reputation for comparative perspicuity and wisdom, could witness the gyrations and listen to the orings of the chief champions of the American Board.

Of all the great men who lent their talents, their eloquence, and their influence, in favor of the Board and its Report at Brooklyn last autumn, who were more renowned and confided in, than Dr. Edward Beecher, of Boston, and Prof. C. E. Stowe, of Andover Seminary, brothers-in-law, and bearing their united shoulders, to this grave load, so large a share of the delegated wisdom of the east and of the west! When the late Report, the joint product of Wm. Greene and Stowe, so imploringly cast its eyes for succor, in the day of public bala, who was it that girdled himself to work of bringing forward new arguments for its rescue? Dr. Edward Beecher, of Andover! And by whom was he seconded and sustained? By Prof. Stowe of Andover! Who that was present, on that occasion, forget the joyous countenances of the members of the Board, while they were speaking? Who has not read the eulogium of their doings, reported in the papers, and very correctly too, as having fallen from the lips of one and another of the Doctors and the

ables of the Board, before they proceeded to the vote?

Dr. Hawes said he should vote for the Report, but added, "I could have wished that the important distinction between social and personal sins had been enlarged upon. It is one of great value."—[N. Y. Evangelist, Sept. 18.]

"Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon, did not regret the discussion."

He then alluded to the distinction between individual and organic sins, made by Dr. Beecher, and remarked that no other good had been obtained than the privilege of hearing that speech, the time was well spent.—[N. Y. Evangelist, Sept. 18.]

Of the Report, (after having heard the expositions and defences of it by Messrs. Beecher, and Stowe.) Hon. Linus Child, of Massachusetts, said.

"This Report had relieved his mind from difficulty.—Regarding slave holding as a sin, it was difficult to see how a slave holder could go to heaven. This is the first document that ever came before the public covering the whole ground so plainly that all can see."—[N. Y. Observer Sept. 13.]

No one who is acquainted with the particulars of the Brooklyn meeting will deny that Messrs. Beecher and Stowe (perhaps we should add Dr. Bacon to the number) were the chief champions of the Board and of its Report, on that occasion.

Since the meeting, too, the religious press has triumphantly adverted to the arguments of Messrs. Beecher and Stowe. And of all the strong writers on that side of the question to whom else, but to those same two gentlemen, has the attention of the reading public been chiefly turned? In successive numbers, and of great length, they have occupied the columns of the Boston Recorder, in further elucidation of their views.

And what is the result? Among other things and whatever else may have been reached by their luminous researches, one result is this, the two brothers-in-law, are completely at loggerheads with each other, about the new doctrine, the eastern inventor of the "organic" theory, (as though he were jealous for his patent) complains of his western brother for unwisely extending its sheltering wing too far! The latter repels the charge, denying that he has ever made any use of the "organic" machinery at all, disclaiming all confidence in it or fraternity with it! But let him speak for himself.

"WALNUT HILLS, OHIO, Dec. 5th 1845.

To the Editor of the Boston Recorder.

GENTLEMEN.—In the Recorder of November 27th just received, towards the close of article No. 7, on *Organic sins*, Dr. E. Beecher says: "I do not call polygamy, idolatry, blood-revenge, war, etc., organic sins." "I regard Prof. Stowe as inaccurate" in extending the use of the term beyond my definition." "Do not then hold me responsible for

another man's use of the term, first introduced and defined by me."

"I read these sentences, and could scarcely believe my own eyes; for in all I have said and written, I have never even once used the term *organic sins*, nor any terms which I regard as synonymous with it. Moreover, so far from classing idolatry with polygamy, war, slavery, caste, despotism, and the *festalities*, I have devoted one of the largest paragraphs in my speech published in the Recorder of Oct. 10, to a statement of the reasons why idolatry should not be classed.

"I have never liked the term *organic sins*; it would not at all suit my argument or course of thought, as any one who reads my remarks with attention, will readily see. My course of thought, whether right or wrong, is entirely independent of Dr. Beecher's, has no connection with it whatever, and was all committed to paper on board the steamboat between Cincinnati and Toledo, before I had ever heard of *organic sins*, and three weeks before meeting of the Board. Dr. B.'s argument may be a much better argument than mine, but it is in no respect the same."

Thus writes Prof. Stowe. An item or two of facts will perhaps show how it happened that the two champion brothers became entangled in so uncomfortable a fix.

Our readers will remember the speech of the Connecticut layman, (A. F. Williams of Farmington) before the American Board, and how he puzzled the Doctors with the query, whether they would admit the Turkish Sultan with his harem of a thousand wives, into their Mission Church! The question came upon them like an unexpected flash of lightning, and not a Rabbi among them adventured to open his lips! How could they? For war, polygamy and concubinage, had been explicitly classed, in the argument, with slavery, not only in the speech of Prof. Stowe, but in the Report itself, and not a man among them, including Dr. Edward Beecher himself, had demurred! And how could they demur, without giving up the main argument, both of the speeches and of the Report?

Anticipating, as it may be presumed, a repetition of the question of Mr. Williams, by A. A. Phelps (with whom he had adventured a discussion in the Boston Recorder) Dr. Beecher, adroitly slips his own neck out of the noose, leaving his loving brother, at the worst, to extricate himself, as he best could! Thus deserted by his eastern ally into the Western Professor makes reprisals, by cutting all connexion and acquaintance with his brothers "*organic sin*," so delectable in the eyes of the *New Haven* seer!

Before tracing this fraternal feud farther, let us pause for a moment and inquire how,

in the present posture of things, the doctrine so enthusiastically welcomed at Brooklyn, stands, and how "*great*" is its "*value*."!

A DILEMMA.

The First horn.—If Dr. Beecher is correct in rejecting polygamy, idolatry, blood revenge, war, &c from his list of "*organic*" sins, of what value is the distinction he has made between organic sins and personal sins? And how can that distinction help him, in disposing of the subject of slavery? He insists upon it that slave holders were admitted into the first Christian Churches; and the reason of this indulgence, he thinks, is because slavery is an "*organic sin*." But then he has quite as good authority for saying that persons engaged in war, and living in polygamy, have been, in some periods, admitted to a standing among the people of God. He, himself (we presume) would not now, exclude military men from the Church. Yet he ranks "*polygamy, idolatry, blood revenge, war, &c.*" among sins. Yes! And among "*personal*" sins, too, in distinction from "*organic*" sins. Quite as much tolerance, then, must he give to "*personal*" as to "*organic*" sins! How, then can the distinction between those two classes of sins help him to dispose of the subject of slavery, in accordance with the Report of the American Board?

The second horn.—If Prof. Stowe was correct when he said he would "*include concubinage, polygamy, war, and slavery, in the same category*" * and if he was correct in supporting the Report of the American Board, which admits slave holders into the Church, (and on the same classification, claiming that the Board had studied "*God's method of proceeding in regard to war, slavery, polygamy, and other kindred social wrongs*") then how will Prof. Stowe, and the members of the Board dispose of the question of the Farmington layman? And what will they do with the Turkish Sultan, with his thousands wives, when they knock for admission into their Mission Church?

FURTHER INQUIRIES.

Some other questions might be appropriate in this place. If Dr. Beecher so strongly disapproved of Prof. Stowe's classification of polygamy, &c. with slavery, how then could the same Dr. Beecher, vote for the Report of the American Board, which contained the same classification, and made it the ground of their action? Or was the disclaimer of Prof. Stowe's classification, as we have supposed, an after thought, to escape from the necessity of a reply to the question of A. F. Williams, if it should be repeated by A. A. Phelps?

If Dr. Beecher, on reflection, does dissent, as it seems he does, from one of the main arguments in the Report of the American Board, why does he not mention the Report and the Board, in his disclaimer as well as Prof. Stowe and his speech? Why saddle poor brother Stowe, with the whole weight of a fault, committed equally by himself, by Dr. Woods, and by every member corporate of the American Board, who gave to that sentiment, in the Report, and affirmative vote?

One question more. If Dr. Beecher himself has detected so grave and vital an error in the Report, would it not be wise in the Churches, to proceed with great caution, and examine it with great care, before receiving its conclusions as orthodox? If Dr. Beecher discards the main argument, not only of the Report, but of Prof. Stowe, as fallacious, and if Prof. Stowe, in return, contemptuously scorns the "organic" device of his brother Beecher, as a mere ruse, got up for the occasion (as he seems to do) a novelty, of which nobody had ever before heard, may we not be pardoned, fanatics as we are, for suspecting both their estimates of each other's arguments to be correct, especially if it should turn out on a careful examination, that the two arguments are essentially one?

For, how can Dr. Beecher make out slavery to be an organic sin, if war, polygamy, idolatry, &c. are not? Or, how can Prof. Stowe make it appear that his distinction between social and personal sins is not essentially the same thing with Dr. Beecher's distinction between organic and personal sins?

Who, of all the persons, who heard them both, at the meeting of the Am. Board, imagined the least discrepancy between them? Who did not understand Prof. Stowe, as illustrating and expanding the doctrine Dr. Beecher had previously advanced?

THE TWO ARGUMENTS COMPARED.

In the Boston Recorder, of Oct. 23, Dr. Beecher says,

"I called the system of slavery an organic sin, because those fundamental laws by which the body politic is organized establish false and sinful relations between the component parts of the body politic."

The only way in which the laws do this, is by authorizing or permitting individuals to hold slaves, and by assisting them to do so.—Polygamy, in those countries in which it is permitted and authorized, is an "organic" sin in the same sense, and in no other. No man can be compelled to hold slaves, any more than he can be compelled to have a plurality of wives.

But idolatry, in many nations, is establish-

*See Report of his Speech at Brooklyn, in the Boston Recorder of Sept. 25.

ed by law, and, as in the instance of Nebuchadnezzar's edict, the worship of the golden image is authoritatively required, a stronger case of "organic" sin than is slavery. War too, enters into the "organic" arrangements of most nations, the highest officers are constituted military chiefs, the citizens are constituted soldiers, and are required to fight, whenever ordered into the field. Yet Dr. Beecher, who puts slavery on the catalogue of "organic" sins, finds it convenient to deny that the evil of war is an organic one!

What other sin, then, except slavery, does Dr. Beecher regard as an "organic" sin?—Is slavery the only sin of that class? We look over his writings in the Boston Recorder, and find the following, in connexion with the allusion to Prof. Stowe.

"I do not call polygamy, idolatry, blood revenge, war &c. organic sins. According to my definition they are not. Absolute despotism is, some forms of caste are, but not all."

But why war, and even polygamy, and idolatry, in heathen nations are not organic sins as much as slavery, despotism, and some forms of caste, we are not told. The enumeration of war, polygamy, &c. "in the same category" with slavery, by Prof. Stowe, and in the REPORT, ADOPTED, by the AMERICAN BOARD, has produced (excepting in the single case of Dr. Beecher, while in conflict with an opponent) no special alarm among the members and defenders of the Board. We ask, therefore whether it would be uncharitable to infer that if either of those sins were as reputable among us as slaveholding is now, and if the Mission Churches, were involved in the practice of them, there be no difficulty in getting either one of "the same category" placed upon the catalogue of "organic sins?"

In disposing of the inquiry just started, it will be pertinent to revert, once more, to the very remarkable position, and the still more remarkable disclaimer of Prof. Stowe. We heard him, and heard Dr. Beecher, at Brooklyn, and took notes of their speeches. And we must say, in all candor, that we read Dr. Stowe's disclaimer with astonishment, and "could scarcely believe our own eyes." What if the terms "organic sin" were not used by him? Did he not convey the same idea? When Dr. Hawes spoke of the "important distinction" that had been made "between social and personal sins," did he allude exclusively to the speech of Prof. Stowe? Or exclusively to that of Dr. Beecher? Or rather, did he not allude to both alike, as conveying the same doctrine?

The N. Y. Evangelist, of Sept 18, reports Prof. Stowe as saying,

"Slavery is the greatest sin on the face of the globe.—But if I can find a Bible method of dealing with it, I feel

myself, bound to follow it. Now where an evil has become interwoven into the very texture of society it does not always allow that the individual who participates in it is guilty. An evil of this kind is to be treated differently from one which is a merely personal affair."

The N. Y. Observer of Sept. 13, reports the same speech as follows.

"We regard slavery as the greatest evil and sin in the nation, but as the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice, if we can find the Bible way of dealing with this thing, we are bound to take that plan and not upon it. It is a peculiar evil, to be treated entirely differently from such individual sins as theft, &c."

The Boston Recorder of Sept. 25th reports him thus—

"He regarded it (slavery) as the greatest sin and evil present existing in this nation. But he believed the Bible to be an infallible guide, and that in it, we find a method of dealing with this and all other evils which are of a legalized and social character and interwoven with the whole texture of society. Such evils, he thought, differed from individual sins, and should be treated in a different manner."

This agrees, essentially, with our own recollections and notes of his speech. Our memorandum of his words runs thus—"Slavery is a social evil interwoven in the texture of society. It is not, always, an individual sin. Missionaries are not bound to express an opinion of these social evils, and they ought not to do so, unless it would promote the success of the mission."

Dr. Bacon, who expressed so much gratification with the views of Dr. Beecher, repeated, as we understood him, his own version of it when he said—"The master does not make the man a slave. The laws do it. The constitution of society does it." Very nearly the language used by Prof. Stowe.

NICE DISTINCTIONS.

What did Prof. Stowe mean by saying that slavery was "interwoven into the very texture of society"—that it was one of the evils "which are of a legalized and social character?" What did Dr. Bacon mean when he said "the constitution of society makes slavery?" Did they not mean that slavery exists through "those fundamental laws by which the body politic is organized, establishing false & sinful relations between the component parts of the body politic?" If they did not mean this, what could they mean? But if they did mean this, then they meant the same thing that Dr. means by an "organic sin"—for this is his own definition of the term.

But Prof. Stowe now says he "never liked the term organic sin" has "never once used the term—nor any terms which he regarded synonymous with it." Indeed he "never heard of organic sins before the meeting of the Board!" Very intelligible, truly!

Well then, the difference between the lu-

sinners—brothers, in just this. Dr. Beecher would not have slavery treated in the church as a "personal" sin as treated, because it is an "organic sin." Prof. Stowe would not have slavery treated in the Churches as "individual" sins as treated, because slavery is "a social evil, interwoven in the texture of society."

"Strange, that such difference there should be,
Twixt tweddle dum, and tweddle dee!"

Having written thus far, we came to the conclusion that there must be something in the word "organic" peculiarly objectionable, in the mind of Prof. Stowe; on what account we could not devise. But, on taking up, again, the Boston Recorder, of October 10th, containing the very "speech" of Prof. Stowe alluded to, by him, in the preceding extract—what was our surprise to find it headed as follows—

"The Bible method of dealing with organic social wrongs, being the substance of remarks by Prof. E. C. Stowe, of the late meeting of the American Board of C. F. M. in Brooklyn, N. Y."

And this is accompanied by a letter in which Prof. Stowe says to the Editors—

"Gentlemen—As a reply to the objections which I have seen to the late doings of the American Board on slavery, I send you for publication a full copy of the remarks which I made at the meeting in Brooklyn.—The I have written out myself, and in some instances expounded [expanded?] the illustrations where expression seemed necessary to the full development of the thought, but I have not consciously changed or omitted anything which I actually said."

At first, we conjectured that the word "organic" in the above caption must have been inadvertently supplied by the publishers; but in running our eye over the speech, the following repetitions of it were, at once witnessed.

Having adverted to "social wrongs of long standing"—to "polygamists—serf controlling nobles, and slaveholding commoners"—the inquiry is raised—

"How does the Bible regard these organic social wrongs?"

Afterwards this clause of a sentence occurs—"I answer—because this is not the Bible method of dealing with organic social wrongs."

Again—The Bible method of dealing with social organic wrongs, of long standing, is not always the method of immediate denunciation and exclusion.

"It (war) is one of those organic wrongs, not always involving individual guilt on the part of those who are engaged in it, and is treated in the Bible as a very different way from murder and theft, though it often involves whole sale acts of both."

"War, polygamy, slavery and such like wrongs, all stand on the same ground. They are different from theft, drunkenness, and other individual, personal sins."

[Prof. Stowe afterwards undertakes to prove that idolatry is not to be classed among "organic wrongs"—and the reason is not that idolatry is never established and enforced by "social" arrangements "of long standing"]

—but because idolatry is "direct rebellion against God!" Just as though he that despoiled the poor did not, in so doing, reproach his Maker! Just as though the "workers of iniquity" who "eat of the people as they eat bread" did not thereby "say in their hearts No God!" Just as though the Judge had never said "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me!" Just as though a breach of the second table of the law did not include and certify a breach of the first!

By this luminous logic, no wrongs can be organic wrongs, provided they involve "direct rebellion against God"—however closely they are "interwoven in the texture of society."

And the sins that may be permitted to nestle in the bosom of the Mission Churches must be such only as those that involve no "direct rebellion against God!" Shades of Duns Scotus! Thomas Aquinas! John Tetzel and Loyola! Pray tell us what sins these are!

Perhaps we are not to take it for granted that Prof. Stowe will admit that "social organic wrongs" are properly denominated sins—We were mistaken, it seems in supposing that his particular antipathy was against the word "organic," for although we find no report of his Brooklyn speech, including our own, in which that particular word is employed, yet we have found a repeated use of it in his own "full copy" of that speech, expanded, and expounded at his leisure. So that if he had never heard the term "before the meeting of the Board" he has not hesitated to use it freely afterwards. And yet, after all this (Dec. 5th) Prof. says—"I have never liked the term organic sins; it would not at all suit my argument or course of thought! In all that I have said and written, I have never once used the term organic sins, nor any terms which I regard as synonymous with it."

It follows, (does it not?) that Prof. Stowe does not regard "social organic WRONGS" including slavery which he says is one of them, to be organic SINS! And this according to his statement, is the wonderful difference between Dr. Beecher and Prof. Stowe!—But what are the definitions of these words?

"Wrong."—Whatever deviates from moral rectitude any injury done to another; a trespass, a violation of right. Wrongs are private or public. Private wrongs are civil injuries, immediately affecting individuals; public wrongs are crimes and misdemeanors, which affect the community.—"—2372R."

"Sin is a transgression of the law"—Bible!

Is there no sin, in "public crimes and misdeemeanors?" Or shall we infer that Prof. Stowe does not regard slavery, though a social organic wrong, to be sinful? This would be to place the professor at Lane, far behind the Old School Doctors at Princeton, who avowedly admit the sinfulness of slavery, amidst all their defences of slave holding. Yet Prof. Stowe thinks the Report of the Board far ahead of the Old School Assembly, because "the Assembly does not condemn slavery at all."

We have not yet arrived at the meaning of Prof. Stowe! For in the same "full copy" of his remarks at Brooklyn, we encounter the following—

"Yet slavery, bad and wicked as it is, is not always an individual sin; it is one of those social sins, (if I may so express it) in which an individual may sometimes and in some circumstances be involved without guilt."

What have we here? Slavery is bad—it is wicked, and even (reluctantly admitted) SIN! Moreover it is a "social sin." But then it is not an "organic sin." I "never liked" that term—and "it would not suit my argument or course of thought." Yet though a social sin, and, by no means an "organic sin" it is nevertheless an "ORGANIC SOCIAL wrong!" And moreover, "an individual may sometimes and in some circumstances be involved" in this "wicked" thing—this "sin"—"without personal guilt."

We have heard of the peripatetic philosophers—of the disciples of Aristotle, the school men, of the middle ages, with whom Luther had to contend. We have read many tough stories of the Jesuits. But does human literature present a more humiliating page, than these evolutions of the actute Professor at Lane? Is it for such ends that God has given discriminating intellects and rich mental endowments to men? Is it for this that he has allowed them to hold positions where they may educate holy teachers of Christian simplicity to feed the Church? With all their splendid acquirements, are they qualified for the task?

It is truly painful to see two such men as Edward Beecher and C. E. Stowe prostituting their talents in this manner. Instead of leading the Churches forward, as they might do, in the holy aggressive warfare against Satan, to which they are called, their whole skill seems expended in the task of holding them back, till community at large shall have sup-

plied their lack of services, and then, when slavery is hunted from civilized society, the Churches (as Mr. Beecher indeed seems to intimate), are to come up to the same standard, and exclude slave holders from their communion. This is making the world a light to the Church, instead of the Church the light of the world! Strange that a minister claiming to be an abolitionist—a minister in Boston; too, and well knowing the influences at work in that region, should so thoroughly endorse and confirm the very sentiment that gives to the opposers of Church and ministry all their strength!

And it was in defence of the American Board, that they girded themselves, and have been led into the positions they now occupy. It is in threading the crooked mazes marked out for them by the Board, that they have thus entangled and bewildered themselves—brought themselves into harsh collision with themselves, with other, with the first principles of Christian morality, and with common sense.

Dr. Bacon boastingly predicted that the people would not "stand the nonsense" of those who denied the propriety of admitting slave holders into the Church. We shall see, in due time, how the people will estimate the wisdom of those who take the opposite ground, the wisdom of which a few specimens have now been given. The time anticipated by Dr. Beecher, and when slave holders shall be excluded from the Churches, and that too, in conformity with the then existing public sentiment of the age, will be the best time to call for the public vote on the present positions of Messrs. Beecher and Stowe. Yet, even now, their mutual disclaimers and self-contradictions place them in a most uncomfortable and unenviable posture.

FROM SHERBURNE, COUNTY OF CHENANGO.

Sherburne Jan. 31, 1846.

BROTHER GOODALL.—I wish to say a word about Church reform in this place. Our minister, J. S. Brown, was thrust out of the pulpit, in March 1844, for preaching and lecturing in behalf of the slave, after having received a call to settle, from the Church and society. At the annual meeting of the society, the object of which is, to transact business of a pecuniary nature, the trap was sprung upon the abolitionists. The call was withdrawn, and a vote passed a few weeks previous, to employ Mr. Brown, to the close of the year (Nov.) was rescinded. The trustees notified Mr. B. of the result of meeting and discharged him.

Things passed on as they naturally would, under such circumstances, till November during which time, the Church had several candidates, and finally the Rev. A. C. Tuttle (one of the famous protesters against Gerrit Smith's preaching politics, on the Sabbath) was hired for a year. The abolitionists were now under the necessity of settling down in silence, under the illegal and immoral vote of the society, as a precedent to follow, or call upon the Church to censure the society, for this flagrant act of injustice. Suffice it to say, that a Church meeting was called for the purpose, and a memorial presented to the Church setting forth our grievances, and the resolution that follows:—

Resolved, That the vote to rescind the vote instructing the trustees to employ the Rev. J. S. Brown, is unprecedented in this society and morally wrong in itself, and as such meets with our disapprobation.

I here copy a few words of the memorial. "As Mr. Brown was deposed for his fidelity, and truthfulness in pleading the cause of three millions of down-trodden and oppressed in our land, we think it is saying, in language not to be misunderstood, that he who is thus faithful cannot be our minister."

The memorial was signed by 59 members of the Church including females. The resolution passed by a vote of 25 to 17. Four months later, Nov. 30, 1844, on the 28th of Dec. a counter memorial was presented to the Church, vindicating the society from the odium heaped upon it, by the passage of the above resolution, which was signed by 43 male members of the Church. A Resolution was also introduced rescinding the above resolution which passed by a vote of 39 to 24—also justifying the society in remarks on the occasion, in the course that had been pursued in the above matter. After this act of injustice, there were a few abolitionists that refused to commune with the Church, (some 4 or 5); while the Rev. Mr. Tuttle was busily engaged to bring about a compromise between the parties by introducing into the Church anti-slavery resolutions, that equaled both ways (I wish I had room to copy them, but you understand them well enough) himself professing to be an abolitionist, and siding all along with the enemies of the slave. A few, finally became satisfied, that they must either abandon their abolition principles or leave the Church.

After several meetings were had by the abolitionists, to discuss the question, fifteen out of some 50 or 60 determined ask for letters to form a free Church, on gospel principles. Sept. 5th we presented our request, with accompanying reasons. The meeting was adjourned one week, and after a lengthy discussion, our request was denied.

The discussion opened the eyes of some of our brethren, and on the 28th of Sept. a request was presented for letters and a division of the property, signed by 34 individuals which was also denied. Twenty-one of this number decided to secede, and sent a paper to the Church to that effect, with accompanying rea-

sons. On the 23d of Oct. we formed ourselves into a Church, through the aid of A. Seefeld, who has since been opposed by Oneida Presbytery for that act, and preaching to us and to other bodies of the same character. I attended the trial, three days, at Cazenovia. Unflinching efforts were made to prove something against his moral character, but they entirely failed, up every charge of that character.

Seven from Smyrna Church joined us, making 31 members, Jan. 9th twenty one more requested letters from the old Church to unite with no letters of course, refused. They have since seceded, and on the last Sabbath nineteen of the number united with us, two more from Smyrna and two from the free Baptists making fifty-four. We have preaching three-fourths of the time, by Mr. Seefeld and W. Copeland, who have been laid aside by the Ecclesiastics.

Our little band is composed generally of upright and faithful Christians. We have found a little heaven upon earth, all of one mind, heart, and sentiment. Let God have the praise.

The old Church, together with the Methodist and Baptists are holding a series of meetings, for the purpose of saving souls.

We have three Deacons and two Church clerks from the old organization, in Sherburne and Smyrna.

Yours, truly in Christian love,

J. C. HARRINGTON.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator for March 1846.

H Hopkins, W. Bloomfield, Brundridge, Ouyler.	2 50	H. H. Blackmer, L. vonia,	2 00
J. M. Haller, do	0 50	J. Manning, Bingham,	1 00
L. Whitney, Champlain,	0 50	Z. Brackett, Salisbury,	1 00
(by J. Mosher)	0 50	P. Noble, Napoli,	0 50
F. Verplank, Bolton 1 00		M. Mitchell, Shingle Creek,	1 00
J. Seckie, Half Day (III)	0 50	J. Thompson, Theresa,	1 00
L. Lathrop, do	0 50	A. Mills, W. Hartford,	1 00
W. Hall, Little Valley 1 00		J. Prescott, do	1 00
L. Gaston, Gap Grove (II)	1 00	W. Fox, Walworth,	0 50
J. O. Palmer, Merryall (P)	1 00	J. Sykes, Mercer,	1 00
J. C. Fuller, Skaneateles	5 00	O. Lowry, Princeton	0 50
B. Green, Whitesboro, 1 00		J. J. Johnson, Preble,	0 50
G. H. Littlejohn, do 1 00		J. Pease, Reynoldsville,	1 00
J. Wilcox, Camillus, 1 00		J. K. Salmon, E. Bloomfield,	1 00
J. J. Ward, do 0 50		P. Wilcox, Whitesboro 1 00	
D. Porter, Pompey, 1 50		E. C. Winchester, Bristol,	0 50
W. Tillinghast, Antwerp, 0 50		A. F. Holt, Elmira,	0 50
R. Seymour, Cazenovia 1 50		G. W. Hathaway, Bloomfield,	0 50
E. Allen, Syracuse	0 50	M. (by A. F. Holt)	0 50
M. S. Wordon, Fayetteville,	0 50	P. Baldwin, Sennett,	1 00
A. Rockwell, Marcellus, 1 00		G. Smith, Perchance, 10 00	
S. H. Cook, Jordan, 0 50		G. S. Loomis, De Witt, 2 00	
H. Bradley, Penn Yan, 3 00		J. Kingbury, Cazenovia,	0 50
J. M. Parker, Apulla, 1 00		C. Abbey, Florence,	0 50
J. J. Wilson, Port Byron, 0 50			
S. R. Wilson, Graton, 1 00			
J. C. Norton, Cazenovia, 0 50			
J. J. Johnson, Preble, 0 50			
M. Worcester, Tully, 0 50			
M. Trowbridge, do 0 50			
O. Cravath, Little York, 1 00			
E. C. Winchester, Bristol, 0 50			
A. F. Holt, Elmira, 0 50			
G. W. Hathaway, Bloomfield, 0 50			
M. (by A. F. Holt), 0 50			
P. Baldwin, Sennett, 1 00			
G. Smith, Perchance, 10 00			
G. S. Loomis, De Witt, 2 00			
J. Kingbury, Cazenovia, 0 50			

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES: VOL. IV—No. 4.
WHOLE NUMBER, 48.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. APRIL, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME,

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services. Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services. Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, if desired, as follows, viz:

Five per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, 50 00
Twenty-eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 2 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

"ORGANIC SINS,"—NO 5.

MORALITY AND DISCIPLINE FOR THE CHURCHES OF THE PURITANS.

The power of the puritans, so far as they had power, consisted very much, in the exactness of their *morals*, and the uncompromising strictness of their *discipline*.—Excessively rigid, in some things, they may have been; and the fact that they were so, testifies to the severity of their virtues. The errors, as they were, of a profligate court, the reprovers of a pliant priesthood, the persecuted seceders from a worldly Church, it became them to watch, with a jealous care, as they were known to do, the portals of their temple. Whatever may have been their errors (and we cannot be blind to them) a low standard of domestic morality, and lax usages of Church discipline, (as morals and discipline were then understood, in Christendom) were faults which their wakeful enemies never once thought of charging upon them. "PURITY" was their watch-word—purity in worship—purity in morals—purity in membership. Purity was their power.—Purity was their glory. Purity gave them a hush in their presence, conceded to them the justness of their claim, and in the very act of deriding them, denominated them Puritans.

Two hundred and fifty years ago! Alas! What revolutions were wrapped up in those two hundred and fifty years! The Churches planted by the Puritans! Where are they now? Do their morals and their discipline still mark them as Puritans? If not, to what

causes must we trace their decline?

The Puritan Churches consented to the admission of slave holders. And neither Hopkins nor Edwards were able to reclaim them from that error. Their purity of worship; is it honored by their fraternal intercourse with the Molatrous Greek Church? Their purity of morals and discipline—is it represented by the champions of the American Board?

"God never reprov'd Abraham for polygamy, that we know of," says Prof. Stowe. "Would you exclude Jacob, from Communion?" "Concubinage was not prohibited in the N. Testament, except to Church officers!"

Posterity will scarcely credit the fact that the learned Professor at Lane over uttered these words. "Our own report of them, we know, will even now, be denied, by the friends of the Board, (as many, including clergymen have denied that Dr. Taylor over used the words contained in his memorable Letter,) and therefore we will quote from the reports of others, who can not be suspected of any hostile design. The N. Y. Observer of Sept. 12, reports it as follows.

Polygamy was universal in Abraham's time; he abhorred but cohabited with his maid-servant; if God reprov'd him for it the fact is not recorded, and we have a right to presume that he never did. So Jacob has a right to presume that he never did. So Jacob lived with four women. If there had been an organized church then would Abraham and Jacob have been excluded? Must we have said to our missionary, if we had had one then, you must exclude Abraham and Jacob? These examples are for our instruction, and they give us just the light we need in this matter. It does not show that these practices are right, but it shows the Bible way of dealing with evils of long standing, and they are the guides to us in dealing with the subject now before us. Polygamy is not prohibited to the Church by the Old or the New Testament, but it does lay down such views as will bring it to an end. I suppose slavery is as offensive to God as polygamy, and that it is to be treated as he treated that other social evil.

The Boston Recorder of Sept. 15th has it thus.

Polygamy was also adverted to as an almost universal practice in the time of Abraham. This patriarch seems to have kept himself free from it, except that at the instance of his wife, he co-habited with his maid-servant, and by her had a son. God had interviews with him subsequently, and gave him instructions in regard to the mother and son, but no record is made of any reproof. Jacob also cohabited with four women, two of whom were his wives, and two were concubines.—Yet God manifested himself to him, instructed him as to his conduct, and never as we learn, reprov'd him for living with four women, nor did him that Leah was his only lawful wife, and that he must live with no other.

The N. Y. Evangelist of Sept. 18, notices it more briefly.

"God permitted Jacob to have four wives, yet it does not prove that God connived at the sin. It only shows the method he took to overthrow the evil."

No marvel that Dr. Beecher should seek to cut loose from the mill stone of such ar-

guments as these! with how much success while retaining his theory of "organic sin" the readers of our preceding numbers must judge. But evidently Prof. Stowe, has no idea of relinquishing the argument, which indeed he could not do, without abandoning the Report of the Board, into which the same argument was introduced. In his "copy" of his Brooklyn speech, written out by himself, for the Boston Recorder, the following passages occur.

Polygamy was nearly universal in Abraham's time, but the patriarch, in accordance with the purity of his character, seems to have obtained from it. At the suggestion of his wife, however, he cohabited with his maid-servant, and by her had a son. God had several interviews with him, gave him instructions, respected this son and his mother; but never, as the record goes, reprov'd him for what he had done, or told him it was wrong, or forbade him to do it again. This is the Bible fact, which cannot be controverted gainsaid. Is it said that the motive of Abraham was to hasten the fulfilment of God's promise, and that the practical result was a sufficient and prov'd proof for his conduct. Very well—that is all for our argument; for it is our very objection that the Bible often leaves such wrongs unpunished, and does not always utter the fact denunciation in words; and that if we ourselves shall sometimes do so too, and allow our missionaries to do the same.

The patriarch Jacob cohabited with no less than four women; two of whom were wives, and two were concubines. He had children by them all successively, merely, but contemporaneously. He was enjoying communion with God all the time. God's spirit rested upon him; gave him directions as to conduct, treated him with affection and kindness, never, so far as the record goes, reprov'd him for living with four women, and never told him that Leah was his only lawful wife and his must confine to her. This, too, is a Bible fact, of which there can be no doubt. And now, if in those days there had been an organized church distinct from the temple, would it have been the duty of the minister, under circumstances, to exclude Abraham and Jacob from communion, because they practiced polygamy?

We may admit that the troubles in Jacob's life were the providential reproofs for his indiscretion, but by no harsher name; but this very admission, if made in the case of Abraham, makes our argument the stronger. These instances are not adduced to prove polygamy or concubinage right. Nor would we infer from them that God connives at sin; but adduce them simply to show to all who reverence the Bible, that there are times of ignorance with God, and that the Bible method of dealing with social evils, and organic wrongs of standing, is not always the method of immediate denunciation and excision.

The Report of the American Board, prepared before any of these speeches in its defence were made, and unanimously adopted by the corporate members of the Board after hearing those speeches, holds a similar language. It speaks of "social, moral evils" with which the missionaries are to come in contact, in prosecuting their work. It characterizes slavery as a "social wrong." And it sums up its argument in favor of the present policy of the Mission Churches, in admitting slave holders, as follows.

"Such, substantially, are the views of your Committee, and the more they study God's method of dealing

...ing in regard to war, slavery, polygamy, and other social wrongs, as it is unfolded in the Bible, more they are convinced that in dealing with individuals implicated in these wrongs, of long standing, intimately interwoven in the relations and movements of the social system, the utmost kindness and forbearance are to be exercised, which are compatible with a ready adherence to right principles."

And this is the Report, and these are the words that elicited such warm commendation from the lips of such a man as Rev. JOEL HAWES, who occupies one of the chief pulpits of the boasted "land of steady states," a pastor of a Church, of which the Governor & a Chief Justice of the state of Connecticut, are deacons, the latter of whom was present, in company with a PARSONS, and a Chancellor WALWORTH, to give dignity and influence to the sentiments thus advanced!

And what sentiments are they? Look at them again, and see! A breach of the sixth Commandment, in the "organic" law of polygamy or concubinage, is to be an "indiscretion" but by no means a punishable offence, in the Christian Church! Concubinage not prohibited, in the *N. Testament*, except to Church officers! "God never reproved Abraham, for polygamy, as we know of!" "Providential reproofs" of sexual impurity, an additional evidence that it does not call for direct denunciation in a Church, and that "our missionaries" would do well to bring it, unreprieved, into the bosom of the Church!

What would our Puritan fathers have said, could they have quoted sentiments like these, from the lips of the clergy of King Charles? What emphasis would the words have been chronicled in the literature of the Puritan, and the historic record, even down to the present day, appealed to, in evidence of the corruption of the English Church, and the absolute necessity of the Puritan secession, in reply to the charge of schism!

Can it be possible, that, in any decent opportunity, not specially inclined to treat the Holy Scriptures as a profane and corrupting literature, it can be necessary to say a single word in its defence against the slanders thus heaped upon it, by its professed expositors, in the presence of a scoffing world? Had not John Paine, ventured to charge such immorality on that blessed book, how eloquent, in reproof of his uncandid spirit, would have been the paragraphs of a Watson?

And how would he have convicted himself out of his own mouth, by showing that he charged the Bible with conveying the impression, that "God never reproved him for polygamy," he was nevertheless aware, that the same Bible recorded God's

reprobation of the crime! And that the voice of God was not heard in his

solemn, retributive acts!

What reader of the Bible does not know that the deceptions and the falsehoods of Abraham, of Jacob, and of Rebecca, are recorded with the same brevity, and the same absence of comment, with which the polygamy of the patriarchs is recorded? But falsehood and deception are individual and not "organic" sins. Does Christ, therefore, tolerate falsehood and deception, in his Church? And that, too, without reproof?

But "if" then had been an organized Church there, would Abraham and Jacob have been excluded?"

"If!" There may be more significance in that "if" than the speaker himself apprehended. How does he know that the organization of the Old Testament Church was not delayed, that the patriarchs might first be cured of their polygamy, their deception, and their falsehood, their "organic" and their "personal" sins? How does he know that the "providential reproofs" were not sent for this end? How reads the record? Was not the covenant effected first, and the initiatory seal of circumcision conveyed afterwards?

And besides. Is it perfectly clear that the constitutions of Church membership, under the spiritual dispensation and the New covenant, are as extended as they were under the family economy of the Patriarchs, and the national Church of the Hebrews? Are the Puritan Churches to be converted to the polity that claims all the subjects of the civil government they live under as Church members?

Or, is it altogether in point, to claim for our nineteenth century Churches, the application of an argument avowedly based upon "the times of ignorance, which God winked at" forgetful that he "now calls on all men, every where, to repent?"

If the course of the American Board already demands such a relaxation of Church discipline as shields from reproof and excommunication, the "organic" violations of the seventh commandment, how long will it be before its course may likewise demand equal leniency for the aggressors of another, and another, and of each and all of the commandments?

Adopting the morality and the discipline proposed to them by the American Board, what static will the Churches of the Puritan, hold, among the Churches of Protestant Christendom? What position will they occupy, and what testimony will they be able to maintain, either among the heathen abroad, or the impenitent at home? What broad-dis-

see Letter of A. A. Phelps, in Boston Recorder.

inction will they exhibit between the Church and the world? Or how will their light, and glorify their Father in heaven? A definition shall be given of the religion if are seeking to propagate throughout all earth? And how shall the vices of man be abashed in its presence, and infidelity awed by the purity of its foot prints?

No learning, no genius, no ingenuity, logic, can suffice to vindicate a course of acts the first principles of a sound moral defiance. Nor can those qualities, if employed, avail for any class of religious teachers, in an enlightened age. Rome, it, in a darker day than ours, and failed. Suppose that American Christians will promptly traverse the issues tendered them by the American Board, is to suppose, that the presence of Bibles, and Sabbath Schools and revivals, the shadows and spectres of middle ages have returned. This cannot. The rally may not seem formidable, at first. But the power of purity, the power of truth, the power of God, will be in it, and will prevail. A purity, purer even than that of the early Puritans, is in reserve for the Churches. It must clothe them before they can become the instruments of converting the world. *This controversy will be understood then.*

WHAT POLICY CONTROLS THE AMERICAN BOARD.

It will be recollected that among the speakers who figured so largely at the meeting of the American Board at Brooklyn, there was certain Rev. Dr. Bullard of St. Louis, Missouri, who was forward enough to present reasons why Christians should not decline to support of slave-holding churches, the Choctaws and Cherokees.—In the course of reviewing our newspaper files, we just happened to glance at a paragraph, in the *Emancipator* of June 25, some months before the meeting of the Board—which serves as a clue to the gentleman's lively and disinterested regard for the Choctaw and Cherokee Churches. The decision of the case would go far towards the decision of another, in which perhaps, he had a deeper interest still. Here is the story. The reader can judge.

CHURCHES FOR MISSOURI.—The Rev. Dr. Bullard, of St. Louis, Missouri, is in this vicinity, attempting to raise the sum of \$10,000 to be managed by the Home Mission committee at St. Louis, as a town fund, to assist

erection of meeting houses for the New School Presbyterians of Missouri. It is to hold in sums of \$500 to \$1000, to enable congregations, who will thus be enabled to build, and as they get stronger, they will repay the loan, which may then go to aid others. I understand he is urging this as a capital anti-slavery measure, on the ground that, as Baptists and Methodists have split, and as in the slave States gone all lengths in favor of slavery, and the Old School Presbyterians have taken strong pro-slavery ground, anti-slavery influences in Missouri must be exerted through the medium of the New School.

It would be pertinent, perhaps, to test the soundness of this very pretty theory, by inquiring how much anti-slavery influence has been exerted through the instrumentality of the projector of this scheme? How many of Ballard's Church members have been through his labors to emancipate their slaves? Also, whether it is understood that converts would now be received to membership, whose religion was not deep enough to make him free his slaves? Also, whether whipping women, or selling children from their parents, or even separating husband and wife, are regarded as disciplinary offences?

That Dr. Bullard should have argued any thing as "an anti-slavery measure" may be strange enough to any one who reads the evening notice of his speech at Brooklyn, in the N. Y. Observer of Sept. 13.

Mr. Ludlow argued for the idea that slave holding is not sinful; and illustrated it by many striking cases. Dr. Bullard of St. Louis followed to the same purpose. His speech was illustrated by instances to the point.

Slave holding be not sinful—if it be not opposed to the will of God, why should Christians be opposed to it? Why should we be opposed to slavery if the common Father of all is not?

How long will Christian abolitionists continue to be bedridden and trammelled by ecclesiastical bodies and Missionary Boards controlled by such management, and modelled in conformity with such views?

Nothing can be plainer than that the action of the American Board in relation to slave holding in the mission churches was determined by the fact that the ministers and lay-

men connected with it, and with the sects cooperating with the Board, have made up their minds to continue their connexion with the slave holding churches of the South, and are therefore unwilling that slave holding should be made a church test. Hence their varied apologies and evasions—marches and counter-marches—ingenious sophistries, and new coverings concerning the method of dealing with "organic sins."

CHRISTIAN ANTI-SLAVERY CHURCH CONVENTION IN BOSTON.

This convention was held Feb. 25th.—The proceedings are published in the Emancipator of March 4th. Dr. Ide, of Midway was President, and among other prominent members were also the names of Joshua Leavitt, Phineas Crandall, D. S. King, C. Webster, Nathaniel Colver, J. C. Lovejoy, David Sanford, all ministers if we mistake not together with Dr. Mann, J. W. Alden, Asaph Rice, &c, &c, laymen. The business committee were Messrs. Leavitt of Boston, May of Lowell, Sanford of Medway, Neal of Boston, King, of do. Russell, of Lynn, Curtis of Lowell, Cobb of Boston, and Wright and Johnson of Boston, all ministers except the last two. We have read the Address, Declaration, Pledge and Resolutions adopted by the Convention, and although they contain much that is true, appropriate, and important, and very little, in a positive form, from which we should dissent, we cannot say that, as a whole, they come up to the tone which the crisis and the times require.

We must say of them what the "orthodox" party in Massachusetts, were wont to say of Unitarian sermons and prayers, some quarter of a century ago, that we object, not so much to what they contain, as to the omission of things which such productions ought to contain. No allusion whatever, is made to the American Board, its position or its course, nor to the question whether slaveholders, remaining such, are proper subjects of admission into Christian Churches and pulpits, nor to the question whether slave holding is inherently sinful. All those turning points of the pending controversy appear to have been dodged. Nor can we suppose it accidental, in a convention where words were carefully weighed (and "sundry verbal amendments were moved, a part of which were adopted, and others rejected") that slavery is several times called "an evil," but only once ranked among "moral evils" along with "intemperance, war" &c, and in no instance called a sin. A corresponding vagueness and absence of point, pervaded the whole proceedings, particularly the pledge, which is couched in such general terms that we should not be surprized to hear that the committee for obtaining signatures had procured the names of Prof. Stuart and Dr. Woods with-

* The strong epithet "abomination" is never used.—There was Brooklyn authority for that. Also discrimination is in vogue, in these days.

out their professing any change in their views. And we cannot but remember that the same David Sanford who was one of the Committee for shaping these documents, was likewise a member of the Committee of the American Board for preparing the famous Brooklyn Report which has his name attached to it, under the name of Leonard Woods. An effort was undoubtedly made, to put forth an anti-slavery document which the Doctors in Boston and Andover could not call extra, fanatical, disorganizing, or tinged with "come outism." This object we should think, has been accomplished, yet it does not appear (and we marvel at it) that either Dr. Edward Beecher, or E. N. Kirk, appeared in the convention, though "a note was read by the President," from the latter.

But the most marvellous circumstance of all remains yet to be noticed. At an early stage of the proceedings, J. C. Lovejoy, pastor of the new Church in Cambridgeport, introduced the following Resolution.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention colored citizens ought to have the privilege of purchasing and occupying such seats as they, like others, may choose in the house of God, and to deny them this privilege, is both unchristian and unjust.

After discussion of this Resolution, Messrs. Willson, Lovejoy, Crandall, and Dr. Mann, it was referred to the business committee," after which nothing further respecting it appears in the proceedings, nor is any allusion to the subject nor to prejudice against color, do we find in the documents adopted by the convention! What are we to understand by this? The Committee would doubtless say, every man of them, that the Resolution expressed their own sentiments. We should be uncharitable to think otherwise of them. Why then decline the proposal, when publicly made by a worthy member of the Convention, to speak as like frank and free men, and put their finger upon the very canker that is eating out the piety of the Churches in Massachusetts?—The monster that is riveting the fetters of the Slave? Alas! What a story of the Churches and ministry of the Old Commonwealth, does the wary suppression of this resolution tell! We must review and renounce the greater part of our stern orthodox theology, so solicitously taught us by ministers in New England, we must repudiate our puritan lineage, forget our Massachusetts ancestry, and procure a new version of the Bible, before we can be persuaded that the Leviathans of iniquity are thus to be tamed! We are, however, consoled, in cases of this kind, by a number of cheering reflections: (1) There is a Power above, and

controls all:—(2) All possible modes of operation against slavery, are likely to be tried. (3) It will be marvelous if some of them do not prove to be the right one. (4) And equally marvelous if all these varied experiments do not show us which methods are useless and which is efficient, (5) *Divine truth* will be honored, and the God of truth glorified, when the truth shall be made manifest, and by the power of the Highest, produce its mighty effects.

We commenced, with the intention of writing only a paragraph, but having said thus much, we may as well record the documents we have commented upon, that our readers may judge for themselves, and be able, in the review, hereafter, to estimate the influence of such movements, as compared with those of a more bold and radical character.

To all the Ministers and Church-Members, believers in Christ, throughout the United States.

The Anti-Slavery Convention of Ministers and Church-members in Massachusetts, held at the Marlboro' Chapel, on the 20th of February, 1819, present the following Declaration of some of their views, and Pledge of their intentions for the future, in regard to the great subject of American Slavery.

The subject has been before us in the light of these interrogatories, viz:—

1. Why the Gospel has not long since abolished American Slavery?
2. Where lies the blame that it has not?
3. Are we authorized to expect that the Gospel will yet abolish it?
4. If so, when? How? By what agency?
5. What ought we to do for this end?
6. How shall the Gospel be so administered, as to secure the abolition of slavery on Christian principles and by Christian influence?

DECLARATION.

By humble inquiry and prayerful consultation; our minds are led to the following conclusions, on several points connected with this subject, viz:—

1. That we have been a nation about seventy years, and in that time, the number of slaves has risen from seven hundred thousand to three millions, and the slave States from seven to fifteen; and the slave interest has grown so arrogant and powerful as openly to control the government, and the great religious organizations of the country.
2. That the Gospel is the chief remedy for

the moral evils which exist among mankind, such as intemperance, impurity, enviousness, injustice, fraud, oppression, cruelty, war, slavery, &c.; and that when it is free, and properly administered, it will surely remove them all, just in proportion as its influence is felt among men.

3. That it does not appear from experience, that the Gospel removes these evils, except as it is applied to them, by the direct efforts of ministers and other Christians, by discountenancing them, and totally abstaining from all participation in them, and faithfully inculcating the opposite virtues.

4. That in cases, (such, for instance, as *was* the common use and sale of intoxicating liquors,) when the ministers and churches have largely participated in the guilt of prevailing evils, it becomes their duty not only to withdraw from such participancy, but to bear an open and a clear testimony against such evil, and thence arises a stronger reason why they should use all possible efforts, and even make greater sacrifices to banish such evil from the community, because their own past connivance has been one of the causes of its countenance and growth.

5. That during the seventy years we have been a nation, the Gospel has been nominally free; and the means of its application have been abundant, in the number of ministers and churches, the facilities of intercourse; the use of the press, &c.; and yet that the evil of slavery has increased more than fourfold; and its power of mischief and the difficulties of its removal in a much greater ratio; and large numbers of ministers and churches in this republic, have freely participated in it; and that the blame and reproach of all this is shared by every one who has not borne a faithful testimony against it, or who has omitted any thing in his power to prevail on his brethren to do their duty.

6. That the greatness of the evil is fearfully aggravated by the reproach that has fallen upon the gospel itself—first, that with all its advantages in this country, it has not abolished slavery—and secondly, that it is openly claimed that the Gospel is favorable to the system itself.

7. That the cruel sufferings of three millions of our fellow-countrymen, very many of them our fellow-ministers and church-members, deprived of every one of their rights, forbidden to read the Bible and to

keep the commandments of God, and subject to every possible outrage on their consciences and feelings, ought to arouse every American Christian to a sense of his responsibility for the continuance of slavery, and awaken an unalterable determination now to do all that is lawfully in our power to put an end to the whole system, without further allowance or compromise.

8. That we are verily guilty concerning our [enslaved] brother, in that we saw ought to have known, the anguish of his heart when he besought us and we would not hear—and for the part that each one of us had in allowing, or aiding, or consenting to the continuance of slavery, we ought individually to exercise a deep and intelligent repentance before God, and to seek his forgiveness and that of our injured brethren.

9. That no sight could be more pleasing to God, more honorable to the Christian religion, more cheering to the slave, more hopeful for the universal extension of Christ's kingdom on earth, than to see ministers and church-members of this land openly bowing down before the altar of God's mercy, in humble and hearty confession of the sin of slavery, and earnest united supplication for God's forgiveness, for his gracious help to remove the abomination from the whole country.

10. That our Savior, when he began his work on earth, declared that he had then begun to accomplish those great social changes, the deliverance of the oppressed, the instruction of the ignorant, and the relief of the wretched, which had been foretold by prophet Isaiah, and which every friend of Christ is bound to sympathize with and promote on earth, to the extent of his power and opportunity.

11. That it is both unbecoming and wise, for ministers and church-members, to fall behind unbelievers or any others, in liberality for the advancement of any form of benevolence, or the mitigation of any form of misery among men.

12. That both the word and spirit of Christ require us to make the case of our enslaved brethren our own care, and to bear its reproach, and share its burdens, and promote its objects, in all circumstances, remembering that they are in bonds as bound with them.

13. That the cause of Emancipation is

of Christ, and therefore every friend of Christ is bound to be engaged in it, as a part of his love to his Savior.

4. That the abolition of Slavery is a natural and necessary part of the work of the Gospel in this land, which must be done ere the Gospel can exert its full influence.

5. That the blame for the continuance of slavery in this land does not rest upon the Gospel, but on the defective manner in which the Gospel has been administered.

6. That the people look to their ministers to be before them in every good work, to show what Israel ought to do, and to summon them to labor and self-denial; and we have no doubt any wise and persevering movement of ministers will be sustained by the people, if it is sufficiently thorough and comprehensive to promise success.

7. That to doubt whether the Gospel is able to abolish slavery is to disparage the power and wisdom of Christ.

8. That our Christian brethren in other countries do look, and have a right to look to the ministers and church-members of the United States, to see to it that the Gospel wins its proper honors in the abolition of slavery.

9. That slavery has continued too long, and it is time it was abolished; that the Gospel ought to abolish slavery and must abolish it; that ministers and churches ought to be united and must be united, in this work, if they are in the Bible Society; and that we must and will put forth our best energies until it is done.

PLEDGE.

Holding these several sentiments, we feel now called upon, in the fear of God, and humbly relying on his aid, to pledge ourselves to one another, to our enslaved brethren, to our country, and to God, that we will make active and persevering efforts for the speedy and peaceful abolition of slavery a prominent part of our religious duty; that we will use every means and bear every sacrifice for which wisdom dictates, and religion sanctions; that we will suspend or postpone other cherished objects which may stand in the way of this; that we will act together as

brethren, so far as we are agreed on this subject, leaving all that is past to be settled between each individual and his Maker; that we will make the cause of Emancipation our own cause, and labor in it as God may give us ability and opportunity, whoever else may help or hinder, and whatever any others may do or leave undone, for or against it; that we will never consider enough done while more remains which we can do; but will do all that is lawfully in our power, individually and collectively, in every capacity, and relation, expecting to do continually more and more, until the fetters are knocked from the limbs of the last slave in our country, and the honor of the Gospel is fully vindicated, as the remedy for slavery, and the charter of civil liberty as well as of eternal life.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. *Resolved*, That all the religious papers which circulate in Massachusetts, be respectfully requested to publish the acts of this convention.

2. *Resolved*, That the above Declaration and Pledge be recommended for consideration and adoption by all Christian societies; not only churches, but Bible, Tract, Missionary and other benevolent Societies, who have it properly in their power to do anything in aid of the cause of Emancipation.

3. *Resolved*, That a Standing Committee of seven persons, be now appointed, to promote the object of this convention, particularly by holding county and other meetings of a similar character, composed of ministers and church members without distinction of sect or party; and bringing the subject appropriately before the different ecclesiastical and religious bodies throughout the Commonwealth.

4. *Resolved*, That this committee be empowered to issue an appeal to all who profess the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, on the subject of American Slavery, urging upon them the accomplishment of two things.

First, to clear the religion of the Bible from the reproach which has been brought upon it by a connivance with slavery, on the part of many who have professed it.

Secondly, to bring religion, by every legitimate means within its reach, to bear upon that sin of our Nation.

The following persons were chosen a com-

mittee to carry out the Resolutions:

N. Colver, J. Leavitt, R. H. Neale, J. C. Lovejoy, D. S. King, S. Cobb, and O. Foster.

Voted, That the publishing of the proceedings be referred to the Standing Committee.

Now it may be said, and very truly, that no person signing this pledge could consistently support the American Board, in its present position, nor vote for pro-slavery lawmakers, nor receive slave holders into church fellowship, nor listen to them as religious teachers, nor tolerate the negro paw, because in doing these things, a person is evidently and voluntarily sustaining, and without necessity, the very "evil" against which he promises to exert his influence. But so long as this is not understood to be the meaning of the pledge, it is evident that co-operation on the basis of it, would only be inviting another combination of elements that cannot harmonize; and this policy, one would think, has already wrought mischief enough in our ranks and sufficiently retarded the cause. From "old organizationists" repudiating distinct political action, and anxious to retain a standing in their old parties, we have heard, long ago, as much rant and rhapsody about "the broad anti slavery platform" as might serve us instead of an emetic. And from "new organizationists" and Liberty men, desirous, either of retaining their old Church Connections or of voting "just for this once" with pro-slavery men, we have heard, and still hear, a variation of the same tune.— Sometimes our "one idea" is cut and cramped into the decimal fraction of an idea, of indefinite value, for the sake of relieving us from the responsibility of adhering to our principles too closely. True abolitionism, like true christianity, of which it is an essential ingredient, furnishes none of your "broad platforms." It is a "strait and narrow way" in which comparatively few are disposed to walk. Their strength is in proportion to their fidelity, rather than their numbers.

At a time when there is so strong a disposition in our own State of New York, to bring about a political co-operation of abolitionists with pro slavery men, and in Massachusetts, to get up some new "Anti Slavery league" on the basis of *profession*, rather than *practice*, we can hardly help regarding this Boston Convention as having struck out a similar course in respect to that much dreaded church question so long deferred, and now in process of getting into a shape in which it will be likely to be moulded and

* We do not believe that one benevolent or Christian enterprise stands in the way of any other similar enterprise, or that the one need to be postponed for the other. Some are so busied about Missions that they must postpone anti slavery agitation, and others are so busied about abolition that they would postpone Missions. — But we believe that every good cause would be strengthened, by the promotion of every other good cause. — Editor C. R. Lovejoy.

managed, in no small degree, by the very men who would prefer to have it postponed or repressed. Time will determine. But we regret that the first movement should bear the appearance of compromise.

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, APRIL, 1846.

CHRISTIAN COLONY FOR OREGON.—We received, some time ago, from bro Lewis C. Lockwood, minister at South Butte, Wayne Co. N. Y. a communication which ought to have appeared in our columns, but we now learn that it is lost. The substance we think, was, that bro. Lockwood proposes to join with a company of Christian brethren who can harmonize in their religious and ecclesiastical views, in forming a new settlement in Oregon. He wishes to make up a company in the course of the present year.

If bro. Lockwood will send us another Notice, we will try to give it due insertion.

YOUTH'S MONTHLY VISITOR, by Mrs. M. L. Bailey, Cincinnati Ohio, at 25 cents per annum. This is a beautiful and cheap little sheet, filled with interesting and instructive matter for children and youth. It is issued from the office of Dr. Bailey's Morning Herald, the well known and able journal of the Liberty party in Ohio, and deserves the liberal support of those who wish to furnish their children with the literature appropriate to their years.

GENESEE PRESBYTERY ON SLAVERY.

In our March No. we recorded the proceedings of Old School Presbyterians in Ohio. We now put on record the proceedings of New School Presbyterians in Western New York. We copy from the *Perry Countryman* of Jan. 22.

The following resolutions were unanimously passed by the Presbytery of Genesee, at their meeting in Gainesville last week.

Resolved.—That our delegates to the General assembly be directed to use their influence to procure a plain and explicit condemnation, by the General assembly, of the System of American Slavery; either by re-enacting the testimony of 1818, or otherwise, as may seem best in the wisdom of the assembly.

Resolved.—That they be further instructed to use their influence to have the word "Slave holding" inserted after the word "Man-stealing" in the Large Catechism, in the list of wrongs forbidden by the eighth commandment.

Resolved.—That delegates appointed are Rev. Joseph B. Page, of Perry, and Doct. Woodruff, of Byron.

That our readers may fully understand the position assumed by the Gen. Assembly, we publish below the testimony of the General assembly of the Presbyterian Church given in 1818, to which reference is made. This testimony has never been repeated.

And these sentiments were unanimously adopted by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church,

having taken into consideration the subject of SLAVERY, think proper to make known their sentiments upon it to the churches and people under their care.

"We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, an gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; an utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ, which enjoins that, 'all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' Slavery creates a parallel in the moral system—it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings, in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the Gospel, whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husband and wife, parents and children, neighbors and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of Slavery—consequences not imaginary—but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is at once exposed, often take place in fact, and in their very worst degree and form; and where all of them do not take place, as we rejoice to say that in many instances, through the influence of the principles of humanity and religion in the minds of masters, they do not—still the slave is deprived of his natural rights, degraded as a human being and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest.

"From this view of the consequences resulting from the practice into which Christian people have most inconsistently fallen, of enslaving a portion of their brethren of mankind—for 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth'—it is manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day, when the inconsistency of slavery, both with the dictates of humanity and religion, has been demonstrated, and is generally seen and acknowledged, to use their honest, earnest, and unwearied endeavors, to correct the errors of former times, and as speedily as possible to place this blot on our holy religion, and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and if possible throughout the world.

"We rejoice that the church to which we belong commenced, as early as any other in this country, the good work of endeavoring to put an end to slavery, and that in the work, many of its members have ever since been, and now are, among the most active, vigorous, and efficient laborers. We do, indeed, tenderly sympathize with those portions of our church and our country, where the evil of slavery has been entailed upon them; where a great, and the most virtuous part of the community abhor slavery, and wish its extermination, as sincerely as any others—but where the number of slaves, their ignorance, and their vicious habits generally, render an immediate and universal emancipation inconsistent, alike, with the safety and happiness of the master and the slave. With those who are in this circumstance, we repeat that we tenderly sympathize. At the same time, we earnestly exhort them to continue, and, if possible, to increase their exertions to effect a total abolition of slavery. We exhort them to suffer no greater delay to take place in this most interesting concern, than a regard to the public welfare truly and indispensably demands.

"As our country has inflicted a most grievous injury on the unhappy Africans, by bringing them into slavery, we cannot, indeed, urge that we should add a second injury to the first, by emancipating them in such manner as that they will be likely to destroy themselves or others.

But we do think, that our country ought to be governed in this matter, by no other consideration than an honest and impartial regard to the happiness of the injured party; unimpeded by the expense or inconvenience which such a regard may involve. We therefore warn all who belong to our denomination of Christians, against unduly extending this plea of necessity, against making it a cover for the love and practice of slavery, or a pretence for not using efforts that are lawful and practicable to extinguish the evil.

"And we, at the same time, exhort others to forbear harsh censures, and uncharitable reflections, on their brethren, who unhappily live among slaves, whom they cannot immediately set free; but who, at the same time, are really bringing all their influence, and all their endeavors, to bring them into a state of freedom, as soon as a door for it can be safely opened."

REMARKS.

The Old School abolitionists for Ohio said nothing about the danger of immediate and

unconditional emancipation; admitting no measure to be "inconsistent alike with safety and happiness of the master and slave." They gave currency to no exhortation to slave holders on this ground. They not "rejoice that the Church" with which they were connected, had long occupied this ground. Nor did they "exhort others to bear harsh censures and uncharitable relations on their brethren [slave holders] unhappily live among slaves whom they do not immediately set free!"

In all this, the action recommended by New School Presbytery of Genesee, N. Y. differs widely from the tone of their School brethren in Ohio; who, by the way, are known to have taken a stand against late action of the American Board. We are glad, however, to see that they would by the word "slave holding" added to the "man-stealing" in the Presbyterian creed. This would indeed be a great improvement. How well it would square with the testimony of the Gen. Assembly of 1818, in other matter. And we should like to know whether the Genesee Presbytery would wish to have the General Assembly tell Slave holders that they are "men stealers" and then tell them about the danger of inconsistency (!) of ceasing, at present, to so, exhorting others not to visit them with any "harsh censures" on account of the "man stealing?"

The above record tells us, very properly, that the testimony of the Gen. Assembly 1818, which the Gen. Presbytery would have "re-enacted" has "never been repealed" and that it was unanimously adopted by the Assembly (slaveholders, and all!) To be sure it was, and it was done in the very act of "striking out" that significant testimony till then on their "Large Catechism" which connected slave holding with man stealing, and for the purpose of giving currency to the opposite doctrine!

"This testimony has never been repealed" we know and more's the pity! It was when (as abolitionists understood then) the N. Y. Evangelist, Dr. Duffield, Dr. C. Dr. Beman, E. N. Kirk, &c. &c. &c. were loud in their promises of having it speedily repealed, and the old note on slave holding, *alors* man-stealing restored instead of it. But now the Genesee Presbytery would have this testimony "re-enacted" instead of repealed, and (strange to tell) the antagonistic note restored, along with it!

What surprises us most in the action

Genesee Presbytery was "unanimous." thought there were some immediate abolitionists in that body.

MR. KIRK ON THE PAPACY.

Mr. E. N. Kirk delivered a discourse on the papacy Sabbath evening, at his own church. He had a house, and for more than an hour held his audience subject with intense interest. The address was marked with startling facts, and the high and strong opinions taken by the speaker were so fortified as to leave room for cavil or contradiction. He took ground that the papal hierarchy or Roman despotism is destined to be overthrown, that the justice of the cause is such that the human race never can be the goal of excellence for which God intended it, as it is demolished. (1.) There is nothing in the will, the soul, and never was, which so loudly calls for the vengeance of heaven. (2.) In confirmation he cited the sins of the papacy—the very worst crimes unrebuked—sanctioned—licensed for

(3.) A connection was made between the papal hierarchy and the Roman Catholic popes. Among the latter might be good men, but in the former there was no good quality. (4.) If there were some good Catholics, it was true that vile men—the vilest the world ever saw—are never excommunicated from the Romish Church as they are from Protestant churches. (5.) In reply to the objection that Protestants have persecuted, it was said, that we disavowed and renounced those practices. (6.) While Rome boasts of her purity and her identity with all that is just, thus claiming to this hour all her horrid misdeeds. (7.) Mr. Kirk pronounced the papacy a despotism—(8.) a centralization, employing civil pains and penalties to make men religious. We have all heard he said, of a woman in New York, who whipt her child to obedience, but Rome whips all her hundred and six millions to make them bow to her. Romanism is religion. The people may be some of them, but the papacy is not. It is a grand political machine whose sole objects is money and power. (9.)

The Jews were unparagonably condemned. (10.) Even the priests, it was said, are controlled by money, whose leading trait is cunning, everlastingly. (11.) Know your man and manage him, was the word of Loyola. We ought to have, said Mr. Kirk, vigilance committees, to ferret out the mole tracks of these crafty enemies and deceivers, to expose their crimes, and break their power at every point. (12.) The Christian Alliance was brought to view, as a plan to unite preachers of all countries against the papacy. In pursuance of this design, an agency has been already been adopted, an agency has been established in Europe, colporteurs employed, and books sold. Especially is it an object to introduce into suitable tracts and books, and at every printer in the published D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation for circulation among his countrymen. From other statements made, it would seem that the Christian Alliance is in a fair way to accomplish the purposes for which it was instituted. An entire redressing of confidence and support does not seem itself to the American churches.—[Boston Order.

NOTES.

1.) "Destined to be demolished." Is not every likewise "destined to be demolished." before the human race can reach the goal of excellence for which God intended it?—Why then, do not the ministers in Boston propose a "Christian alliance" for that purpose, to commend it as "an enterprise demanding the confidence and support of the American Churches?"

2.) Does not slavery "as loudly call for vengeance of heaven" as the Papacy?

3.) What crimes can be charged on the papacy, worse than those that can as truthfully be charged upon slavery? Cruelty, murder, imposture, persecution, forbidding

the free worship of God and the reading of the scriptures, "forbidding to marry" making merchandize of the souls of men, keeping the mass of the people in ignorance, and establishing a despotism over them! Are not these the chief crimes charged upon the Papacy? And is not slavery equally identified with the same "crimes"? In addition to this, does not slavery withhold the hire of the laborer, chattelize human beings, sell them at auction under the hammer, and break up family ties?

"Unrebuked!" And do the Boston Churches "rebuke" these "crimes" when committed by the Protestants of "the American Churches"? Do they not violently oppose those who do "rebuke" them, and say that such rebukes are "denunciatory, unchristian, incendiary, and disorganizing?"

"Sanctioned"! And have not Prof. Hodges, Prof. Stuart, Pres Fisk, and other leading Protestant divines in America without number, adduced the scriptures, in proof that these same "crimes are not essentially sinful, and should not be excommunicated from the Protestant Churches? Have the churches and ministry "disavowed" their sentiments?

"Licensed for money"! How much short of this, is the present position of the American Board, that will not "rebuke" these "crimes" lest they should lose the support of slave holders at the South, and their apologists at the North? When Dr. Bacon proposed, at Brooklyn, such an amendment of the Report as would introduce a "rebuke" of only a part of these "crimes," the proposition was unanimously voted down (itself finally assenting) on the ground, openly avowed in conversations freely entered into in the lobbies, during recess, and in our hearing, that the sensitiveness of Theodore Frelinghuysen, Chancellor Walworth, and other prominent members and patrons of the Board was such, that "it would not do," however proper and desirable it might be, to introduce any such "rebukes" at all!

4.) "There might be good men" among the Catholics, but this plea would avail nothing. But when the American Board could make out, as they supposed, some possible cases of innocent slave holding or of pious slave holders, the exception was exalted into the rule of receiving all slave holders into the church without scruple, and without question! What would Mr. Kirk say about receiving

some of these good Catholics, with all their adherence to the Papacy, to the fellowship and communion of his Puritan Church?—And what would be any of a proposal to receive all Catholics, indiscriminately, into Protestant communion, without any demur or question about their Catholicism, provided in other respects they appeared like good men?

5.) "Excommunicated as they are from Protestant Churches!" The recent refusal of the American Board to recommend the excommunication of the perpetrators of these "crimes" from their Mission Churches, is a sufficient reply to this arrogant and most unfounded pretension! A "viler" set of men "the world never saw" than remain "unrebuked" in the American Churches, and not only remain there unrebuked, but exert a controlling influence over the denominations to which they belong.

"If slaveholding be a sin, and a vertizing and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters is a direct violation of the Divine law, and if the BUYING, SELLING, or holding of a slave, FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN, is a heinous sin and scandal, then, verily, THREE FOURTHS of all the Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians in eleven states of this union are of the Devil. They hold, if they do not buy and sell slaves, and with few exceptions, they hesitate not to apprehend and to restore run away slaves, when, in their power.—[Rev James Smylie A. M. of Mississippi.

"Brutal stripes and all the various kinds of personal indignities are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses." "Brothers and Sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives, are torn from each other, and permitted to never see each other no more. These acts are daily occurring among us."

"Cases have occurred, in our own communion, where, professors of the religion of mercy, have torn the mother from her child, and sent her into a merciless and remorseless exile. Yet acts of discipline have rarely followed such conduct."—[Synod of Kentucky.

"Even ministers of the Gospel, and Doctors of Divinity may engage in this unholy traffic, and yet sustain their high and holy calling."—[Elders, ministers, and Doctors of Divinity, are with both hands, engaged in the practice.]—[Speech of Mr. Stewart of Illinois in Gen. Assembly.

Persons are still living who remember the time when a congregational minister of high standing, in Connecticut, separated husband and wife, by sale, both of them members of his own church! The husband died of a broken heart, but the minister was neither "excommunicated" nor "rebuked." And, not ten years ago, a southern minister, attending the May Anniversaries at N. York, gave a hundred dollars to a religious society, the avails, as he said, of a slave he had just sold! But he was welcomed into some of the principal churches in New England!

Such facts are a striking commentary upon the boastful statements of Mr. Kirk.

"Never excommunicated from the Romish Church!" Why! None but a very few, even among abolitionists themselves, are ready

for any such measure as an ecclesiastical separation from the perpetrators of these "crimes." The Editor of the Christian Investigator, to this hour, is considered a "dis-organizer" because he advocates the excommunication of "the vilest men" from "the Protestant Churches!"

(6.) Is it true, that the Protestant Churches and Ministers of America, in general, disavow and condemn the practice of persecution? Who first proposed and incited the putting down of abolitionists by "popular indignation?" Roy Joseph Tracy, of the Vermont Chronicle, and kept up the cry, till his very words were clamorously re-echoed by the Colonization mob that burned the furniture of Lewis Tappan, in the streets of New York. And how was this act of persecution "disavowed and condemned" by the principal ministers, Churches, and religious Editors of New England, and the middle states? Was it by the patronage of the Vermont Chronicle and of the other religious papers that copied and circulated the Editor's assaults, not only without "rebuke" but with commendation?—Was it by the ecclesiastical maneuvers by which the same Joseph Tracy was promoted, first to the Editorship of the Boston Recorder, and then, of the N. York Observer, and by the increased patronage extended to those prints in consequence of the services of Mr. Tracy, in still maligning the abolitionists?

Was persecution "disavowed and condemned," by the Colonization Meetings, conducted by leading ministers, at N. York, Philadelphia, Boston, Utica, Alton, and all over the country, in which murderous mobs against the abolitionists were, first instigated, and then triumphantly celebrated with applause?

Was persecution "disavowed and condemned" by the cool proposal, during these scenes, by the "Literary and Theological Review," Edited by Leonard Woods Jr. and patronized without "reproof" by the principal clergy of N. York and N. England, to visit the "radicals" with "the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures?"

Was it "disavowed and condemned" by Dr. Spring, of N. York, when he "spoke with sympathy of the sentiments of the South as evinced in the speech of Mr. Wise" a slave holder and a duellist who had just said, in the same colonization meeting, that "the best way to meet the abolitionists was with Dupont's best [gunpowder] and with cold steel?"

Has Dr. Spring, ever "disavowed" this sentiment of his speech, as reported in one of the public Journals of the city in which he resides? Or has the Protestant Church and Ministry ever "reproved" him for that bloody speech?

What "disavowals" or "reproofs" have the Northern Churches and Ministry in general ever uttered against the violent persecution of Amos A. Dresser, a northern Church member, by Church members, at the South? What "rebukes" or "condemnations" have been heard of the murderous throats of Rev. Wm. S. Plummer, D. D. Rev. Robert Anderson, D. D. Rev. Thomas Witherspoon, &c. &c. and of other Ecclesiastical dignitaries too numerous to mention, in the American Protestant Church?

(7.) If the scenes of St. Bartholomew's eve were not repeated in the city of New York, in October 1833, and in May and July 1834, it was not because the leading Protestant Clergy of that city were not as industriously intent upon it, as were the Roman Catholic clergy of Paris. Let the atrocious speeches at their Colonization Meetings bear witness. And where, to this hour, are the "rebukes" of the N. England Churches and clergy of these proceedings?

(8.) *The Papacy, a Despotism?* And what of that, Mr. Kirk? Hast thou not learned from the Biblical Repository and Princeton Review, that *despotism* is not sinful, and is not reprov'd by Christianity?—And, from the Report and Speeches of the American Board at Brooklyn, that it is no part of the business of the Christian minister to assail *despotisms*? Do they not belong to the category of "organic sins?" Why will not Mr. Kirk hearken to their ghostly advice, and not turn aside from his appropriate work of *saving souls*? Why not confine his labors to the anxious seat and the protracted meeting, and let the "civil" and "political organizations" of this world alone? Cannot Dr. Wisner instruct him that "Christ's Kingdom is not of this world," and that Satan's kingdom of Anti Christ must therefore be "let alone?"

(9.) *A grand political Scheme, and not a Religion?* If this be a proper description of Romanism, why not leave it to the politicians, and not drag it into the Church?—And on a Sabbath Evening, too? The Reverend Protesters against Gerrit Smith's preaching politics on the Sabbath, should lose no time in taking this puritan offender in hand!

(10.) *Unsparingly condemned!* What an unlovely and unchristian spirit does Mr. Kirk betray! But stop! It is only the "despotisms" and the "crimes" of Romanism that Mr. Kirk "unsparingly condemns."—A vast difference, that, to be sure. And yet, ought he not to reflect that "a soft answer turneth away wrath," and that "molasses will catch more flies than vinegar?" In the present case, we should not wonder if Mr. Kirk should conceive that Solomon's "soft answer" is to be reserved for the proper occasions, and that ministers of Christ have, sometimes, other work to do, than either to "turn away wrath" or to catch flies!

(11.) *The Jesuits! Cunning! Everlasting cunning!* If there be any Jesuitism, on earth more subtle and pernicious than that of the American Board and its advocates, let it be produced! If any ecclesiastics can be found, more proverbially and notoriously skilled in *cunning*, than the controlling spirits about Andover and Boston, we should like to know *where*? To "know their men and to manage them" was not more the maxim of Loyola, nor could he have been more skilled or successful in it than Dr. Morse and Dr. Woods! And the plentiful crop of disorganization and infidelity that has grown up and ripened, just in the field of their influence, corresponding so exactly, as it does, with the matured fruits of Jesuitical cunning, in an intelligent community, the world over, is a sufficient attestation of the fact. "Wheresoever the carcass" of a lifeless and putrid

orthodoxy is found "there will the eagles and ravens of the spiritual world, be flocked together." If the very "city of the grims" is becoming a second Paris, as we sometimes told, there must be a cause, and appropriate one. And what can that be, but a Jesuitical priesthood, and a woe church?

(12.) "For it out!" "Sleek enemies!" "coivers!" "Artificers!" "Break their power!" Significant epithets these! Spirited expressions! Quite descriptive, too, of the scenes, and of the men, with whom the Editor had to do. And, be it remembered, was speaking of a professedly Christian Ministry, a professedly Christian Church! We shall do well to lay up these epithets, expressions, for a similar use, in a future warfare. And we may take it for granted that Mr. Kirk will not call us "vile," "denunciatory, or unchristian," for applying his own words to the same characters of the same class of objects to which he applies them. If he, or any one else, thinks we misapply them, when we use them against the anti-abolition churches and clergy of the Protestant sects in America, we are ready to meet the investigation, and to enter upon the comparison, feature by feature, and fact by fact! In his laudable exertions against the "despotism" and the "crimes" of the Romish Church, we heartily bid him speed. We perfectly agree with him in the sacramental host of God's elect are hereby called to this warfare, that these impostors "destined to be overthrown," that "justice of God requires it," that "the race can never reach the goal of excellence for which God intended it, till this system is demolished," and that it "loudly calls for vengeance of Heaven." We hope he has an eye to survey the full dimensions of the evils he describes, that he define the anti-christian host by the principles of God's blessed Book, and in the "Romanism" he opposes, all progeny of the hated monster, all the "despotisms" and the "crimes" that enter its definition, in *whatever communion they are found*, and whether existing under the "Catholic" or the "Protestant" name: In that his warfare will be one of holiness and Christian fidelity, not of bigotry and sect. The "circulation of D' Aub History" will accomplish, and is already accomplishing, a great work. No candid intelligent reader can help running out his own mind, the wonderful parallel between times of Luther and our own. God bless for that unprecedented Book. It has more for promoting the church than sought by the "Christian Investigator," its Editor could expect to do in half a century to come, could he continue that time long in the field. The circulation of that Book, the most part, little dream of the result which it is preparing to introduce.

Payments and Donations, crowded out this

MARRIED,

At Honesdale, March 4th by William Goodell, Esq. GLENN E. E. FITTS.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher, Honesdale, Oswego county, N. Y.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. IV—No. 5.
WHOLE NUMBER, 19.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MAY, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

ISSUED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

19.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, always in advance, and free of postage.

Persons who will procure four subscribers, and pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, as follows, viz:

100 50 | Sixty papers. 50 00
50 00 | One hundred papers, 2 00
Persons, if requested, will frank letters enclosing papers.

"ORGANIC SINS,"—NO 6.

OPINIONS ABROAD.

Sentiments of ministers and Christians in countries, where slave holding does not cannot but be interesting, in a conclusion like this.—The opposers of "moderation" are not-unaware that the publication of other countries claiming to be more favorable to "radicalism" on our own, so far as this subject is concerned. Their sensitiveness on this score, is frequently disturbed. And quite probable is it, that whenever they can form themselves with any trans-atlantic opinion, they are exceedingly prompt to do so.—Hence of this we have in the famous Report of the American Board, in which Dr. Chalmers is made to figure, and an attempt was made to drag the Church of Scotland into the same position. Since the Christianity of Scotland was evoked by the Board, let us listen to the response that the appeal has drawn forth, from Christians in that country.

Glasgow (Scotland) Emancipation held a meeting, Nov. 5th at which secretaries were instructed "to prepare a report expressive of the views of the meeting respecting a Report on Slavery, put forth by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Signed by JONAS WOODS and eight others, and for the circulation of said document in this country and America, as circumstances will allow." The document appears in the Anti-Slavery Standard for March 5, addressed "To the Rev. Leonard

Woods, D. D. and others constituting the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," and to the friends and patrons of the Board.—[We omit some portions of the document, to save room.]

Your Report is before us. From this we learn that the occasion which called it forth was the presentation of "certain memorials relating to the admission of slaveholders to the churches under the care of the Missionaries of the Board."

The charges preferred by the memorialists:—That slaveholders are admitted to those churches as Christians—that the Board sanctions the principle, that a man may hold slaves and at the same time live under the power of the Gospel—and that thus its influence goes to sanctify slaveholding, and make it honorable. In answer to these charges, you admit that slaveholders are received into churches under your care, and in a long argument you attempt to show that a man may hold men as property, and, at the same time give "credible evidence of a saving change of heart, and of repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."

[Alluding to the reference made by the American Board, in their Report to Dr. Chalmers, they say that he has never been an advocate for emancipation, except upon his own favorite plan of having the slaves purchase themselves of their owners. They then proceed.]

The sentiments of a man who could thus propound, as a just and Christian mode of abolition, that the wronged slaves should buy with money, earned by years of toil under the lash, the bodies and souls which their Creator had given them and of which their masters, by fraud and violence, had despoiled them, are quoted by you to justify your conduct in extending Christian brotherhood to such unmakers of men.

You say—"The more we study God's method of proceeding in regard to Slavery, polygamy, and other social wrongs, the more are we convinced that, in dealing with individuals implicated in these wrongs of long standing and intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system, the utmost kindness and forbearance are to be exercised which are compatible with a steady adherence to right principles." In

this you sum up your main argument to vindicate your conduct in recognizing slaveholders as Christians, and in receiving them to your churches. Your argument is—the sin of which they are guilty is "of long standing and intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system." So among the Algerines, you would admit those to your churches whose business is to seize and enslave Europeans and Americans who are driven upon their coast; in New Zealand, you would receive those who slaughter and devour men for food; and in some countries, you would receive those who offer human sacrifices;—for all these evils, in these countries, are of "long standing and intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system."

If but one man in the United States were in the habit of offering human victims, could any possible amount of evidence convince you that he has the mind of Christ, and is a meet subject for Christian fellowship? No; he is alone in his sin—the universal sentiment of the nation is against it—it is not yet become an "organized sin." You would join the community to consign him to dungeon or a gallows.—But, the practice becomes a national affair—constitutions and laws are made to regulate and protect it—time rolls on—and human sacrifices become sanctified and honored as a religious ordinance, and the custom is transmitted, "by inheritance," from age to age. Now, you would receive to your Mission Church those who sacrifice human victims—for the evil is "of long standing—intimately interwoven with the relations of the social system"—and has assumed the dignity of an "organic sin" as one of your number—Rev. C. E. STOWE, called Slavery.

One man sets up the business of slave-breeding and slave-trading, say in the State of New-York. He also enters his neighbor's house and takes men, women, and children, and sells them. Him you would not receive—the community is against him;—and his sin is of recent date. But the whole State enters into the business. The Constitution and laws make special provisions for its support. Governors, Legislators, Doctors of Divinity, and Judges, engage in it. It becomes an essential element of the "social system;" and is, besides, a time-honored custom: and men become slave-breeders, slave-traders, and slaveholders, "by inheritance." Now, you would say they can give "credible evidence of repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ," and still continue in

these practices. Their sins are "of long standing"—"are deeply and inveterately inwrought into the very texture of society"—and the man, who, while a solitary slaveholder, you would have rebuked as the vilest of men, is now to be treated "with the utmost kindness and forbearance"—and honored with your confidence as a Christian—and promoted to the eldership and the ministry!

Thus the principle on which you estimate the heinousness of sin is, that it loses the nature of sin, and becomes respectable and Christian, in proportion to the number who commit it, to the length of time in which a whole community has indulged in it, and as it is legalized, and "interwoven into the social system." You would hold the pirate and murderer innocent according to the depth and inveteracy with which piracy and murder "are inwrought into the texture of society!"

You have churches on the coast of Africa. A man comes forward to join one. Your missionaries have nothing against him—except that he goes into the interior, burns villages, captures men, women, and children, brings them down to the coast, and sells them to American and other slave-traders. This practice you ask him to abandon. He replies—the traffic is "of long standing and is intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system." Would you receive him? If you receive the slave-trader in Georgia on the ground that his sin is "intimately interwoven into the social system, and of long standing"—why not receive the African slave-trader on the same ground, other things being equal? You must, or give up your apology, and confess that your conduct is without excuse.

You have a church at Smyrna, in Turkey. A Mahometan convert wishes to join. He gives "satisfactory evidence of a saving change of heart, and of repentance and faith in Christ." In the estimation of your missionaries. Yet he has two wives and two concubines, or it may be a much larger number of these. Your missionaries talk with him about it; and learn that polygamy and concubinage are "deeply and inveterately inwrought into the very texture of society." Having learned this, you treat him "with the utmost kindness and forbearance"—and receive him to your church as one whose "life is hid with Christ in God!"

We infer from this Report, that those who practice *polygamy* are received into churches planted by you among the heathen. You intimate that you deal with such as you do with slaveholders, i. e. "receive them on their giving satisfactory evidence of a change of heart;" but ceasing from this "organic sin" is not included in this evidence, any more than is "renouncing property in slaves."—Are the friends and supporters of the Board in Great Britain and America, especially among the *female* portion of society, aware that they are supporting churches into which those who practice *polygamy* and *concubinage* are received as Christians?

You must be allowed to have discovered a new and most ingenious way to restrain men from evil practice—i. e. receive them to "all the distinctions and privileges of Christian

society"—and then persuaded them to forsake their evil ways. So, to do away drunkenness, you would receive drunkards to your churches, as persons who may "give convincing evidence of regeneration." To induce man stealers to forsake their wickedness you would assure them that man-stealing may be perfectly consistent with a "credible profession of Christianity," and throw around them whatever of respectability, membership in your mission churches can impart; and to induce *polygamists* to abandon their iniquity you would receive them to your pulpits and communion as Christian men and ministers. This, you say, you are "convicted in God's method of proceeding in regard to Slavery and Polygamy, and other wrongs that are interwoven with the social system!"

"Adultery, drunkenness, extortion, man-stealing, hatred, and strifes," were "interwoven with the social system" in Asia Minor—yet it is said, "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

You well know that the sin of denying marriage to *three millions* of slaves is "deeply interwoven with the very texture of society" all over the Southern States; and because it is, you would appoint those who commit this sin, and who hold men and women together in a state of concubinage, to be your secretaries and missionaries; and you receive them to your churches as respectable men and Christians; while you spurn as heathens the polluted men and women who do the same deed in Boston. If you treat the man who keeps five hundred men and women in this condition in Louisiana "with the utmost kindness and forbearance," and receive him to the "distinctions and privileges of Christian society;" why not accord similar treatment to a man or woman who affords five men and women accommodation to live in such a sinning, wretched condition in New-York? Of the two, if there can be any comparison, in their guilt, the Louisiana planter is far the most guilty. Why not receive the one into your churches as well as the other, in order to induce him to forsake his sins?

The circumstance which you mention to extenuate the slaveholders' guilt and to justify your Christian alliance with him, is the reason, above all others, which proves him most unjust, and why you should exclude him from your fellowship—i. e. the fact that Slavery is "inwrought into the very texture of society." This fact makes the condition of the slaves more hopeless, draws around his soul a deeper gloom, and arrays against him the combined sympathy and power of the whole community. A nation, instead of an individual, stands ready to crush his every effort to arise from the condition of a brute to the dignity of a man.

This very circumstance, which, above all others, aggravates the sorrow and sufferings of the slave, drives deeper the iron into his soul, and makes the lash and chain of his servitude more galling, you bring forward in mitigation of the guilt of those who thus systematically and deliberately torture his body, rob him of his rights, and overcloud his mind with artificial night. The fact, that the slaveholders have "interwoven Slavery with

all the relations and movements of their system," and by fraud and threats prey on a whole nation to lend its power to them in crushing their victims, proves their evil plans and purposes are deliberate, deep laid, malignant. Their villainy is the result of a sudden provocation and burst of passion, but it is cool, deliberate, and calculating. Their purposes of injury and wrong to the slave appears more and more desperate, in proportion to the coolness, and system, with which pursue their object. Your great argument to extenuate the slaveholders' guilt proves him a more deliberate, determined and systematic villain; and the slave the victim of deeper and more inexcusable injury.

Thus reasoned Mr. Rice, in the Convention that formed the Constitution of the A. S. Society. He says:

"It is vain for me to plead that I have no sanction of law for holding slaves; for **THE LAW MAKES THE INJURY THE GREATER**—it arms the community against the slave and makes his case desperate. The owners of such slaves are **LICENSED ROBBERIES**; and not the just proprietors of what they claim."

If the fact that slaveholding is "inwrought into the texture of society," protected and perpetuated by constitutions and laws, sanctioned by social religious customs, makes the injury to the slave the greater, none can doubt that it does; it also makes the guilt and infamy of the slaveholders more apparent. Whatever circumstance deepens the injury, deepens the guilt of those who inflict it. The "legislative enactment for the continuance of Slavery," which adduces to palliate the slaveholder and to justify your reception of him as a Christian, is declared by William Pitt to be "an outrage upon justice, only another name for **FRAUD, ROBBERY, and MURDER**, infringe all the principles of law and subvert the foundation of morality."

So far as the influence of this Report may extend, it can but work evil, and only evil, the cause of Liberty and Christianity; a tendency appears to us to be to establish principles, subversive of the foundations of moral government, viz:—

1. That holding and using human beings as property, and breeding and trading in slaves are consistent with a "credible profession of Christianity," and that ceasing from these sins is not included in the Gospel idea of "Repentance and faith in Jesus Christ."

2. That a wrong done to men is less sinful in proportion as it becomes "intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system."

3. That slaveholders, polygamists, concubinists, thieves, and robbers, become less guilty and more worthy of Christian confidence and respect, in proportion as their numbers increase, and as they are enabled to band together and to pass laws to legalize and justify their evil deeds, and make them essential elements of the social state.

These principles seem to us to constitute the basis of this Report. On behalf of the Committee of the Glasgow Emancipation

we therefore wish to record our protest against it; and against the religion which the Board and its agents are seeking to propagate among us as the religion of Him who came to every yoke and to let the oppressed go and who forbids his followers to "join with thieves, or to be partakers with them."

JOHN MURRAY,
WILLIAM SMEAL. } Secreta ries
Nov., 20th November, 1845.

Never the friends of the American Board and of its present position shall remain Christians in Scotland, as able to stand on their side of the question, the poor people, from Maine to Louisiana, shall be put in possession of it.—Each of their Editors will copy this?

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS—MODE OF CONDUCTING THEM—WANTS OF THE AGE.

The present position of the American Board and of other prominent missionary societies, in relation to American Slavery, has been upon the minds of Christian friends of a consideration of 'missionary' operations, in the course of which, many defects have been revealed, and the whole subject is like to undergo a general and searching review.

A few ardent friends of the missionary cause, including some of the most self-denying missionaries, find themselves obliged to co-operation with the old Board, a problem before them is, in what manner, upon what principles, through what means, and by what instrumentalities they hereafter proceed. In beginning this of vast moment, to begin right, to set a safe precedent, and not headlessly pursue a course which shall introduce again the abuses against which we have been contending, or others of a character to be dreaded. We propose at the same time, to throw out a few brief hints, which may be useful in the incipient stages of discussion upon which the friends of Christian Missions are already beginning to enter.

I. THE CIRCULES.
It is a time to act, yet not too hastily to act rashly and wisely. There must be a comparison of views, consultation among select cliques, but on the broad platform of the equal Christianism of all at large.

OF DIRECTIONS AGAINST THE AMERICAN BOARD.

acted on wrong principles. In bad

hands. No prospect of a radical reformation.

"Close corporation" in its structure, ultra Episcopal in its superintendency, self constituted and self perpetuated—irresponsible either to the Churches, or to a constituency of contributors, or to local societies, Pansyite in the East, Pro-Slavery at home, Oppressive and vexatious at the Sandwich Islands and elsewhere. Controlled by an aristocracy, obsequious to the wealthy, confiding in the omnipotence of money. In fellowship with the ungodly, recognizing a new birth without a decent morality, an evangelism without humanity, a piety towards God whom we have not seen, without love to our equal brother whom we have seen.

3. DIFFICULTY IN THE WAY OF A RETURN TO RIGHT ACTION.

An almost idolatrous veneration for the American Board, the assumption arrogantly and openly made in its behalf, that it holds, as of divine right, the occupancy of the field, or at least of the scenes where it has stations. The popish claim of its infallibility and superiority to scrutiny, because it was founded in prayer, and has been blessed as an instrument of good. The ecclesiastical influence and power of the corporate members of the Board. The consequent obsequiousness and servility of many, both among ministers laymen, who, in private, complain of its course, but are silent in public, or give it their juncture. The want of manly independence and integrity, where it is most needed, and might have been expected. Very few local churches and fewer ecclesiastical bodies, ready for right action.

Individuals, who are dissatisfied, are hampered by their ecclesiastical connexions, or stand in need of favor or patronage: Divided into different sects, few in number, scattered, without concert, without plan; misled by bad precedents.

4. ENCOURAGEMENTS.

God is at work, accomplishing his own predictions, fulfilling his own promises, "overturning, overturning, overturning." Producing great changes, casting down imaginations, stripping off disguises, pressing men to decision, who had determined on concealment, stirring up a spirit of inquiry, pouring contempt upon bodies hitherto unapproachable and dignified, and putting it into the hearts of the people, in obscure places, to mourn over the desolations and the cap-

tivity of Zion, and pray for her deliverance and enlargement.

Many are running to and fro.—knowledge is increased. The progress of the age is irresistibly onward, because God himself has determined and impels it. The signs of the times are ominous. The conservators of existing abuses, apparently left to themselves, give evidence of the insatiation that always precedes overthrow, and they resort to expedients and subterfuges which can scarcely fail to accomplish their own defeat and disgrace in the end. It was not until Christ, by his ministry, while in the flesh, had succeeded in withdrawing the confidence of the populace, and particularly of his disciples, from a Jesuitical priesthood, who made void the law by their traditions, and devoured widows' houses, and it was not until he had suffered martyrdom, at their hands, for his integrity, that the way for a spiritual regeneration of society, at the day of Pentecost, was prepared. The dawn of the Protestant reformation, the beginnings of the Puritan and of the Wesleyan revivals, were marked, more or less visibly, with similar developments. When the enemy comes in, like a flood, the spirit of the Lord lifts up a standard. Already a deep toned and wide spread dissatisfaction with the existing state of things, prevails: and is connected, more or less, with ardent longings, and hopes, and expectations of better days. When did God ever disappoint hopes like these?

5. WHAT WE WANT, AND MUST HAVE.

Christian Missions must be so conducted as to meet the divine approbation, unite the friends of thorough reform, and relieve them from the control of those in whom they have no confidence, and with whom they cannot conscientiously co-operate. Men of levity or of pliancy, who can expose, eloquently, and shrewdly, the Jesuitism now in the ascendant, and yet swim along with it, or content themselves with seeking only such changes as can be effected by the pressure of public sentiment upon venal minds, must learn either to become earnest men themselves, or give place to those who are; and who can be satisfied with nothing short of Christian honesty in those who undertake the propagation of Christ's religion.

Christian Missions are needed, adapted to the coming age, progressive and yet stable, liberal enough to unite the true friends of Christ, restricted enough to exclude the sor-

did and the selfish, "who seek their own, and not the things of Jesus Christ." Missions based on an evangelical Christianity, that includes humanity and fundamental morality, propagating Christ's Christianity by Christian means.

0. STANDARDS, LAND MARKS, TESTS.

The New Testament, the teachings and example of Christ and his apostles, the living spirit of the Christian religion, the fundamental first principles of equity and truth, the doctrines of inalienable human rights, the unity of a common brotherhood, the holy equality of souls before God."

These must be followed, in distinction from, and in opposition to, human authorities, current usages, venerated precedents.

7. WHAT MUST, AT ALL EVENTS, BE AVOIDED.

In order to any trust worthy reformation in the department of Christian Missions, we must, in all cases, and at all hazards and sacrifices, avoid.

1. The least departure from the standards, landmarks, and tests, already specified, or the least compromise of them, either to gain numbers, respectability, or funds. For these are fundamental, and vital to the preservation and integrity of Christianity itself, and consequently, to Christian institutions and Christian missions.

In particular,

2. The absolute and unimpaired independency of local churches, either at home or abroad, must in no degree, and under no pretext, be trenchd upon. There must be no violation of "ministerial equality," no virtual Episcopacy, no incipient hierarchies, no monopoly of the field or of the work of Christian Missions. Of Course.

3. There must be no central Boards, Committees, or Secretaries, who shall exercise the prerogative, exclusively, of selecting missionaries, or stationing them.

There must be no episcopal superintendency of missionaries or of missions, by missionary Boards.

From this, however, it will not follow, that those who sustain missions and mission churches, may not cease to support them whenever, at vital points, they depart from christian morality and evangelical faith.

A better definition of the course to be pursued, in this respect, could not perhaps, be given, than by saying that it should be precisely opposite to that of the American Board, who will employ no Missionaries, who have scruples concerning infant baptism, who station the missionaries, direct them, and control them in all their movements, with a minuteness seldom equalled by any of the

Bishops of Episcopal churches, and yet, whenever the Missionaries or mission churches are charged with participating in the "greatest abomination in all the earth," they shelter themselves from responsibility in sustaining them, by pleading that the churches and Missionaries are so independent of them, that they have no right to interfere!

8. MODES OF ORGANIZATION.

But how, it may be asked, shall these principles be carried out into practice?—How shall the friends of free Missions, scattered all over the country, co-operate together, in sustaining Missionaries, without the help of a central Board? And what shall such a Board do, unless it collects, stations, superintends, and directs the Missionaries and the churches they may gather?

In answer to those, and kindred inquiries, a number of hints and suggestions may be made.

1. It must be admitted that the friends of free Christian Missions, on Bible principles, are in a scattered and feeble condition, and this is partly because they retain church connexions inconsistent with their principles, and calculated, in many ways, to divide them, keep them apart from each other, prevent their co-operation, and tempt them to support missions of an opposite character to those that they approve. How much will be done to sustain Bible Missions abroad until Bible Churches are established at home, is a question which we have no disposition to forestal. If those who undertake to sustain Missions on Bible principles among the heathen, do not honor those same principles in regard to Christian institutions in their own country, we are not among those who can promise them much success, till they learn to correct their mistakes.

Christians retaining fellowship and connexion with pro-slavery churches and ministers in civilized countries, are certainly in an awkward position to insist upon having none but anti-slavery churches and ministers among the heathen! Their opponents understand this; and it was not without force and effect that Dr. Beecher and others, urged, at the meeting of the Board, that it would be difficult and seem harsh and partial to require of the Choc-taws and Cherokees a higher standard of Christian morality, and of Christian character than is maintained in the American churches that sustain them.

It must be admitted that the slave church members and ministers among the white population of the U. States, are inexcusable than those among the Cherokees, who are just emerging from heathenism, and have less means of knowledge. And the negro hating church members and ministers of the non-slaveholding states will not worship on terms of equality with their sabbath brethren, who point the finger of scorn, and cry out, "amalgamation!" who do—and who wield their civil power for the elevation of slaveholders and the perpetuity of slave laws, (even declining, in some cases, even to petition for their repeal), doubting as guilty, to say the least, as slaveholders themselves. They commit essentially the same sin, not only against the light, but in compliance with feeble professions, and against better professions. Those who can consent to retain church connexion with these, must find it a hard task to carry out the principle of sustaining mission churches that contain slaveholding members. The real slave holders (who hold the slaves in bondage, though not tending to own them,) are found in these states, here at the north.

The very question in dispute between the American Board and the Abolitionists, are dissatisfied with their course, is the question whether or no the practice of stationing shall be prohibited in the churches, whether the slave question shall be a TEST QUESTION IN THE CHURCHES. If you decide this question in the negative, you decide that the American Board are in the wrong. If you decide it in the affirmative, you decide that those who remain members of pro-slavery churches, and who support pro-slavery ministers, here in the United States, are in the wrong.

2. All this has to be considered, in the disposition of the inquiry—How shall the friends of Bible Missions unite their efforts without the intervention of a Mission Board wielding Episcopal powers? If they had Anti-slavery Churches, instead of pro-slavery churches containing minorities of abolitionists, those churches would be able to do the work of supporting missions among the heathen. Each Church, or at least, three neighboring churches, might employ a missionary of their choice, in such a

they could mutually agree upon, and support him without any Missionary Board, a contrivance unknown in primitive times. Especially might they do this, if they would take Prof. Schmucker's advice, and carry on religious worship among themselves, without a salaried pastor, (as the first Christian churches commonly did,) rather than leave the heathen without a supply.

3. But the efficiency of such churches might depend much upon the decision of another question. If all evangelical Christians, dissatisfied with pro-slavery missions abroad, and pro-slavery churches at home, could come together on the basis of a well understood, and scripturally defined Christian Union, distinguishing the *essence* of Christ's religion from its mere incidents, great strength and efficiency might be gained. But if each stitch in the hem of the Savior's garment must be exalted into a church test, and made the occasion of schism; if Christ's distinction between mercy and sacrifice must perpetually be spurned—if none can be "received" except on condition of uniformity in matters of "doubtful disputation"—if one must needs be of Paul, another of Apollos, another of Cephas, another of Luther, another of Calvin, and another of Wesley, then indeed, the time is distant in which churches, (local churches such as the Apostles planted,) shall be taken into the account, in determining the organizations needful for sustaining Christian Missions. Jesus Christ and his Apostles provided no missionary organizations but local independent churches. And if the spirit and form of primitive church institutions could be re-established, it is not probable that Christians would think it necessary, or desirable, to organize any other missionary institutions in their room.

FIRST PLAN.

4. Taking things as they now are, the problem of missionary organizations in accordance with the fundamental principles of Christian equality and freedom, is a more difficult one. And yet we may conceive of operations that might give sufficient scope and opportunity for most of the friends of the cause to co-operate, without a violation of the rights, either of the missionaries, or of those who support them—or of the churches that might be gathered hereafter, either at home or abroad.

The friends of the cause in different locations and vicinities might confer together, select a missionary or missionaries, from among themselves or of their acquaintance, and send them into the field they might prefer. If re-

quisite, they might request some trusty brother, living in New York or Boston, to act as their banker or agent in the remittance of funds.—A direct correspondence between the missionaries and those who sustain them, would convey all the needed information, and carry on the intercourse between them much more perfectly than is now done through a Committee and Secretaries, having the charge of so many missionaries and stations, on their hands. In this way the absence of local anti-slavery churches at home, so far as the work of missions is concerned, might in some measure be supplied. Something like this, if we mistake not, has been done in Boston and vicinity, where remittances for the support of a few well known missionaries in the British W. Indies have been made through a "West India Committee" acting merely as a medium of intercourse between the Missionaries and their friends.

This plan, if adopted in all parts of the country, would go far towards superseding the necessity of any General Missionary Board, on the customary plan of Episcopal supervision. Individuals far remote from others of the same views, might make their selection of some one of these local societies or their city agents with whom to co-operate, when no society could be formed in their own neighborhood, able to support a missionary, by themselves.

SECOND PLAN—IN ADDITION TO THE FOREGOING.

Should it be thought desirable, however, to organize a General Missionary Society, we would suggest the outline of a plan like the following:

1. Let the society consist of all such persons, all over the country, as shall approve its principles, and contribute to its funds, or remit through its Treasury to Missionaries acting on the principles of the society.

2. The principles of the society might be briefly stated, comprizing the outlines of an Evangelical faith, (omitting the doubtful disputations of the evangelical sects) the first principles of inalienable human rights—the equal brotherhood of the saints—the church discipline that shall exclude oppressors and other ungodly men—the gospel methods of propagating the religion of Christ.

3. The Constitution might provide for the customary officers of such bodies, including an Executive Committee, Secretary and Treasurer, to be chosen annually by the members. The chief business of its Com. Secretary and Treasurer, to be the collection and diffusion of missionary intelligence; and to act as a medium of free communication between the

missionaries abroad, and the friends of Missions at home—each party, including the officers of the society, to have free access, within reasonable bounds, to the public ear, thro' the publications of the society.

4. Local societies (as before described) to remain independent of the National one, transacting their own business in their own way, and using the National organization as a medium of communication, only as their own convenience may require.

5. Local societies or individuals might remit for the support of such missions, or Missionaries, as they choose, through the treasury of the General Society, the Treasurer retaining for the society a suitable percentage for their trouble, when remittances are made to Missionaries sent out by the local societies.

6. Monies might also be contributed to the treasury of the General Society, to be distributed by them, among the Missionaries at their discretion;—and the Executive Committee might recommend fields of labor, and recommend Missionaries to labor in them. But they should hold no authoritative control over them, or over the churches founded by them.—When it is ascertained that any of the Missionaries or mission churches depart from the essential principles and practices of Christianity, the fact should be made public, and the Committee and Treasurer should no longer receive funds for their support.

7. The Missionaries to forward home an annual or semi-annual account of their receipts and expenditures.

8. The Mission Churches should be taught and encouraged to do all they can for the support of a gospel ministry among themselves, and for the instruction of those who are still in heathenism.

9. The publications of the society to be supported by subscriptions, and by specific donations for that object.

10. No "life memberships" but by "continuance in well doing." No preference of wealthy contributors above those who "cast in their mites." No "auxiliary societies"—nor "delegates"—the society being composed solely of its own members, in their own persons.

GENERAL REMARKS.

By some such methods we might begin to do something for Foreign Missions, without waiting for the previous organization of anti-slavery churches at home.

No distinct mention need be made in the societies thus constituted (especially the General society) of any of the existing sects, and their merits or demerits, aside from their modes of conducting missions, need not come under

direct discussion, in arranging our operations.

When we speak of the *Episcopal* nature and operations of our existing Missionary Boards, we only refer to an existing fact—long ago noticed by Episcopallians, in their controversies with Presbyterians and Congregationalists—a fact that the opponents of Episcopacy have never yet ventured to deny. Mr. Colton affirms that the American Board and the American Home Missionary Board are the most formidable Episcopacies in America; wielding more power over churches and ministers than any other Bishops in the country. And certainly it cannot be denied, that such power as is wielded by these Boards is of the nature of Episcopacy, which essentially consists in the supervision and control of local churches and ministers by some other body; and especially in the control of *ministers over ministers*. What becomes of "ministerial equality" when three or four ministers in Boston, the Secretaries of the American Board, control hundreds of ministers in all the four quarters of the globe? Let the operation go on and be successful, what prevents the rise of a power in Boston, analogous to that in Rome?

The present mode of conducting missions, emboldens Episcopallians to say that Episcopacy is necessary to the propagation of Christianity, since not only Presbyterians, but even Congregationalists are obliged to resort to it. Until the practice is laid aside, the reproach will not cease, and our young clergy, educated in the atmosphere of such usages, will continue their eager rush toward Lambeth and Rome.

High time is it to repel the pretension!—The most efficient missionary operations the Christian religion ever realized, were carried on before the least departure from local church independency had been made—before a diocesan Bishop was ever heard of—before a Missionary Board was ever organized.

If a pure Christianity is ever to be propagated through the earth, the spirit and the methods of the apostolic age must be restored.

We copy the able article that follows from the American Freeman, Prairieville, Wisconsin.

DO THE EVILS OF SLAVERY EXTEND TO A FUTURE LIFE?

This inquiry, we may be told, belongs to the theologians. We suppose it did. But, inasmuch as they have not made it, have not hinted at it, so far as we learn, we even venture to make it ourselves.

"There are more things in Heaven and earth and sea, Than are spoken of in our theology."

And after having read the Bible Vindication of one D. D., the recommendation to (chance) "vote for the least of two evils" by another, and the sublime theory of "organic sins" by another, we are more than half inclined to set aside the doctors, and, with such helps as we can command, to elaborate a theology for ourselves. And we promise, at the outset, that if we do not do better than some who are our seniors in the school, we are far from any chance of doing worse.

In considering the question—Do the effects of slavery extend to a future life? we assume as true the Christian doctrine of the reality of a future life, and the doctrine that the character of a future life is cast and determined by that of the present. We abstain from those questions agitated by universalists and their opponents, and from those respecting the development of the intellectual and moral faculties of those removed from this life in infancy and early childhood. We simply wish to contemplate slavery and slaveholding as influencing the character which slaves and slaveholders are forming and establishing; and which, in most cases, they are, to all human appearance, to carry along with them into the future world. We have a thousand times, in books and sermons, been taught the following doctrine, viz: As childhood is to after life—as the seed sown to the harvest growing from it—so is this life in its influences upon the life to come. A childhood without instruction passes, of course, into a manhood of ignorance and moral degradation. A childhood of indolence, of devotion to caprice, self-gratification, irascible passions, &c, naturally passes into a vagabond and ruffian character as the individual reaches maturity. So, it is rationally presumed, is the case with the present life, considered as comprising the germ, the elements, the infancy of the future. And intellectual and moral habits, it is presumed, adhere to the individual and pass along with him on the path of existence, and that, irrespective of any change of locality and outward circumstance which that existence may undergo. Mental and moral habits and acquisitions we see continually surviving all changes of locality, condition and relation, in the world of living men; and all analogy is in favor of the belief that so it is in the world of the departed; and so, too, throughout the universe of created intelligences. We have no evidence that, in entering upon another life, the present life or any portion of it is blotted out or set aside; or that, after one development of the intellectual and moral faculties has been made in unfavorable and disastrous circumstances, an-

other and a new development, remedying the defects and correcting the evils of the previous one, is to supervene. An eye put out, a limb cut off, or any bodily organ destroyed, even in infancy is never restored to the individual suffering such privation. The body may be mutilated and deprived of various important organs and functions which the individual is forever unable afterwards to acquire or have restored. Analogous to these cases, it is presumed, are cases of permanent and remediless injuries inflicted on the minds and moral characters of those who are the victims of cruelty and wrong. The spirit, the intellect, the moral powers may be dwarfed, deformed, rendered imbecile or depraved; and that, too, for perpetuity, as truly as the limbs or bodily organs; and there is no ground at all for the presumption, that an injury befalling an individual by the crime of another will be remedied, any more than for saying that a life destroyed by the act of another will be restored. Men are every day occasioning great and permanent and remediless injuries and destruction to one another, so far as the present life is concerned; and who shall say that the victims of wickedness do not suffer injuries the effects of which neither a future life nor an endless life will eradicate?—The murder of the soul is the extremest atrocity of murder: the converse, we venture to assert, of the sentiment contained in the adage, "Charity to the soul is the soul of charity." We heard a slaveholder, not long since maintaining the *opposition* to slavery was unreasonable, "because slavery does no injury to the soul of its victim." No injury to the soul!!! Why then, in the name of wonder, does the whole south and nine-tenths of the north, incessantly and passionately insist on the impossibility of managing such masses of human ignorance, degradation and depravity, as are and must be the colored population of the south, whether enslaved or free? Why do our friends shiver with horror and quake at the thought of what slaves set free would do—those very slaves whose souls are not hurt by slavery? Are they all thieves, all liars, all unchaste, all cherishing malignant and revengeful feelings towards their white oppressors, all bloodthirsty, all stupidity, indifferent to all which pertains to the cultivation and improvement of mind and moral and social character?—Are slaves, as a general fact, all this, and yet *their souls not hurt by slavery*? Ah! 'tis the degradation, the impoverishment, the deformity, the imbecility of intellect and character, of conscience and heart induced by slavery, its paralyzing influence upon all

Christian Investigator.

HONEYE, MAY, 1846.

"OLD SCHOOL" PRESBYTERIAN ABOLITIONISTS.

The following is a copy of the Memorial circulated among the "Old School" Presbyterians in the south-west, to which we alluded in our March number:

MEMORIAL.

To the Moderator and Members of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church, to meet in the city of Philadelphia in May, 1846:

We, the undersigned, Ministers and Members of the Old School Presbyterian Church, would respectfully pray your Reverend Body to rescind the decision of the General Assembly of the year 1843, on the subject of Slavery—to pronounce slaveholding a sin deserving the censure of the Church—and to take the constitutional steps for exercising discipline on slaveholders.

We believe that the decision of the last General Assembly, which declares that the holding of slaves should be no bar to Christian communion, is founded on a false assumption, viz: that Christ and his Apostles received slaveholders to the communion of the Church. We believe that it implicates the Merciful Jesus in the crime of sanctioning the most cruel oppression; and that it has brought reproach and disgrace on the cause of our blessed Redeemer. We believe, with the General Assembly of 1794, that "men-stealers are all those who buy, sell, or keep slaves;" that those who "keep" slaves, are slaveholders; and therefore, that in all cases, those voluntarily engaged in holding slaves, are unworthy of membership in the church of Christ.

REMARKS—It will be noticed that this document condemns *slaveholding*, and not merely *slavery*, the *slave laws*, and the *slave system*. It meets, therefore, without evasion, the very question now mooted both among the Old School churches and the New.

And it takes the ground that *slave holders* are men-stealers, and ought not to be received into the churches. This covers precisely the ground of dispute between abolitionists and the American Board.

We repeat the question whether "New School" Presbyterian Abolitionists, even in the State of New York, are distinctly and actively taking this stand? And we now extend the inquiry to "New School" Congregationalists, (and "Old School," too, if there are such,) not only in New York, but in New England? The position of the American Board, if nothing else, furnishes a proper occasion for such a movement among "New" as well as "Old" School abolitionists.

HOW TO DISPLACE ERROR:

Almost all successful teachers of error owe their popularity and success, in a great measure, to the fact that some important and neglected truth, or something which very nearly resembles it, is incorporated into their system, and made prominent in their teachings.

The only way to meet and counteract such teachers is, to give no less prominence, in

our own teachings, to all the truths they inculcate, to present the *exact* truth in contradistinction to their distorted perversions of it, and then show the consistency and harmony of these very same truths with the truths which those errorists are intent upon opposing and obscuring. The misfortune is, that, while this mixture of truth and error leads many to swallow down the error along with the truth, it leads others, who undertake the task of combating the error, to weaken themselves by denying or casting into the back ground, the truths that have been thus mingled with error.

Thus, those who deny a particular Providence, fortify themselves by insisting much upon the freedom of human will, which they think inconsistent with the all comprehensive control of such a Providence. And many who oppose them, have been so unwise as to discredit or disparage the doctrine of human freedom.

Another class, who were intent on denying the free agency and accountability of man, have intrenched themselves behind the doctrine of a superintending Providence that controls all things; and their opponents have been led to deny such a Providence in order to vindicate human freedom!

Those who deny the divinity of Christ, insist largely on his humanity; and this has led some to throw into the shade, his humanity, in order to vindicate his divinity. Thus they weaken their own theology, give an advantage to their opponents, prevent distorted views of Christianity, and lose all the precious instruction and consolation of the humanity as well as the divinity of the Savior.

Those who are intent on the work of disparaging and overthrowing Christian institutions, the Church and the ministry, are forward to expose existing *corruptions* in the Church and ministry, and to insist on the Christian duty of coming out from among them and holding no fellowship with them. How lamentable is it that the opponents of these men, (abolitionists among others) instead of admitting frankly these undeniable truths, and insisting strongly upon them, urging upon Christians the duty of *restoring* the Christian institutions of the Bible, now trampled in the mire, should be so unwise as to palliate or deny the corruptions which all men know to exist, or else to teach the Christian duty of embracing, in Christian fellow,

which distinguishes man from brute, that constitutes more, far more, than ninety-nine hundredths of the mischief its occasions.—All thirst for knowledge repressed, all ambition annihilated, all the endearments of domestic life embittered beyond expression, all hope banished from the breast, all thought of improvement precluded, the social nature imbued with sentiments of hatred and revenge for wrongs perpetually endured and ever accumulating and multiplying—all this, and all else that slavery includes, goes to make up the injury to the soul which slavery inflicts. It is the crowning wrong—the high finish of aggravation, to the evil of slavery, that its victims are rational, and moral, and immortal beings. Heathenize, chattelize, brutalize, demonize, and that for life, and from one generation to another, millions of mankind, and claim that no injury is done to the soul.—To what infinite absurdities does not the endeavor to defend slavery compel those who make the attempt! We believe that slavery is as unfavorable a school, whether to the intellect, the morals, the religious character, or any thing else of man that is to survive the present life, as it is to train in for eminence in art or science. Every particle of its influence is to dwarf and deform and disorder and impair the spirit's energies. No transcendental process, newmoulding the intellectual and moral constitution is likely to supervene at death. The individual carries with him just all the mental and moral degradation which he here acquires either by his own fault or the fault of others. He passes into the other life with a character formed, with moral habits established, with an education for an immortal existence, just precisely such as the "peculiar institution" has furnished him. Here is the vast, the infinite difference as regards the application of the chattel principle to man and the application to the brute that perisheth.

We invite the investigation of this subject by our friends who have made the subject of man's future and immortal existence familiar to their thoughts. Christian slave holders and Christian apologists for slavery might derive benefit from a careful and candid study of the subject. And Christians engaged in the anti-slavery enterprise may here find new and vastly more powerful motives to exertion than those commonly urged upon the attention. We have more to say on this topic at future opportunity.

PRACTICE.

ANTHOMIANISM I—What shall we say of it? What need we say? It tells its own pedigree. Look in its sanctimonious face, and you will see the image of the beast there. *Its breath is evil*—its speech portentous—its whole bearing, the bearing of presumption and impudence. Common sense cannot be deceived by its flimsy sophistry—and every moral feeling of the soul is roused at its approach, and instinctively lifts up the heel against it.

Well! well! speak gently, lest you involve yourself in the condemnation you utter. Antinomianism has several forms, and it sometimes happens that they who are loudest in their denunciations of it under one shape, hug it to their bosoms when it appears in another. To attempt a savorance between faith and duty—to cry up the virtue of belief, and to cry down the obligation to act—to nixie men's hearts the sepulchres, rather than the soil, of truth—to justify the strangling of principles in their cradles, lest they should cry and give annoyance to neighbors—what is this but antinomianism? and who is more chargeable with this than they who are perpetually chiding nonconformity with their authoritative 'Lie still?' And it is observable that both classes of antinomians base their tenets upon the modest assumption of supereminent spirituality. It is all for the gospel's sake that professed dissenters maintain a studied silence, and urge determined inaction in reference to their distinctive principles. They cannot consent to, endanger the progress of true religion, by any serious efforts to spread—what? Avo! What, on their own showing? Error? No! Uncertain opinions? Not at all! Conclusions fairly arrived at by human fairly arrived at by human reasoning? This is not their way of putting it! But, revealed truth—a pert and parcel of Christianity—a portion of, the expressed mind of God. "Hush!" they cry, "for the sake" of spiritual-mindedness, hush! Say nothing about 'bat—do nothing to carry out that—balk not the chances of Christian union by insisting upon that—peril not our present liberty by combining for that. .

"In shade let it rest like a delicate flower;
Obtain it on it softly! it died in an hour."

Truth says, "Ho—but ho, in order to do?" The thoughts which she inspires must kindle into warm affections must needs evolve themselves into action. Nothing born of truth can be evil—"bare," we say, for there may be an image on the understanding, when there is no life in the conscience—and where there is not life, there can be no nonconformity. But all vitality, moral as well as physical, craves exercise—and a principle in the heart, though but of yesterday, like a new-born babe, will first cry, and then kick—first profess itself, and, as soon as may be, act.

Another martyr has entered his rest.—
CHARLES T. TORNEY, died in prison, at Bal-
timore, on Saturday May 9th under the
laws of Maryland, against hiding the outcasts,
relieving the distressed, and administering to
the wants of the least of Christ's brethren.—
He enjoyed the presence of the Savior to the
last. And the disciples of Gamaliel were
consenting unto his death. How long will
the disciples of Christ through their syna-
gogues and listen to their teachings?

G. W. Clark, Victor	0.50	S. Seymour, Lebanon,	0.50
W. P. Green, Troy,	1.00	H. S. Redfield, do	0.50
J. A. Northrup, Low-		W. Clark, Lenox,	0.50
villa.	0.50	Y. Lewis do	0.50
L. Tuttle, Camden.	0.50	Orion & Taylor, Eaton,	1.00
N. & L. Foster, Palmy-		Levi Blackmer, Hon-	
ra,	2.00	nye.	3.00
S. W. Brown, Little		W. B. Stone, Gardner	
Falls,	1.00	Mass.	1.00
H. Gilbert, Richmond.	1.00	B. King, B. Bloomfield	1.00
J. C. Gilbert, Moravia,	1.00	G. W. Cherry, Canoga	1.00
J. Cady,	do	E. Grissam, Huston,	0.30
J. Stoyell,	do,	P. Reed, Richmond,	1.00
L. Noble, Honeoye,	1.00	Geo. Price, Sandwich	
F. C. Green, Mechanica		Mass.	0.50
villa,	1.00	J. F. Clark, do,	0.50
R. Sleeper, Mt. Morris	1.00		
N. L. Steadman,	0.25		
		Amount,	\$21.63

☞ The friends of this publication will see that we need additional support.

WILLIAM GODDELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honzoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

✠ Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by
Win. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity
and a blessing. 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling. (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—*Arise and Build*. 4 pages, \$2.62½ per hundred.
No. 5.—*Fellowship with Unrighteousness*. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

Printed at the Countryman Office ; Perry, N. Y.
Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills
together with every description of Book & Job Printing.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. IV—No. 9.
Whole Number, 50.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JUNE, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—Or, if procuring eight subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

per dozen, 50 00 Sixty papers, 52 00
per eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00

Post Masters, if requested, will frank letters enclosing money for papers.

ORGANIC SINS.—NO. 7.

DOGY AND ORTHODOXY OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.

The rigid morality and strict discipline of Puritan churches was not more remarkable than the high tone of their theological principles, lying, as they believed, at the foundation of all that was sound and worthy in their practice. Reversing the popular maxim that it is no matter what we believe if our practice is correct, the Puritans taught that correct practice, in the spiritual sense of the term, results only from a loving and intelligent attachment to the principles of action, that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," or, in other words, (according to their exposition) if a man believed the truth, loved the truth and followed the truth, he would walk in the truth, and there would be no occasion of stumbling in him; but if he believed a lie, and followed a lie, and followed a lie, he would be in darkness, not knowing whither he

went. Whether the Puritans were right or wrong, being or bigoted, in these rigid notions of theirs, we need not now stop to inquire. Let it be said, here that they seemed to the testimony of a venerable antiquity of high authority on their side, in this. It may be further remarked that Puritan theory, at one time nearly extinct, seems in process of resurrection by our reformatory "fanatics," who, in a Puritan severity, insist upon it, not that men should be pledged to the support of certain specific objects, but to certain

fundamental principles, in the light of which as they say, all particular measures must be understood, shaped, moulded, and defined.—They insist too, as the Puritans did, that this theory is not to be confused or set aside, because many who intellectually perceive and verbally acknowledge correct principles hold them merely as idle abstractions, and never reduce them to practice.

The theology of the Puritans, like their morality and their church discipline which grew out of it, has been thought too unbending and rigid. Very probably it was not faultless, and possibly too, some recent innovations, particularly by the Doctors at New Haven, may have been, at some points, subversive of the Puritan faith, rather than improvements upon it. Be this as it may, the churches supporting the American Board, in and out of New England, "Presbyterian, Dutch, German Reformed, and Lutheran," as well as orthodox Congregational, profess to believe in the general outlines of the evangelical or orthodox faith, as held by the Puritans, and to place a high value upon the distinctive peculiarities of that creed. They would repel as an aspersion the charge of propagating any other faith, and they would spurn the proposal of affinity, in their missionary enterprises, with any others than those who are sound in this faith, as it is written out in their various Church creeds, which they conceive to be substantially and essentially one.

THE BOARD NON-COMMITTAL—AND IRRESPONSIBLE.

But it is very remarkable that the American Board, unlike the Churches for which it acts, in the important work of propagating the Christian faith, has never yet specifically defined its theological position, has never adopted any religious creed or declaration of faith; and in order to the election of any new member of the Board, (and the Board itself holds the sole power of electing) it is not made necessary, either by the Charter of the Board, or by any published rule of its own, that the candidate should hold to this or that religious sentiment, or even profess faith in Christ, as a condition of membership!

"The Board is not an ecclesiastical body." Neither is it controlled by any. The Churches hold no ecclesiastical control over it, they are not represented in it by delegates or

otherwise, and if the funds, at any time, in possession of the Board should be perverted to the propagation of another faith however opposite to that of the churches for whom they act, and of the donors by whom the funds were contributed, neither the Churches nor the donors have any means of redress. They may withhold their contributions in future, but in the mean time, and so long as the old fund lasts, they may use it for the propagation of Swedenborgianism, Universalism, or any other religion they please, and there is no help for it, nor security against it.

ITS RELIGIOUS FAITH—HOW ASCERTAINED?

Under these circumstances, it becomes an interesting question, *what is the religious faith of the present American Board?* This question, in 1846, is not to be decided by a reference to the faith of the founders of the Board, more than an entire generation ago! Nor is it to be very satisfactorily answered by saying that the members of the Board are members or ministers of the Churches for which the Board acts, and have never openly repudiated the avowed faith of those Churches. Events in the Puritan Churches, of more recent occurrence than the organization of the American Board, attest the utter uncertainty of conclusions based on premises like these. It is known that ministers have continued to preach in those churches, for years after their theological sentiments were revolutionized, before any suspicions of the change were entertained, by their hearers. We enter not, now, into the much mooted questions of the morality of the course then pursued; we only refer to the historical fact, and for the simple purpose of saying that what was done and defended once may be done and defended again.* Within a few years, we have known prominent ministers and religious editors, in good reputation for soundness of faith, who when pressed on particular points, in private conversation, have admitted that they held

* One solution of the phenomena alluded to, deserves attention, at this time. It was said, and perhaps truly, that the subjects of that theological change were unconscious of it, while it was in process, and even after it had taken place. Of this we can easily conceive, in the sequel of passing events, it will be seen whether a similar change is not in progress again now, all over the country.

theological views which they did not think it prudent to divulge because the people were not yet ready to receive them. The doctrine of expediency as held by Dr. Palay and Dr. Taylor, and as daily urged in arguments against abolitionists, could scarcely fail, under given circumstances, of leading its advocates to pursue such a course. If the whole truth respecting slavery and slave holding or the treatment of slaves, cannot yet be proclaimed to the slave holders among the Choctawes and Cherokees, because they are not in a condition to receive it; and the Missions might, in consequence, be broken up how do we know that the whole truth, (as perhaps now apprehended by the members of the Board,) respecting the Puritan or "Evangelical" theology, as opposed to the "liberal," the Universalist, or the Unitarian, may not be withheld from the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, because they are not yet able to bear it, and for fear that the churches at home might be broken up?—What assurances can we have, from the lips of those who daily utter the current maxims of utilitarian prudence, that we really know any thing of the theological sentiments they cherish? If they do not think it prudent to avow all their sentiments to the slave holders, how do we know that they think it prudent to reveal all their sentiments to us?

The American Board, as we have already stated, has never put forth any religious creed, or Declaration of its Faith, in the usual form and for the purpose of telling, directly, what it believes. We can only infer its creed from such sources of information as may come to hand. And we know of only one document issued by it, from which its theological sentiments might be inferred or deduced, with sufficient copiousness and clearness to make out a connected system or scheme of theological doctrine. That document is the Report on Slavery, adopted, last September, in Brooklyn. To that Report then, must we look, and to the approved speeches and writings of the prominent members of the Board, by whom the Report has been explained and defended, if we would know any thing of the theological position of the Board, and compare that position with the creeds of the Churches for whom the Board acts, and with the well known features of the Puritan faith. In the absence of any other trust-worthy evidence, this Report must decide the matter, must furnish us with the clue by which the Theology of the Board must be tested, and its position determined.—There can be no unfairness in taking their

own statement of their own views, the only statement they have ever given us, especially if it shall be found that the statement is too full and explicit to admit of mistake or shadow of doubt. Nor may it be pleaded that the Report was not issued for the direct purpose of giving us the theological creed of the Board. We know it was not. And for this very reason we hold it to be a much more reliable exponent of their real views than any formal creed could have been. When ecclesiastical bodies sit down to the task of drafting the church creeds that are to give them a standing in orthodox communities there is little danger that their articles will not be tolerably orthodox. When our political leaders undertake to set forth the creeds of their respective parties, for the purpose of securing popular support, there is no danger that the "self evident truths" of the national declaration will not be enunciated with due emphasis. The real creed, political or religious, is more commonly revealed by the measures proposed, and by the arguments by which those measures are sustained. An argument must involve some principle and the principle adopted in practice reveals the real creed of the heart. By a simple reference to their acts and the reasons alleged for them, we may ascertain, with sufficient distinctness, the theology of the American Board. This, we shall now proceed to attempt.

But in order to do this properly, and to compare their faith with the written creeds of the churches that support them, and on whose behalf they undertake to teach the heathen what to believe, we will take a brief,

VIEW OF THE PURITAN FAITH.

As still indicated by the church creeds of their successors, Whoever has studied the "orthodox" or "evangelical" faith, cannot fail to have been struck with one grand distinctive peculiarity by which it is, every where, characterized, constituting its central or foundation idea, and bodying forth the living spirit in which the entire scheme, as a system of theological sentiment, must have been conceived. It is the idea of the awful and absolute supremacy of God over all the intelligent creatures he has formed, the all comprehensive grasp, the unutterable solemnity, depth, and weight of his never to be relaxed or suspended claims upon each one of them, upon all that he is, upon all that he possesses, upon all that he thinks, upon all that he designs, upon all that he can do. It is the idea of necessarily existing and irrevocable law, emanating from Infinite Majesty and coming down, with all the weight of

Infinite Authority enforced by Almighty power, upon worms of the dust, depending for existence upon the divine breath, yet destined to an immortality, either of wretchedness or of glory, according to their obedience or disobedience, whether in violation of law or in conformity with it. The idea of essential law, as based upon the immutable truth, the unchangeable atom, in the nature of things, law, enacted by the God of truth and righteousness, because it is true and right, law, which God himself cannot repeal or suspend without repealing or suspending his own nature and contradicting himself, law, synonymous with holiness, justice, goodness, and no more to be suspended, compromised, lowered down, or set aside than holiness, justice, and goodness themselves: law, fulfilled only in love, or benevolence, the cognizance of the heart, commanding the affections, requiring or prohibiting desire, joining hatred of wrong & love of right, extending to thoughts and intentions, to principles and motives, to the will and to the action, to the act and to the form of it; law, enthroned upon all the rational powers of the man, instructing his reason, enlightening his conscience, directing his steps, laying claim to his lips, to his hands to every fibre of his muscles, to every moment of his life; law extending over all space, inhabiting all duration, law written with the unerring finger upon all created hearts; law, identical with the divine will, based upon the divine nature, defining the divine character, sustaining the divine throne, binding together all minds, illuminating and giving life to moral intelligences, in all worlds: law, including penalty and sanction, penalty commensurate with the weight of its authority, with the infinity of its magnitude, with the ubiquity of its extent, with the eternity of its duration, with the guilt of transgression, with the ill desert of the transgressor.

This is the constructive principle of which the Puritan, the "orthodox," the "evangelical" theology is based. This furnishes the key by which even its highest mysteries may be unlocked. To this leading idea the various parts of the system are adjusted. To this, they conform. The several articles of every well developed and definite "evangelical" creed, the wide world over, are so many exhibitions or manifestations of this great and comprehensive principle of law in some of its appropriate applications and forms. This one idea of eternal, immutable, irrevocable law, is the

ot, upon which the whole system of faith relies, the corner stone, upon which it rests. Remove this, and you remove the foundation, you take away the main spring. It unhinges and throw into chaos, the whole. A part of it remains what it was. Remove it, and make all the parts of the system harmonize with it, and the edifice rises again, in its sublimity and magnificence.

Run over, in your own mind, the several elements of belief that go to make up an "orthodox" faith, and see, as you pass along, of what materials they are composed, and what purposes, in the system, they are evidently adapted to subserve. See, whether they do not all consist in varied expressions of the simple idea of moral law, whether they do not all revolve round this central idea, and whether it be not the grand scope, design, and effect of the whole system to proclaim impressively, to enforce rigorously, to exalt, increasingly the high, the sacred, and holy claims, of immutable, changeless, uncreated, irrepealable LAW?

The doctrine of absolute divine sovereignty, of unlimited human dependance conjoined with accountability and free moral agency, the duty of unreserved, unlimited and unconditional submission to the divine will, to the divine law (extending to all our thoughts, desires, and actions) and to the divine Providence, extending to all events.—The doctrine of the infinite guilt and demerit of sin, which is a transgression of the law; of the indissoluble connexion between sin and the sinner, of his unutterable ill desert, of the justice of the divine sentence "The soul that sinneth it shall die." The doctrine of the deep and universal sinfulness of the whole human race, of the entire moral corruption of the human heart, the doctrine that all are gone out of the way, and there is none that doeth good, no not one, until, regenerated by the Holy spirit, renovated in their tempers, radically and thoroughly changed that all in whom this "great moral transformation" is wrought, are still dead in trespasses and sins, that they are condemned already, that the wrath of God, abideth on them, that they have no part nor lot with God's people, and no right to a place in the church: that sentence of death hath passed upon all men, because all have sinned. The doctrine that God cannot look, with the least allowance, upon transgression, that he will accept of no apology or excuse, that the transgressor can make no amends for his past transgression, either by oblation, by penitence, or by good works, that no man can redeem his brother from the penalty of violated law nor give to

God a ransom for his own soul, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." The doctrine that no finite intelligence could have devised or even conceived of a method by which God could vindicate his purity and rectitude, as moral Governor of the universe, and exempt any one sinner from the full penalty of law, that the highest display of infinite wisdom was made in devising such a scheme of redemption, a scheme which the angels desire to look into, which fills all the heavenly hosts with astonishment, and manifests to principalities, and powers, through the redeemed church, the manifold wisdom of God! The doctrine that without such a divine method it would have been forever a moral impossibility for God to pardon the least transgression, that the whole human race must have perished eternally under the penalty of his law unless a ransom had been found, that the throne of God would have been untarnished, and his inflexible justice not only unimpeached but gloriously displayed, if he had passed by rebel men as he did rebel angels, without devising for them any method of salvation, or making to them any offers of mercy. The doctrine that the lowest and only price of man's redemption from the penalty of violated law, is the life blood of the co-equal and well beloved son of God, who in the beginning was with God and was God, who was manifested in the flesh and dwelt among us, the brightness of the Father's Glory, the express image of his person, the true God and Eternal Life! The doctrine that he was wounded for our transgressions, that his soul was made an offering for sin, that it pleased the Lord to bruise him, that the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all. The doctrine that no relaxation of law or compromise of its demands could be admitted into this method of redemption, that the Redeemer came, not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it to magnify it, and make it honorable; that he suffered, the just for the unjust, that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, and that without this, the forgiveness of any sinner would have been forever as impossible as for God to lie, and become unholy himself, and confederate with rebels against his own throne! The doctrine that the incarnation of the Redeemer, the union of Divinity and humanity in his person, was essential, that he might become at once, the High Priest and the sacrifice, the mediator between God and man! The doctrine that righteousness and peace thus meet together, mercy and truth embrace each other, and forgiveness is thus reconciled with the unimpaired majesty of holy,

unchangeable, penal LAW, so that the law is not made void, but established, by the grace or free unmerited favor of the gospel, to the ill deservings. The doctrine that there is no other name given under heaven, among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of this Redeemer, that he that believeth on him shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall remain under condemnation, that the transgressor must repent and believe, or his sins will not be blotted out; that he must repent, and do works meet for repentance, must "break off his sins by righteousness, and his transgressions by showing mercy to the poor." That he must humble himself & cry, "God be merciful to me, a sinner."—That he must "accept the punishment of his iniquity," and cordially acknowledge the righteousness of the law that condemns him; That he must forever ascribe his salvation to the free unmerited mercy of the God whom he has offended: the doctrine that free grace, abounding, unspeakable and incomprehensible mercy and grace will forever be the song of all the redeemed from among men, while eternity endures. ["Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."] The doctrine that the soul once contaminated by transgression comes under a bondage to Satan from which Almighty power alone can deliver it, that nothing short of the new creating breath of the Holy Spirit ever quickens and restores men thus dead in trespasses and sins, that the contrast between the spiritual death of the impenitent and the spiritual life of the penitent believer is such that no supposed process of a gradual transition from the one to the other, can possibly have any foundation in fact, in the case of any human being, that all who are truly born of God are instantaneously regenerated, that all who ever truly repent *at all*, repent with an *immediate, unreserved, unconditional repentance*. The doctrine that God *now* commands *all* men, every where, to repent, that *now* is the accepted time, and *now* is the day of Salvation, "To day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts:" that those who procrastinate and delay the repentance of any known sin, so far from being now in a state of salvation, have no prospect of ever coming into that state, and *cannot* do so, until they lay their procrastination aside, and turn from it, with self abhorrence and loathing, for having indulged in it, and that all who cannot be persuaded to do this, most inevitably perish forever.

The doctrine of the immortality and infinite

value of the human soul, and that the least sin, wilfully persisted in, will ruin that soul eternally. The doctrine of the radical distinction between the righteous and the wicked—the importance of discerning between them in this world, the impropriety of admitting any to the privileges and ordinances of the Christian Church, except those who give creditable evidence of having been morally, and spiritually transformed—the future and everlasting separation of the righteous from the wicked—the final judgment, at which, the assembled universe shall be made to see and understand and feel, and acknowledge, the equity of the divine proceedings, in the case of each individual, the justice of God vindicated in the infliction of the penalty of violated law, in the case of all the impenitent, and the glory of divine mercy exhibited, in the salvation of all the redeemed.

CHARACTER AND AFFINITIES OF PURITANISM.

Such, in brief outline, are the distinguishing articles of the Puritan or 'Orthodox' faith. With little modification, they correspond with the creeds and confessions of the early Protestant Reformers, and of the Churches that are now known by the name of "Evangelical," whether Baptist or Pædo Baptist, whether Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Lutheran, Dutch, or German Reformed. We may have stated them in a somewhat more practical form, or more in the language of the Bible, than that in which they sometimes appear in Church Creeds. The substance, nevertheless is the same. To the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, (abating its remains of Romanism) to the shortest independent Church covenant, and then again to the voluminous Presbyterian Confession, this general outline will be found to correspond. The Methodist standards, too, in all the particulars essential to our present argument, do not very widely diverge, and we think we may add, the general views of many, among the Orthodox Friends, and other sects.

We have to do now, with the Churches sustaining the American Board. None of these, will dispute the general correctness of the outline we have drawn, of the items of their religious belief. Unless their creeds have indeed become the most lifeless of dead forms, unless they have become more dry technicalities, without vital power or even intelligible meaning, the *Supporters of the American Board* profess to believe, substantially, the Puritan faith, as now defined. And this is the scheme of religious belief which they wish the Missionaries to carry to the heathen, that they may receive it, obey it, and be saved by

it. Any other faith they would regard "another gospel" and inconsistent with that by which they hope, to be saved themselves.

But what is the grand central idea—the constructive principle—of that system of faith, if it be not, what we have described it—the sublime principle of universal, holy, sacred, irrevocable LAW, of which, according to the "Orthodox" theory, it may be affirmed that it is "easier for heaven and earth to pass away," more possible for the Creator of all things to strike the whole fabric into non-existence, nay, to consign over the entire human family to the terrible and unutterable penalty of suffering forever, the righteous penalty of law rather than "one jot or tittle"—the smallest fragment or minutest shred of it should "fail" of supremacy, should be frittered away, or *compromised or suspended* in its dominion and efficacy, for a single moment "till all be fulfilled?"

We pause not here to defend or to discuss the Puritan theology. We simply state what it is, and for the purpose of seeing how it compares with the supple and pliant theology of the *American Board* as exhibited in its Brooklyn Report. A gloomy system, the Purity theology has been called—repulsive, vindictive, barbarous, a relic of ruder times unworthy of an enlightened age, dishonorable to the benevolence of the Universal Father incompatible with the mild spirit and winning words of the Messiah, a system whose extravagant doctrines, and abusive charges against mankind (guilty, to be sure, of some venial errors) would only exasperate and offend them, and be productive of more evil than good, too severe to be attractive, too rigid to be practicable, a system whose earnest propagators had more zeal than discretion, more fanaticism than prudence, more enthusiasm than philosophy, by no means to be commended for their tact, or knowledge of modern times, rough, uncouth, uncharitable, vituperative, denunciatory, and wanting in the gentler graces and polish of liberal and rational Christians—a race moreover, of impracticables—dealing in metaphysical abstractions as though they really thought them applicable to the common affairs of life!

Thus, during the times of Luther, of Knox, of Bunyan, and so down to the last of the *bona fide*, earnest Puritans, were orthodoxy and the orthodox described and characterized, by their opponents, including the mass of worldly and unconverted men who made no professions of a spiritual life, and derided the visionary schemes, precise habits and strange singularities of those who attempted to stem

the current of popular vice! How much "orthodox" theory is to be disparaged such objections and such objectors—or did most for God, for Christianity, for mankind, and for liberty, the Puritans, or their dignified opponents, in Church and state, questions we leave for our readers to examine at their leisure. We have glanced at these objections for the purpose of showing how nearly, in many particulars, our present struggle, resembles that of our Puritan fathers, and how identical were the objections against Puritanism and the Puritans, with the objections now urged against "modern abolitionism" and the fanatical abolitionists. And no marvel. For let any one who chooses to make the experiment assume as true the doctrine of Puritanism as already described, and then proceed to apply them to the specific practice of American slave holding, without arriving at the precise result of "modern abolitionism" if he can, and show how he arrives at his conclusion! We are confident it cannot be done. If the Puritan theology is correct, then "modern abolitionism" is right, and all the objections brought against it, are identical in principle, with objections against "orthodoxy" itself.†

We stop not now to contend with those who think they can find a better theology than the Puritan or "Evangelical," a faith in better harmony with the entire scope of the Scriptures, in better keeping with the fundamental principles of eternal rectitude, with the known facts of human history and character, a faith founded on loftier principles, better adapted to the edification of a world of righteousness, or to the restoration of a lapsed race, like ours; a faith furnishing heavier artillery to wield against the confederate powers of Satan and sin. If lower views of law, if less rigid and stringent restraints, if sanctions less weighty, if justice less inflexible, if denunciations less terrible, if penitence and humiliation less thorough, if grace and mercy less signal (for grace in forgiveness, is measured by ill desert in transgression) will answer the purpose, then we have over rated the malady to be removed. And when we notice, moreover, the inflexible reign of law in the *physical* world, we can find no analogy that could reveal to us a lower standard or less unbending supremacy of law, in the *moral* and *spiritual* world, than the Puritan faith indicates. In the absence, then, of a more trustworthy guide, we take that. The American Board must not demur.

†This has often been shown, in detail, and it is quite remarkable that among all the professed teachers of the "orthodox" theory, who oppose "modern abolitionism" no one has yet attempted a refutation or a reply.

If we test them by the creed of the Churches on whose behalf it has undertaken to propagate Christian truth. It will be interesting, at all events, to compare its position with the "orthodox" standard of religious belief.

THEOLOGY OF THE AMERICAN BOARD.

We come, then, to seek after the Theology of the American Board, as indicated by its Report on Slavery.

Slaveholding is either sinful, or it is not.—The question presents itself, and cannot be blinded. What says the Board? Has it a standard of Theology, by which it can decide?

The "Orthodox" or Puritan Theology decides that question unequivocally, and at once. It does so, by its cardinal principle of the universal application & binding authority of LAW of law that cannot be compromised, that cannot be repealed, nor turned aside. For slavery in the abstract is admitted to be contrary to the original law of our natures, that the law of God.

Now a theology that made less of LAW than the "Evangelical" or Puritan theology, might perhaps hesitate to pronounce sentence of condemnation in this case, till it looked at the circumstances: till it inquired about the consequences. But "orthodox" theology knows nothing of these. It only asks after original, necessary, eternal, uncreated, divine law. Reveal that, and no second question is to be asked, in the presence of the Puritan. It affirms, (and every vein and artery, every nerve and muscle of the whole system of orthodoxy, sends back from every limb and end of the body, the responsive—amen!) It affirms that sin is the transgression of LAW, transgression of law is Sin—that Sin, and transgression of law are convertible terms signifying the same thing:—that where you find a transgression of law, you have found a sin—that where you have found a sin, you have found a sinner—that the transgression of law, and the sinner, are one, and the person, just as sin, and transgression are one and the same thing.

The "Orthodox" theology, decides that slaveholding is sinful, because God is absolute, supreme, and sovereign, over every being, at every instant of time, saying "Thou shalt worship me." Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Moreover, all human beings are free accountable agents, under solemn obligations to obey God, at every moment of time, and therefore having a right thus to him. This right slavery denies. This supremacy, it contradicts. It says

"The slave belongs to his master." "The slave is entirely subject to the will of a master to whom he belongs." Slavery therefore is sinful. And this is equivalent to saying that slave holding is a sin. For there is no slavery without slave holding. And there is no slave holding without slavery. The one always goes with the other. They cannot be separated in any instance. To say that Slavery is sinful, but that slave holding is not a sin, is to utter an absurdity that can never be understood nor explained. But if slave holding be a sin, then the slave holder is a sinner. If a man says he is a slave holder, but pleads that he does not deny God's absolute and supreme authority over the slave but concedes that supreme authority, that he does not deny but concedes to his slave the right of free agency, the right to obey God according to the dictates of his own conscience, then he utters a palpable self-contradiction, and affirms that which cannot exist. Let him only draw up a paper, naming that slave, and conceding God's supreme authority over him, giving said slave henceforth the full right thus to obey God, according to the dictates of his own conscience, with none to molest or make him afraid, let him do this in such language and form that the courts of law can understand and recognize its validity; and he has given to that slave as valid a deed of entire emancipation as can be made.† Only make that undisturbed free agency a matter of fact, and no abolitionist will ask more.

The slave laws which define the slave's condition are admitted to be wicked. It follows that those are wicked who take advantage of those laws to hold any person in the condition those laws describe. And this is the case with every American slave holder.—Abolish those wicked laws and he could not be a slave holder an hour without liability to prosecution for a high crime.

The American System of slavery is admitted to be wicked, "the greatest abomination in all the earth," as said one of the chief defenders of the Board's Report, at Brooklyn. Then every slave holder is a transgressor, because he sustains that abominably wicked system. There could be no such system without slave holders. There could be no slave holders without that system. The two cannot be separated so as to condemn the one

† Witness for example, the well established fact that even the inadvertent and mere verbal consent of a slave master, in Connecticut, many years ago, to the marriage of his female slave with a free negro was held, by the best jurists in that state, to be equivalent to a deed of emancipation. The right to be married is a right to freedom from Chattelhood, the only terms on which our slaves are held.

and justify the other. What the one is, the other is also.

Common sense and any system of Theology that can be named, warrant these obvious conclusions. How much more, then, are they demanded by the Theology of the Puritans, the most stern, rigid, uncompromising, and unrelenting that the world ever knew, or of which the heart of man has ever conceived!

To talk of holding the "orthodox" or Puritan faith, and yet not condemn slave holding as sinful is most manifestly ridiculous and absurd. Those schemes of theology that all the "orthodox" consider too lax, too latitudinarian, and therefore defective, in this very matter of rigid, uncompromising, unyielding laws, are nevertheless understood by many of the most discriminating among their advocates to be condemnatory of slave holding. Unitarians and Universalists, to a great extent, would be ashamed to confess that they held to a creed so low and lax as not to condemn slaveholding as sinful. Deists with only the light of nature to guide them, Mahomedans and Pagans (to say nothing of Puritans!) have learned from their theological systems, or at least from their consciences, perhaps in despite of their theories) enough of the principles and the demands of moral law, to enable them to decide, promptly, that American slave holding is wicked. Low and lax as their apprehensions of divine law may be, in the comparison with those of "orthodox" Christians, yet Paul testifies that they are not wholly without law, within their own bosoms, and we find in fact, that their notions of moral law are not low enough to permit them to doubt that slave holding is wicked!

But how is it with the American Board of commissioners for Foreign Missions?—How is it with the agents of the Puritan Churches for evangelising the heathen?—Have they any theology that can help them to a clear, a definite, a prompt, and a trustworthy decision of the question? Have they any standard to tell them whether or no an action be sinful? What is their report in the case? And whereabouts, in the scale of theological elevation in the vital point of fundamental moral and divine law, does their Report place them? That Report the Board made at Brooklyn. What station does it assign to them? Does it mark them as Doctors of the Puritan School? Or does it place them below Deists and Mahomedans?

"By the law," says Paul, "is the knowledge of sin." "I had not known sin, but by the law." "Without the law, sin was dead;

for I was alive, without the law, once, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." "For sin," says James, "is a transgression of the law." Nothing can be plainer than that all men's ideas of sin will correspond with their ideas of law, of which sin is merely the breach the opposite, the contradiction. Reveal the law, and you reveal the transgression. Hide the law or remove it, and no transgression of it appears. "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." Elevate the law, raise its demands, magnify its authority, and many acts are seen to be heinous sins which are often to be altogether innocent, or mere venial faults. Depress the standard of law, lower down its demands, depreciate its authority, and you ease many a troubled conscience, you administer to every Felix within your reach, a strengthening cordial, and set every Belshazzar upon firm legs again. Put another thought along side of the preceding.—That system of Theology is highest toned, most elevated, and comes nearest to the Theology of Heaven, that makes most of God. Can there be any dispute about that? And that Theology makes most of God, that makes most of the Will of God, the Law of God. Systems of Theology range higher or lower, are comparatively sublime or trifling, pure or grovelling, accordingly as they elevate or depress the standard and the claims of divine Law, reveal sin or conceal it, unmask or cover it, reprove or palliate it, chastise or protect it, make men uneasy or tranquil, while in the commission of moral evil, while in the infliction of deadly wrongs. By this rule it is that we condemn the heathen mythology as sensual, and devilish, when we find it sloping in obscenity and blood. By this rule it is that we claim for the Christian Theology a heaven high throne above all the other theologies, and philosophies on the globe because it reveals of a purer law, and more clearly exposes and pointedly condemns sin. By this rule it is that the admirers of the Puritan faith claim for it a place far above that of its rivals; because, say they, it makes more of God, more of divine law, makes sin appear exceeding sinful, and loads the conscience of the convicted sinner with a burden of guilt, which atoning blood only can remove, instead of winning applause from fools who make a mock at sin.

* The theological reader will here be reminded of Andrew Fuller's "calvinistic and socinian systems examined and compared as to their moral tendency" also of Wilberforce's "Practical views." Whatever else may be said of these books, it will not be doubted that the writers held the morals of theology in high esteem. It will be found that both these works abound in exposures of very much the same palliations of sin as appear in the Report and speeches of the American Board and its members. See particularly Fuller's Letters V. and VI.

By this rule the evangelical poet estimated the orthodoxy of his approved preacher.

"His name a theme for praise, and for reproach;
"The joy of many, and the dread of more."

Well were it for our "orthodox" churches, if all of them were blessed with a ministry that could be accounted "orthodox" and "evangelical" by this rule. Great joy will there be in heaven, great quaking among oppressors, great rage and despair among the thrones and principalities of hell, when all professedly and nominally "orthodox" Doctors may be thus characterized. The whole creation groans and travels in pain for the deliverance of that hour! At such a period, how stands the American Board? By what theological standard does it test and ascertain sin? The verdict of the Boy of Tunis, is on record. Even the Pope has made his voice heard. One practice prevails, in our nineteenth century, so strongly marked, that earnest men, of all creeds and of no creed, instinctively perceive its fiendish character and are forced to pronounce its condemnation. The denouncers of Puritanical severity and denunciation, confess it to be in place, here. Your rationalists who had resolved the scriptural terms, Devil, and Hell, into mere figures of speech, stand aghast to find veritable realities and living beings stalking abroad on the earth, by daylight, to which the terms might not seem inappropriate, giving passage if not certainty of what must be, if the abomination be perpetual and progressive. They have, at length, made discovery of an iniquity which nothing but some real Satan could have instigated, and of which a future perdition would be no unsuitable punishment.* Personified despotism itself, claiming a seat above all that is called God, has caught sight of a despotism so far surpassing its own, that it complacently exults. "Thank God, I am not guilty of that practice!" That practice is American Slave holding! Of that practice, what thinks the American Board of Foreign Missions? Can such a body have so defective a Theology as to fail of condemning it, and of treating it as one of the greatest of sins?

* This is no idle declamation, nor fancy sketch.—While thousands have either been driven into infidelity or confirmed in it, by Biblical defenses of slave holding, not a few have been cured of their skepticism by their earnest opposition to that practice. Not only have they confessed the full evidence of human depravity, the credibility of future punishment and the existence of evil spirits, but they have opened their eyes to the sublimity of moral law, and yielded their hearts to the Lawgiver's high claims such, will understand the Puritan faith we have described.

Does the Brooklyn Report condemn slave holding as sinful? Some of its advocates, at the time it was under debate, said that it did. Others of those advocates said it did not! Others who voted for its adoption said they were in doubt whether it did or no! Fears were expressed by members conversing openly together, in our hearing, that Walworth and Frothinghuyesen would leave the Board, if they thought it did. And others feared the Board would lose the support of abolitionists, if they understood that it did not. To the present hour, the adherents of the Report and of the Board, do not agree among themselves, whether or no it condemns slave holding! Prof. Stowe, writing to conciliate abolitionists, gives it the one exposition. Others, addressing anti abolitionists, give it the other. Is this all the light that the Theology of the American Board can shed upon its own foot step? Has that Theology no other answer to the great moral question of the age? Does their creed like the ancient heathenacles give them a double and ambiguous answer, capable of opposite constructions in circumstances vary? Is this the wisdom gloried in by members of the Board in adopting the Report, a wisdom that should be told, the principles and the policy of Christian Missions for coming generations? Is this a specimen of the spiritual and moral discrimination, between righteousness and with which the theology of the American Board has gifted them, and with which they propose to enlighten and guide the heathen? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, shall prepare himself for the battle!"

We present to the American Board and its defenders a brief and simple dissertation entirely conclusive of this entire question concerning their theological faith. If they can treat of the practice of American Slave holding, without branding it as a departure from the former, or evangelical faith, for they have no the standard of God's law not only below the Puritan standard but below the standard of decent religious sect in the world!†

† Edwards, Hopkins, Emmons, those honest, clear sighted, and gigantic defenders of the "faith," held and taught the same doctrines of sin, essential, and heinous sin of slave holding, the duty of immediate and unconditional emancipation, and the necessity of purging the church of slave holders. That "ultra abolitionist" now told, actually pressed church discipline on this subject, the church of which he was pastor, in New York, till the slave holders were glad to quit it, leaving membership, chiefly, of females, who adhered to the teacher, who was almost stripped of pecuniary

other hand, if they do consider slave holding to be sinful, then their manner of dealing with this sin shows that their views of sin are such as to prove them wholly apostate from the Puritan or evangelical faith. They may select which horn of this dilemma they please, and meet it as they best can. They may pass by the charge in dignified silence, but that will not prevent the world and posterity from passing sentence upon them.— They may treat it with levity, but that will only furnish the ecclesiastical historian of our times with another corroborative proof. They may cry out "bigotry, denunciation, uncharitableness, unchristian spirit," as other lapsed and lax religionists commonly do, when pressed for defensive arguments, but this will not answer instead of such arguments. Turn which way they will, the radical departure of the "American Board, at vital points, from the "Puritan," the "orthodox," the "evangelical" theory, at the period of the Brooklyn Report, A. D. 1845, will remain, while time and eternity endure, a *fixed fact*. They may not know it now and the churches may not know it, any more than other theologians and other churches have known when they have apostatized.— What Montesquieu said of the liberties of a nation is equally true of the faith of a sect or of a church. The loss may be consummated in a day and not be discovered for a century. A church departs from its faith whenever that faith ceases to govern its practice. The dead form may be retained for a time, first from inattention, then from convenience or shame; but shame and convenience, not to say disgust, will ultimately call for its burial out of sight. What rational, or honest, or worthy use can a church have for its creed, when it ceases to furnish the standard of its practical decisions?

In respect to the sinfulness of slave-holding, the Report of the Board, if we have said, has been claimed upon both sides, and we give it the benefit of selecting its position, in this matter.

Of Slavery, the Brooklyn Report of the American Board, says—

"The unrighteousness of the principles upon which the whole system is based, and the violation of the natural rights of man, the debasement, wickedness, and misery it involves, and which are, in fact, witnessed, to a greater or less extent, wherever it exists, must call

by his fidelity in this matter. What a contrast to those who are afraid to adhere to christian principles lest it should break up the churches. His was a practical "orthodoxy." Dr. Channing, on the other hand fell short of "modern abolition" just at those points where he fell short of the Puritan orthodoxy. Thus he understood the matter himself, as we learned, once, in conversation with him, though some who speculate with him in theology are not withheld by their theory from being "orthodox" on the subject of abolition. A reproof to those who profess more and practice less.

forth the hearty condemnation of all possessed of Christian feeling and sense of right," &c. &c.

Let it be noted that this is said, *not* of the abuses, incidents, and tendencies of Slavery, but of the system itself. How then, can it be otherwise, than that the American Board condemn slave-holding as sinful, aside from the question of the peculiar treatment of the slaves? "All unrighteousness is sin," and common justice to the Puritans and to all other believers in the "orthodox" or "evangelical" faith requires us to insist that neither the Board nor its defenders can separate the sin from the sinner, the act from the actor, the guilt of slavery from the slave-holder; on any pretence of "organic" arrangement, of Biblical exegesis, of alleged primitive example or apostolical precedent, without a plain and palpable departure from all the grand outlines of the "orthodox faith." Whatever else may be said of such arguments, *this* has to be said of them, that if they are valid, the whole superstructure of the Puritan faith, as already exhibited, falls to the ground, with all that is distinctive in the system! If there be any system of theology claiming to be Christian, that can lower down the high claims of God and his law, separate sin from the sinner and divorce human acts from responsibility, after this fashion, *that* system is not to be found in the Puritan creed. The lowest toned, the most lax and latitudinarian theologians of the present century, have felt themselves assailed, and have complained of misrepresentation, when the mere tendency of their systems to such palliations and excuses for transgressors has been urged on their attention. What reader of our polemic literature does not know this?

To suppose that the American Board occupies that low ground is to suppose that it openly and undeniably occupies as low a theological position as that which the orthodox have ever changed the most ultra universalists with occupying, a position they would commonly disclaim.

We will not charge that position upon the Board, until we have authority for doing so.

Whatever Leonard Bacon may have since written, of the entire innocence of a certain sort of slave holders whom he imagines to be himself, and describes, the Report of the Board, and the speeches of Messrs. Beecher and Stowe, did not, as we understand them put the question, or its decision, on any such ground. They made the *slave holder* a wrong door, for the act of slave holding, and not merely for the abuses and cruelties at which Dr. Bacon's resolutions were levelled. The Report classed the slave holders whom

the Board would receive and retain in the churches with other wrong doors, such as "polygamists," "oppressive rulers," "proud Brahmins" guilty of "unrestrained exactions" "various forms and degrees of oppression" &c. They advocated the reception of all those, along with slave holders, into the church, and certainly they could not have intended to teach that these are guilty of no sin! Such a position, certainly, could not consist with adherence to the Puritan theology. And this one expression, in the Report, seems inconsistent with such a position. "Strongly as your committee are convinced of the *wrongfulness* and evil tendencies of *slave holding*" &c. To maintain that "*wrongfulness*" is not "*sinfulness*" would savor more of the Jesuitical than of the Puritanical school of theology.

Prof. Stowe and Dr. Beecher, in their speeches before the Board, agreed with the Report in classing the slave holders whom they would receive into the church, with the polygamists &c. whom they regarded as habitually living in "sin."

"God permitted Jacob to live with four wives, yet it does not prove that God connived at the sin." "God never reprobated Abraham for polygamy," Prof. Stowe.

"Prof. Stowe then went into an extended examination of the Bible method of dealing with long standing, social SINS, instancing, as examples, blood revenge and polygamy" &c. &c. 1b, see N. Y. Evang. Sep. 18.

"Why do we not treat the sin of slavery, as we do OTHER SINS?" "Slavery is an organic sin, the others are individual sins." Dr. Beecher, N. Y. Evang. Sept. 18.

The Board, then through its Report and the speeches of its leading members, at Brooklyn, understood, (did they not?) that in deciding upon the reception of slave holders into its Mission Churches, it decided in favor of receiving, not innocent persons, whose slave holding involved no transgression of the divine law. It decided in favor of receiving persons whom it understood to be living daily, habitually, and perseveringly, in SIN!— It was "strongly convinced of the wrongfulness of SLAVE-HOLDING." Yet in receiving slave holders into its churches it would not take the fact of slave holding, at all, into the account, any more (as one of the speakers said) than the question whether or no he was a lawyer! It rejected the proposition of Mr. Phelps, to treat slave holders as it did "drunkards, gamblers, and the like." It did not claim that its Missionaries ever taught the slave holders the sin or "wrongfulness of slave holding." It did not propose nor intimate that the Missionaries should hereafter

Dr. Hawes, who voted for the Report, was sorry that it contained no intimation that slavery was not to be permanently continued in the Mission Churches!

change their teachings or their discipline.— On the contrary, the Report undertook to lay down the principle and establish the precedent for the permanent course of Missionary endeavor, and the mode of treating "social evils," such as slavery, polygamy &c., "on the broad field of the world."

"Slavery" said the Report "is not the only social wrong to be met, in the progress of the missionary work, and to which the principles which are adopted in prosecuting that work must probably be applied. There are the cases of India, deeply and inveterately wrought in the very texture of society, causing to the mass of the people hereditary and deep degradation, leading to the most inhuman and contemplative feelings and conduct in social life, and presenting most formidable barriers to every species of improvement."

The Report proceeds to specify "unrestrained exactions," "various forms and degrees of oppression" &c., as belonging to the class of sins which are to be treated by the Missionaries in the same manner in which they are to treat slave holding. Assuming that men may be regenerated without renouncing this class of sins (!) the Report advocates the gathering of such masters and slaves into the same churches, along with the "proud Brahmins" "oppressive rulers" &c. who may give evidence of conversion, while remaining proud and oppressive! Bring them into the church, says the Report, where "the most effective influences are involved, in respect to all who have grace in their hearts, in the special ordinances of the gospel."

"Under such influences," (adds the Report) "may not the master be prepared to break the bond of the slave, the oppressive ruler led to dispense justice to the subject, the proud Brahmin internally to embrace the man of low caste, and each to do it cheerfully, because it is humane and right, and because they are all children of the great household of God? By such influences, is the great moral transformation to be wrought in the master and the ruler, in the bondman and the oppressed, all important to both, and the only sure guaranty for permanent improvement?"

With this classification of slave masters with oppressive rulers and proud Brahmins, we might, as abolitionists, be gratified, but our common sense and our evangelical theology revolts at the idea here expressed of the mature and relative position of regeneration and of membership in the church!

Why! What have we, here? In the first place, a regeneration that leaves men still in their sins! The proud Brahmin gives evidence of conversion to God, but is the same, "proud Brahmin" still! He has not learned to embrace man as man! The oppressive ruler, too, is converted, but remains an "oppressive ruler," still! He has not yet learned to "dispense justice to his subjects!" [Verily, the problem of converting and pious slave holders is in a way of easy solution, by the doctrine of a regeneration like this!] Study the picture. The statement is not that the Brahmin, the ruler, and the master have not yet become so per-

fectly sanctified as to be subject to no relapses into their former frames of mind. No! The ruler may properly be characterized as "oppressive," and the Brahmin, as "proud."— It does not appear that any perceptible change has commenced! The proud Brahmin has not begun, even for once, "fraternally to embrace the man of low caste," nor the oppressive ruler to "dispense justice to his subjects," nor (just parallel) the slave master to emancipate his slaves! In the matter of conduct they stand just where they did before! But they are converted! Converted to what? To the Missionaries and to the Church, we suppose! No "great moral transformation" is yet wrought in them!— And this, the Board appears to have understood:

For, see! In the second place, the "proud Brahmin" remaining proud, the "oppressive ruler" remaining oppressive, and the slave master holding his equal brother as a "chattel, are to be brought into the churches, for what? Why! in order that "the great moral transformation" may "be wrought" in them? So says the Report, explicitly!— And how? By "such influences mainly" as are to be brought to bear upon them by bringing them first into the Church, and under the "influences involved in the special ordinances of the gospel!" In one particular, the statement of the Board is commendably correct. It is this. Whenever "the great moral transformation" takes place, then the Brahmen will "fraternally embrace the man of low caste," then, the ruler will "dispense justice to his subjects," then a master will "break the bonds of the slave." This is "orthodox" and "evangelical" to be sure; the true "Puritan" doctrine, and consequently it is in harmony with the sentiments that "modern abolitionists" have always urged! But the departure of this paragraph from a sound "evangelical" theology lies in this; that, in the first place, it teaches a regeneration, a conversion, and a "grace in the heart" without any "great moral transformation" at all (!) and in the second place, it takes such

The next time the Board attempts to set forth "God's method" of dealing with oppressors, and of evangelizing the heathen, they will do well to ponder the Missionary sermon of the prophet Daniel, addressed to an "oppressive ruler," entrenched in his "organic sins," "intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system." "Wherefore O King, let thy counsel be acceptable to thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness and thy transgressions by showing mercy to the poor. Dan. IV. 27. Daniel's idea of conversion involved a "great moral transformation" in "oppressive rulers" and the "dispensing of justice to the subject." The Brooklyn Report would have taught Daniel a different "method," in accordance with which he would have circumcised Nebuchadnezzar in the first place, in order to secure his "moral transformation" afterwards!

converts into the church, in order that this "great moral transformation" may be effected by its influence, and particularly by "the special ordinances of the gospel." Take your proud Brahmins, it says, your oppressive rulers, your men stealers, your polygamists too, (for these are included in the argument) bring them into the church, admit them to "the special ordinances of the gospel," in other words, BAPTIZE them, administer to them the SACRAMENT, as the "most effective" means of producing in them the "great moral transformation" desired!

(To be Concluded.)

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, JUNE, 1846.

Correction.—In our May number, page 323, middle column, 24 lines from the bottom, instead of "give it their sanction," read "give it their *sanction*."

[N. B.—Our types are assured that the Editor cannot "sanction" such deviations from his copy, at the present "junction" of affairs.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, June 1846.

W. H. Olin	W. Bloom-	W. D. Henry, Branch-	
field,	1 00	port,	1 50
J. W. Merrill, Grove-		J. Sperry, Henrietta,	0 50
land,	1 00	A. Wooster, Hannibal,	0 50
J. Keep, Painesville,		S. W. Brewster, do,	0 50
Ohio,	1 00	P. Hayes, Bristol,	0 50
A. Griswold, Kinsman,		A. Siedman, Taberg,	1 00
Ohio,	1 00	A. D. Mier, Lima,	0 50
J. Cowman, Honeoye,	1 00	B. Stowell, Honeoye,	0 50
R. Wilcox, Jr. Whites-		A. Colman, Ellicottville,	1 00
boro,	1 00		
Dr. Gaylord, Sodus,	0 50		

\$ 13 01

Less than the cost of printing this number, to say nothing of the paper!

The friends of this publication will see that we need additional support.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor and Publisher.
HONEOYE, Ontario county, N. Y.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build, 4 pages, \$0.62 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness, 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

Printed at the Countryman Office, Perry, N. Y.
Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills

Together with every description of Book & Job Printing.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. Vol. IV—No. 7.
WHOLE NUMBER, 51.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JULY, 1840.

WILLIAM GOODELL, 1 EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

REPRINTED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive one copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
single papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

ORGANIC SINS.—NO. 7.

(Concluded from our last.)

There is a theology, we all know, with which this "method of dealing" with transgressors of the divine law, in whom the "great moral transformation" has not yet been wrought, perfectly harmonizes, and to which it adjusts itself. But all the world knows that that theology is not the "evangelical," the "orthodox," the "puritan." No! This "method of dealing" sends us back for theological foundation to the theory of Rome, the theory of High-Church of Englandism, in which the man becomes a church member first, that he may become, through the "influences" of baptisms and sacraments, a subject of "the great moral transformation" afterwards! The intercourse of the American Board with the Greek Church in which that same theory predominates, had already given us some apparent clue to its theological position, but it is interesting, though painfully so, to find in the Brooklyn Report, so unequivocal an attestation of the fact. The worst of it is, this "method" of working out "the great moral transformation" in men by means of sacraments and baptisms and Church membership, has not proved successful enough to warrant an exchange of the Puritan theology for that of the Board. You may baptize your "proud Brahmins" and "oppressive rulers" and "repentant man stealers" ever so much, and they remain without the "great moral transformation" after all. They remain

proud, and oppressive and dishonest still, No! The process must be reversed! The "orthodox" theology, and not the Romish, the Puritan, nor yet the latitudinarian, must furnish and suggest our "methods." Instead of admitting wicked men and oppressors into the church in order to learn them christianity, we must first learn them christianity, and insist upon their renouncing their iniquities, before they are admitted into the Church.—

Teach, evangelize first, and baptize afterwards. Baptize men because they have become the subjects of the "great moral transformation" and not in order that they may become so! Insist that the "proud" shall "fraternally embrace the man of low caste" in order to "put on Christ" and show himself a regenerated child of God, instead of treating "the proud Brahmin," as *already* a true child of God, in order that he may be persuaded, by that consideration, to embrace the man of low caste as his equal brother! Every intelligent theologian knows that *this* method, and nothing short of it, can mark any missionaries as "orthodox" or "evangelical" according to the "Puritan" theology, or the Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, or Congregational standards. A more explicit renunciation and contradiction of that entire scheme of theological sentiment, the Committee of the Board could not, easily, have penned.

And with that decidedly anti evangelical paragraph, the grand scope and main drift of the Report, very evidently corresponds.—Take up the entire document, at your leisure, study it thoroughly, lay hold of its fundamental principle and compare it with the grand outlines, the distinctive features, the foundation principles of the Puritan theology, as delineated already. A more perfect contrast cannot readily be conceived. The one is inflexible, uncompromizing. The other is full of palliation, toleration, excuse, and compromise, from beginning to end. The one insists on immediate and unconditional repentance of every sin. The other is all gradualism, procrastination, repentance in the future tense.

Puritanism demanded a pure church, "a congregation of faithful men." Its conver-

sion was "a great moral transformation" and must precede admission to "the special ordinances of the gospel." The American Board puts up with a "conversion" that leaves "the great moral transformation" still future, a work to be brought about by church membership, "special ordinances," sacraments, baptisms!

As an illustration of this doctrine of the Board, Wm. W. Patton, "congregational minister in Connecticut, introduces into his Review of the Report (in the Charter Oak) the following incident: The editor of the Presbyterian Herald, Louisville, K. Y. had charged a Methodist Minister, J. L. Forsyth, Ford Gibson, (Miss.) with admitting a known infidel into the Church. Mr. Forsyth defends himself thus:

"Now, according to the above mentioned prudential regulations, we did receive a man residing in this country, who had been known to be skeptical on the subject of religion, but who, at the time of his admission among us, was earnestly seeking for mercy and truth, he did candidly say that his mind was not fully satisfied of the inspiration of the Scriptures; but we did not think that, nay, we could not think it, a sufficient reason why we should drive him from even the outer court of the temple of righteousness and truth: rather we think it is a reason why he should draw nigh and see and hear and feel for himself, and know that the doctrine is of God. Now, *alors*, where under heaven are there such spiritual influences as in the Church of Christ? or where are men of a skeptical caste of mind more likely to become convinced and converted, than in connection with those who feel the quickening power of the spirit of God?"

What a remarkable *fac simile* of the doctrine and language of the Brooklyn Report!

But the defenders of the American Board may tell us that this infidel was not accounted a converted man. We answer that the "evangelical" theology does not recognize the conversion of any man, who in the very instant of that conversion, is not *morally transformed* and does not abandon his sins. They may likewise plead that the sin of the infidel was not an "organic sin" committed in accordance with civil law! We answer, the law of Mississippi does not *forbid* infidelity any more than it forbids slave holding. It *enjoins* neither the one nor the other. And if it did enjoin infidelity, and at the same time prohibit slaveholding, the "orthodox" or "evangelical" theology would allow of no modification of church polity or discipline, on any such grounds. And the bare fact that the Board and its defenders have attempted any

distinction in that direction is sufficient, of itself, to mark them as recreant to the principles of the Puritans, and to the theology of "evangelical" christendom, at war, as that theology ever has been, with the principalities and powers of this world. "Organic sin!" What would the evangelical reformers in Germany, in Switzerland, and in France, have said, of toleration to sin in the church, because it was interwoven in the structure of society, and enforced by the imperial mandate of Charles? What change could the theology of the Board now effect in the Italian dominions of the Pope, should it prevail there?

Here is a Missionary Board, professing, not merely to embrace, but to propagate, a theology distinguished above all others for its insisting upon the absolute supremacy of God, and the uncompromising claims of his law.—But stop! Here is a sin permitted, sanctioned, protected (not enjoined) by the authority of man! And behold! The Missionary Board doff their hats, reverently, to let that sin into the church! It is an "organic sin" and not to be treated like other sins, that do not enjoy Caesar's special protection! Prof. Stowe and Dr. Beecher may philosophize as they please, may construe scripture and primitive church history as they choose. We may follow them as others have done, if convenient, and examine the soundness of their philosophy, the propriety of their criticisms, the verity of their supposed facts. It may be interesting to do so. In the meantime there are certain *fundamental principles* of christianity, in the *light* of which all these speculations must be tested, with which all these expositions of particular texts, and alleged facts of church history must be compared, and by which all great practical decisions must be weighed. There is an end to theological science, as to all other science, it acknowledged and known *first principles* are not to have sway and dispose of difficult or controverted questions. Theological knowledge is of use to us, just here. Now the "Puritan," the "orthodox" the "evangelical" theology claims precisely this function. If its topics are not evidently radical, primary, fundamental, scientific, it does not claim to be heard. If its axioms are not self evident, if its distinctive features do not bear the impress of divinity, if the heart and the voice of the Great Lawgiver are not revealed in them,

then let them pass loosely along, with the drift wood of mere human opinion and conjecture. But if the power and the brough of the living God be in them, *then let them be heard and obeyed!* He that hath a dream let him tell a dream. He that hath a curious fact from the pages of "Ignatius," let him relate it. He that hath discovered slave holders in the early churches, along with Nicolaites and Jezebels, let him announce his discoveries, (not forgetting Paul's directions how to treat "extortioners" detected in the Churches, 1 Cor. V. But he that hath the living word, the pure doctrines of the gospel, let him proclaim that word. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord?

The radical departure of the American Board from the theology of the Puritans is sufficiently manifest in the contrast between their opposite views of LAW and of TRANSGRESSIONS of law. And, taking up the several items of the evangelical theology in detail, to which of them, can the Brooklyn Report be made to correspond?—Will the Board and their Missionaries take the Puritan creed in one hand and their Report in the other, and show the heathen how to receive and accredit them *both*? Let us see how such an experiment would work.

We come, say they, to teach you the absolute Sovereignty of the Great God, before whom all the nations are but small dust.—Fear not them which can only kill the body, but fear him who can cast soul and body into hell. The smallest sin exposes you to eternal damnation. If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, or you cannot be saved. But if any of these nations enact laws which sanction "wrong" practices, which establish "unrighteousness" and the "violation of the rights of man" you can be "converted" and come into the fold of Christ, though you continue for the present, to indulge in those wrong practices!

Repent, and do works meet for repentance. Repent! renounce your sins and be baptized, and come into the family of the faithful.—Nay: stop! Come into fold of Christ" first, be baptized, partake of the sacrament, enjoy "the special ordinances of the gospel" that "by such influences mainly, the great moral transformation *may be wrought* in you."

We come to teach you that God never admits any excuses or palliations for sin, which is a transgression of his law, under which

law all the rulers of the nations are placed. But if these rulers frame mischief by a law, it only an "organic sin," then. God does not treat it, as he does other sins, nor allow his Missionaries to do so, by excluding it from the "fold of Christ" as they do "drunkenness and theft" which sins, your chiefs (perhaps I) have *not* sanctioned!

We come to teach you that the soul that sinneth, it shall die, shall die eternally. For God cannot contradict his own nature by allowing sin to pass with impunity. And every one of us must give an account of himself to God. The sin cannot be separated from the sinner, nor the guilt from the sin, nor the punishment from the guilt. But the sins of holding slaves and of living with many wives "do not always involve individual guilt" because they are permitted by your chiefs, and are therefore "organic sins!"

We come to teach you the doctrine of atonement. Unless Christ had died for sin and suffered, the just for the unjust, your Creator and Lawgiver could never have forgiven you the least sin even if you did repent of it and forsake it. Rather than suffer the penalty of law to be set aside without a propitiatory sacrifice, (which would have involved God himself in pollution) he would sooner have suffered the whole race of man to perish. "Slavery has been introduced among you, and regulated by you, in unhappy imitation of your white neighbors in adjoining states." It is a sinful practice. "We are strongly convinced of the *wrongfulness* and evil tendencies of *slave holding*. The practice ought to be "abolished." "This consumption, justice, humanity, and christian principle, demand should be hastened" But it is the "unanimous opinion of the Missionaries and of the committee that any express directions from this Board requiring them to adopt a course of proceeding essentially differed from that which they have hitherto pursued [in receiving slave holders into "the fold of Christ"] would be fraught with *disastrous consequences to the Mission*, the Indians, and the African race among them." So say our Brooklyn Report. To which our Doctor Beecher has added the very important reason that slavery is only an "organic" sin, not to be treated like other sins. You understand then that God could not receive transgressors into his arms, while their sin was unexpiated with blood, even if they should repeat

it and forsake it. But he would have the missionaries receive them "into the fold of Christ" and consider them "converted" into "the great moral transformation" is yet to be "wrought in" them, and while they continue in their "wrong" practices, which violate justice, humanity, and Christian principles, demands of them to abandon. And all this while slave holding is an "organic" sin, and because a different course, in "our opinion," would be fraught with disastrous consequences to the mission! The moral grounds of the atonement, you will now understand, and learn from it how the faith we each admit of no compromise with sin even to save the whole human family from "disastrous consequences," except in the case of "organic" sins, and "Missions among the heathen" &c!

We come to teach you the doctrine of regeneration. Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Repent, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out. Make to yourself a new heart, for why will ye die?

And yet we believe a man may be "converted," may come into "the kingdom of God" and should be welcomed into "the fold of Christ," in whom "the great moral transformation is yet to be wrought, and who does not renounce his most cherished sins, provided they be "organic" sins, "intimately interwoven with the relations and movements of the social system."

Such would be the process of teaching the orthodox theology to the heathen, along with the theology of the American Board! When the most opposite religious sentiments can be made to harmonize, then may these!—Albert Barnes has shown that evangelical churchmen cannot successfully propagate evangelical Christianity while repeating constantly to their hearers the anti-evangelical portions of their liturgy and administering gospel ordinances to those who are yet in their sins. Equally futile will it be for the missionaries of the Board to attempt such an experiment, to undertake the propagation of evangelical Christianity, while they re-echo the theology of the American Board, and practice according to their instructions.—The Episcopal or superintending power will be as fatally subversive of a pure faith in the no case as in the other. We do not say that the Board are conscious of having de-

parted from the Evangelical faith. We now ortheloss record, considerably, and in view of our solemn responsibilities, *the fact*.—Would to Heaven it were not the fact. But since it is so, the cause of evangelical Christianity requires that the fact be understood.—Will the Board, even at this late hour promptly retrace its steps? If not "*Ichabod*" is inscribed forever, upon its walls. It comes to be an "Evangelical" Board, and "Evangelical Christians" must find other means for the propagation of their faith. The highest standard of Christian character known in Christendom is that indicated by the "evangelical" theology. The lowest is that of the American Board! In adhering to the one, the churches must inevitably renounce and abjure the other.

"THE BAD SPIRIT OF ABOLITIONISTS!"

It has become so universal a charge against abolitionists that they "*manifest a bad spirit*," and it has become so common for a certain class of abolitionists, in their intercourse with pro-slavery men to propitiate their favor by throwing in as a sort of peace offering, their own confessions, on behalf of their more active and self-denying brethren, of this same "*bad spirit*," that it is, perhaps, too late in the day to attempt any thing like doing justice to those who, by common consent, are given up to the denunciations and the abuse of those very mild and amiable gentlemen, who, forsooth, cannot possibly bear a denunciatory and abusive spirit!

We do not intend, by these remarks, to claim, either for ourselves, or for other abolitionists, an entire freedom, at all times, from impatience of spirit.

We are men of like passions with others. But we do say, that the charge as a whole, is unfounded, that it is made by opponents "in a bad spirit" and as an excuse for their refusal to do their duty, a substitute for the arguments which their course needs, but which they are unable to produce. A few propositions in respect to this stereotyped charge, we will deliberately lay down, and hold ourselves ready to maintain them.

1. Compared with other reformers, in general, of other times, whom, by common consent, the wide world now honors, abolitionists in general, cannot justly be charged with the exhibition of a bad spirit. Their prominent writers, and speakers, including

those most censured in this respect, are no more justly obnoxious to the charge than were Luther, Zuingli, Melancthon, John Knox, John Milton, George Fox, Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, and Granville Sharpe.

2. Such reformers as those just mentioned, were as much blamed by opposers and by temporizers, in their own day, as abolitionists now are. And we may add that the more ancient reformers, the Hebrew prophets, Socrates, and the New Testament martyrs, were chiefly unpopular and offensive to their contemporaries, on the same account, and suffered martyrdom on the charge of their malignity, their exhibition of "*a bad spirit*!"

3. By far the greater part of the difficulty lies in the fact that abolitionists use Bible language in reproving men's sins. They call oppressors robbers, and they call enslavers men-stealers, just as God calls them. They cry aloud and spare not. They lift up their voice like a trumpet and show the people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins. They speak of oppressive religionists and of unfaithful ministers, just as the Bible teaches us to speak of them. They do not palliate sin, because it is found in the Church. When teachers of religion, in high places, inculcate infidel sentiments and exhort Christians to honor and obey "*little devils*," some abolitionists call it "*infidelity*" and "*atheism*," just as every body else would, if Thomas Paine and Robert Dale Owen should utter the same horrible blasphemies! And this gives offence! Abolitionists are charged with "*a bad spirit*" because they use Bible methods and employ Bible language in opposing flagrant sin! The charge lies mainly against the Bible, and against God! And it springs from the same unwillingness to come to the right lest their deeds should be reproved, the same aversion to be told of a sin-hating and a sin-punishing God, for which unrighteous men, in all ages, have been characterized.—For my own part, whatever else I may have to repent of, and to deplore, in connexion with my anti-slavery labors, it is not my fidelity to God and to his truth, in this matter. Until I renounce the orthodox faith in which I was educated, and which the New England Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, &c. &c., profess still to believe, I cannot admit, for a moment, that it is an exhibition of "*a bad spirit*" to speak of oppression, of oppressors, of their apologists, of transgress

on and of transgressors, and especially of oppressive ecclesiastics, in the same language which holy prophets and martyrs, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself (see 23rd Chapter of Matthew) spoke of them. I admit that men may indulge in a bad spirit, in the use of scriptural denunciations against sin. But I deny that the mere use of that language, which all religious teachers are bound, on proper occasions, to use, can be an evidence of that bad spirit. Yet this is the foundation, mainly, and almost exclusively, upon which abolitionists are thus charged!—Is it a specimen of a "charitable spirit" to prefer such charges on such grounds?

4. Comparing abolitionists with their opponents, who bring these charges against them, it will be found on an impartial examination of their language, that abolitionists are by no means, so much exposed to the charge of exhibiting a "bad spirit" in their language as are the persons by whom they are thus charged. Abolitionists deal less in offensive personalities than their opposers commonly do. They display less of personal pique. It is not so much their opprobrious epithets (of which they are more sparing than their opponents) as their deliberate statements of *fundamental principles*, that furnish the occasions of complaint. This comparison might be instituted in three particulars.

First.—Abolitionists are not in the habit of using language in respect to slave holders and their apologists which is more denunciatory and severe than their opponents and all men commonly and instinctively make use of, in speaking of many other sins, or sinners whom they wish effectually to reprove. If it were commonly believed that slave holding were as sinful as abolitionists believe it to be, there would be little or no complaint about the denunciatory language or the "bitter spirit" of abolitionists. It would be easy to fill volumes with illustrations and proofs of this statement, in the language used by all sorts of persons, including the most mild and conciliatory, against *other* offences and offenders, who, in the sight of God, or in the impartial judgment of disinterested men, cannot be considered more worthy of severe reprobation than slavery, and slave holders. Let those who charge abolitionists with the use of bitter language, only become as earnestly opposed to the sin of slave holding, and locate it as much as they do petty larceny, (committed

against themselves,) let them undertake to oppose oppression as some of them oppose tipling and rum-selling, let them apply to slave-holding the same language that they use against the sins that they are earnestly laboring to remove, and then see how the case stands between abolitionists and themselves. It cannot be greatly wondered at, that those who have earnestly deprecated *all* agitation of the subject of slavery, or who would now gladly see the discussion *cease*, who tell us that it will "do no good" and had better be let alone, should find fault with the language and spirit of those who do not listen to their advice. Yet it was by these men that the charge under discussion was first made. By them it is still repeated, and by those who wish to conciliate and humor them. Convert all these into earnest, active, and consistent opposers of slavery, and the world would hear little more about the "bad spirit of abolitionists."

SECOND.—Let a comparison be instituted between the language which abolitionists use concerning slavery, slaveholders, and their apologists; on the one hand; and the language which the bulk of the community, political and religious, especially leading ministers and religious editors, have all along used on the other hand and still use, respecting "abolitionism" and "abolitionists." It will then be seen whether abolitionists are justly charged with any peculiar or remarkable severity of language, and whether on that account, they should be considered as exhibiting peculiar evidences of a "bad spirit." We cannot find room, now for specimens of the current literature of the day, which should be brought into a fair and impartial examination of the subject.

We have been intending, for sometime, to present a chapter or two, of these specimens, to be put by the side of any accredited specimens of anti-slavery literature that could be produced. We should cite from grave theologians and Biblical reviewers. If we shall ever find time and room for this exhibition, it will be found if we mistake not, that the *contrast* will be a marked and instructive one and pointing in quite the opposite direction to the common and popular impression of the facts of the case. It will be found, we think, that on the one side, will be arrayed the language of divine inspiration against the sin of oppression, and on the other hand, the scoffs, jeers, and taunts with which the faithful reprovers of gigantic wickedness have been as-

sailed, in all ages, and nations. We speak now, of the language of that sort of abolitionists with whom we co-operate and harmonize. But we will include the language employed by Mr. Garrison himself, up to the time when (on other grounds, and not for the severity of his anti-slavery language) we felt compelled to adopt measures of political action which he repudiates. We might go further than this. We might challenge a comparison of the language of the opposers of abolitionists, including those who charge abolitionists with "denunciatory language, and a bad spirit" with the language of *any* class of "modern abolitionists," even those whose peculiar literature we are, by no means, concerned to defend. We will take Stephen S. Foster himself, who is *not* one of our sort of abolitionists, and who certainly writes, at times, in very bad taste: we will take the most "harsh and bitter" paragraphs that can be selected even from *his* writings, and put them by the side of the paragraphs we will select from the most polished and accomplished divines and literary men, who have taken up their pens against "modern abolitionism." If Foster does not come out a gentleman in the comparison with *them*, we mistake. And we will yield the point in respect to the "bad spirit," if there can be found even in his writings, any evidences of malignity comparing, at all, with the "Despot's best, and cold steel," with which the speeches on the other side, will be found plentifully spiced and that too, without any forfeiture, in the eyes of the religious public in general, of the speaker's reputation for suavity, decorum, and dignified Christian forbearance!

In order then to place abolitionists upon a *level*, even with their opponents, (that is, with the great mass of ministers and Church members) on the score of denunciatory language and a "bad spirit" it will be necessary to show a *stronger* occasion for severe language and indignant rebuke, on the part of the opposers of abolitionists, than can be shown on the part of abolitionists themselves. In other words, it must be shown that "modern abolitionism" is more offensive to the God of the oppressed, than the chattelizing of his own image, and calls for sterner rebukes!—It must be shown that "modern abolitionists" are monsters of wickedness, who must be visited with a severity of denunciation which would be an evidence of a "bad spirit," if uttered against those who were guilty of no higher offence than that of embruting their fellow men! Remove from the religious community the impression that *such* are in

city, the comparative demerits of slave holding, on the one hand, and of abolitionism on the other, and you have removed the only basis upon which that community could be successfully appealed to with the allegation of the abusive language of abolitionists as an evidence of their "bad spirit!"

Among all the evidences of a "bad spirit," on the part of abolitionists we believe is has never been alleged against them that they were guilty of fomenting riots against their opposers, that their "denunciatory language" has ever produced this effect upon those who sympathized with it, that abolition meetings have ever been resorted to successfully, for that purpose, and that the champions of the Colonization Society, have been assaulted, have suffered assassination or martyrdom, as a consequence, either at New York, Philadelphia, Utica, Alton, or else where. The story of the country, we trust, has no recollection of such transactions, for the eye of posterity. The swift ships and steamers have conveyed no such intelligence to other lands; and has "the literary and theological" press of the country, in the hands of abolitionists, been prostituted to the effort of silencing, by the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical measures, the arguments which they found it convenient, otherwise, to "put down!"—Whatever evidences of a "bad spirit" abolitionists may have betrayed, they have never, as we know of, exhibited any such developments as these. How far it is modest or prudent for those who have been active in similar efforts to overcome and prohibit the dissensions of abolitionists, or who have looked idly and silently on, while such developments were in progress, or who still look up to the principal actors in such scenes as their worthy spiritual guides, how far, we say, is becoming and decorous in such, to stand in the light of day, and accuse abolitionists of having exhibited "a bad spirit," is a question for themselves, first, and for an impartial posterity, afterwards, to decide.

Third. Let a comparison be made between the language and spirit of "modern abolitionism" and the language and spirit of their opponents, in respect to slave holders themselves, and see what the comparison will result!

It has been thought that the "bad spirit" of abolitionists is sufficiently proved by the strong language in which they describe and condemn the sin of the slave holder, though the language of the Bible concerning oppression and oppressors. The publications of abolitionists have been denominated imperious, unchristian, and incendiary.

on this account. Yet these same abolitionists have been uncommonly careful to discountenance insurrection and bloodshed; and in this particular, their writings display a remarkable contrast with other writings against slavery. It will be found, on a careful comparison, that those who are most uncompromising in their reproofs of the sin of slave holding, and of the sin of upholding it, at the ballot box, or in the Church, have more tenderly regarded the lives and the best interests of the slave holders, than those who are ready to form sinful conspiracies and compromises with them, to quiet them in their sins, and to cry out against the unchristian bitterness and bad spirit of those who will not consent with them, in their worldly and temporizing policy.

The opposers of "modern abolitionism" profess to be opposed to slavery, themselves. They claim the right to choose their own measures for opposing it. And among those measures, or in company with them, we find the measure of receiving slave holders into the church, and the measure of voting for slave holders to rule over the nation. If we would only consent to agree with them in these measures, we might say almost what we pleased concerning slavery, without being charged with exhibiting a "bad spirit." As it is, they can by no means consent to co-operate with persons of so unlovely and unchristian a spirit, and who slander "our brethren the South," at so uncharitable a rate as to deny their title to our votes, and to a seat at our tables of communion.

Well, then. Let us notice how this very mild and compromising sort of abolitionists express themselves concerning slave holders, and the attitude they assume towards them, themselves, whenever they really undertake, in earnest, to do any thing, on the subject of slavery, or whenever, on any grounds they come into controversy with them.

The country has heard much of the anti slavery services of JOHN QUINCY ADAMS; who is not a modern abolitionist, who goes against the abolition of slavery in the Federal District and the inter State Slave trade, by the only legislature holding the constitutional power. What then, are his anti slavery claims? He vindicated the right of petition, but that was the right of the people of the free states, not of the slaves.—In all his writings or speeches it would be difficult, perhaps, to find the paragraph that is imbued with lively sympathy for the enslaved, or glowing with the impartial love of the colored man, or instinct with the righteous condemnation of slave holding, as essentially sinful. John Quincy Adams is among the

number of those who do not like to have slave holding denominated man stealing.—He even finds fault with the laws of the land for stigmatizing the slave trade as piracy.

Yet what, after all, is the language of John Quincy Adams towards slave holders? What is his attitude towards them, whenever, in the fluctuations of political life, he actually comes in personal contest with them? Such as thorough and consistent abolitionists are seldom known to indulge in. There is an asperity, an impatience, a contemptuousness, peculiarly his own, and something that constantly tells you that he cherishes a keen remembrance that the South deserted him, when he was President, and deprived him of his second Presidential term. Take away from the speeches, of Mr. Adams the sharp, retaliatory thrusts he makes, as a northerner, against the south, and you deprive him of nearly all his anti slavery armor and trophies. The *North* against the *South*, is but a sorry substitute for humanity against chattelhood, and Christianity against sin! Yet this is the abolitionism that charms the leaders of the Church, disgusted as they are with the "bad spirit" of those who condemn slaveholding as essentially sinful!

Our readers have probably heard of the abolitionism of the Methodist Episcopal Bishop, who could by no means bear to think of an ecclesiastical rupture with his dear christian brethren of the South. He was "as much opposed to slavery as any body." He "hated slavery as he hated hell." But these modern abolitionists were "too ultra, too vituperative and denunciatory." They had a "bad spirit." They were "unchristian."—They would "rend the seamless garment of Christ."

"But, Bishop," said a by-stander, "If we cease to agitate the subject, what is to be done? Is slavery never to come to an end?"

"Oh! yes! It will certainly come to an end." "But how? And by what means, if we let the south alone, as you advise?"

"Why! After a while," resumed the Bishop, very coolly, "The slaves will doubtless revolt, and regain their freedom in blood!"

And this was the kind and Christian spirit that could not bear the vituperative and denunciatory abolitionists.

Within the last dozen years, we have found a number of clerical duplicates to this Methodist Episcopal Bishop, horrified at the thought of disturbing our amicable and fraternal relations with the south, but perfectly composed and tranquil, at the prospect of a servile insurrection, as the alternative, of their own guilty silence and delinquency!

Among recent specimens of the kind and

benovolent spirit of that class of anti slavery men who refuse to co-operate with abolitionists, and who complain of their "bad spirit" we find a speech in Congress, by Mr. GIDDINGS, of Ohio, on the Oregon question.—We copy from the Charter Oak.

Mr. G. had asserted our claim to "the whole of Oregon," and had expressed his belief that war would be the consequence of the enforcement of the claim. In such a war, the manufacture of New England, New York and Pennsylvania, and the agricultural interests of the West, Mr. G. thought, would be promoted.—But the South would suffer—the cotton interest would be destroyed. He then continues:

"Slave labor would be depreciated, and slave property depreciated. But this policy of adding territory to our original government, is the offspring of the South. They have forced it upon the northern democracy.—Their objects and ends are now answered. Texas is admitted. They have attained their objects, and they now require the party to face about—to stop short, and leave the power of the nation in their hands. They now see before them the black regiments of the West India Islands landed upon their shores. They now call to mind the declarations of British statesmen, that 'a war with the United States, will be a war of emancipation.' They now see before them, servile insurrections which torment their imaginations. Murder, rapine, and bloodshed, now dance before their affrighted visions.—Well, sir, I say to them, this is your policy—not mine.—You have prepared the cup, and I will press it to your lips until the very dregs shall be drained. Let no one misunderstand me. Let no one say that I desire a slave insurrection; but, sir, I doubt not that hundreds of thousands of honest and patriotic hearts, will 'laugh at your calamity; and mock when your fear cometh.'—No sir; should a servile insurrection take place—should massacre and blood mark the footsteps of those who have far ages been oppressed—my prayer to God shall be, that justice—stern, unyielding, and unalterable justice—may be awarded to the master and to the slave."

Such is the language and spirit of a statesman who can be not only supported but lauded to skies as an abolitionist of the right stamp, by the very men, including professors of religion, ministers, and those who shrink back with pious horror at the thought of fraternizing with the "bitter and incendiary" abolitionists who support James G. Birney! By the side of this specimen, we will now place the Editorial remarks of William H. Burleigh, of the Charter Oak, on the above paragraph of Mr. Giddings, that the reader may be able to compare their "language and spirit," and judge for themselves:

There may be truth in all this—but it is truth *ferociously* uttered. Mr. Giddings seems to gloat over the idea of "murder, rapine and bloodshed;" from a servile insurrection in the South. All this may be demanded by "stern, unyielding, and unalterable justice"—but who that is conscious of his obligations to God's mercy, dare pray that "unyielding justice" may be awarded to his fellow-men? Justice, if not restrained by Mercy, would sweep the wide earth with its red sword, and North and South, and East and West, would be involved in a common ruin. But Mercy cries "Forbear!" God is long-suffering, and sinful men are spared. Does Mr. Giddings ever think of this?

These sentiments of Mr. Burleigh correspond with those of "modern abolitionists," from the beginning. And in John Quincy Adams, Bishop Hedding, and Mr. Giddings we have, perhaps, as fair a representation of "moderate" and conservative Anti Slaveryism as could be made.

We might go further back, and examine the Anti slavery speeches, such as they were, of the greater part of the New

England Federalists, political and clerical from 1805 to 1815, and on the credit of which it is so confidently claimed that the North has always been opposed to Slavery. They were gradualists, and ready enough to "compromise" the interests of the slave, yet they could bluster about *northern* interests, and rail at the *South* about slavery, for political effect. The South, of course, understood them, and, not unfrequently cast the evidences of their insincerity in their teeth. While the famous Missouri question was pending, the northern members of congress, as usual, made a show of resistance to the measure, and pleaded their conscientious objections and scruples. "You have no conscientious scruples on the subject," retorted Richard M. Johnson, on the floor of Congress, "for if you had, you would have abolished slavery in the District of Columbia long ago, where you have the constitutional power. You are only jealous of an accession of southern strength." Thus rebuked, the northern members quailed, gave up the contest, proved the truth of Johnson's declaration by assenting to the Clay "compromise" and were complimented by John Randolph as "dough faces" for their reward.

The *philosophy* of the contrast we have exhibited, is comprized in a nutshell.—Slavery may be opposed either on principle and from philanthropy, on the one hand, or from selfishness and jealousy on the other.

Those who oppose slavery upon principle, and from true philanthropy always call slave holding sinful: they call it robbery just as the Bible does; they give it no quarter, they make no compromises with it, and demand its immediate and unconditional abandonment. This is called being "denunciatory" and having a "bad spirit." But those who oppose slavery or slave holders merely from selfishness and jealousy, are always ready to "compromise" the matter for selfish advantages, to defer the day of emancipation, and of course to concede that slave holding is not essentially wicked!—And this is called christian prudence and *moral suasion*! A christian prudence that has well nigh eradicated christianity from the land. A moral suasion that has nourished slavery into its present gigantic dimensions, and bound to its iron car both the church and the state.

Reformation Tracts, now on hand, and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y. No. 1. Iniquity and a Meeting. 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet.) 8 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build. 4 pages, \$0.62½ per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness. 8 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, JULY. 1840.

SPECIMENS OF CORRESPONDENCE.

We have thought that some of our readers might be interested with a few specimens of the Letters we receive from various parts of the country. For the most part, they were not particularly written for publication, and therefore we withhold the names.

FROM NEW JERSEY.

A friend, writing on business, (Feb. 13th) mentions the names of one or two ministers in his neighborhood, who are true friends of the enslaved, and then adds:

"The other ministers, I have reason to think, see the iniquity of holding property in man, but value an *influence* (a sinful influence it must be) among their supporters, more than the consciousness of being independent expounders of truth to a benighted people. On account of the great business done with the South this is rather a pro-slavery district. The two last numbers of the Investigator concerning organic sins, I regard worth more than the money I have enclosed (one dollar.) The Board of Missions are placed by it, in a most unenviable position.—If they are honest, they will turn their course in a very different direction. To some of us here, no periodical is more welcome than the Investigator."

Another brother in New Jersey, writes under date of Feb. 9th as follows:

On the whole, the course you have pursued seems to me to be the true one, although it would be generally regarded as 'disorganising' schismatic &c. It is difficult for most people to comprehend, that the churches which assume the position of teachers and emblems of christianity, whose imposing edifices meet the eye in every direction, whose bells every sabbath, call men to 'hear prayers offered, Hymns sung, and sermons preached' can be otherwise than what they profess.—To admit that all this is but a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, carries a feeling of mournfulness and almost desolation to the soul!

It is an unwelcome truth indeed! What the church in which we have been nursed, which holds the dispensation of the *Bread of life* which begets plans for christianizing the world, which has learning, wealth, influence, numbers, great resources in her hand, can *such* a church be reprobate can she forsake humanity in its utmost distress, writhing, perishing, groaning with

...unutterable, for deliverance? Alas, the church has given hints, not to be misunderstood, that she will not be troubled about such matters! Her sacred composure is not to be ruffled by applications of such a nature. She has business of more importance on hand, such as evangelizing the earth, except, of course, this part of it, which is already christianized and even adorned with *Patriarchal Institutions*! The Roman Catholics' must be attended to! Are they not intent upon scattering their poisonous doctrines thro' the land? Were they not guilty, some centuries since, of exercising undue influence upon those whom they considered heretics, in order, if possible, to save their souls, thereby! Protestantism must needs stir itself in these days, and then how many other things has the church to attend to!—Behold her institutions of Learning, of *Sacred Literature*! Behold the scores and hundreds and thousands of young men who must be educated for the Christian Ministry! And then, the internal economy of all these churches furnishes matter for the deliberations of the grave Divines. *Verily*, it would seem, at the cause of the *enslaved* in this country, to suffer abuses and injuries, such as fiendish ingenuity never before invented, who are heathen of heathen the *poor* of all poor, wretched of all wretched, it would seem, say, that the churches of *Christ*, would bestow some of its pious regards upon those poor sufferers! But I forbear. This whole matter looks too much like a great farce, acted in the name of religion.

There are some difficulties, Bro. Goodell, which present themselves to my mind, probably to others, in the endeavor to reform the church by a different organization. The principal one may be expressed thus. Suppose christians unite, under what they believe to be the arrangements sanctioned by the Lord, and the Apostles, under the *best* arrangements. What safeguards shall we then have, against declension and corruption? If we have perverted the first, will they not pervert the second, the third, the fourth. After all, does it not depend upon the *character*. Which the members of such a church shall maintain, and continue to maintain? Their attachment to the great ends of christianity, will not waver, or all is lost. Some men, for instance, who would oppose slavery and every other specific sins, which might be separated, would flinch from another uprooting of the very principles, for which in that application, they profess so high regard. A man may oppose *Negro Slavery*, and yet may, in his relation, as employer, as white men and their families, act the part

of a real tyrant and oppressor. It will be found, it has been found, that to carry christian truth, to its just applications, is a matter involving no little self sacrifice and self denial!

REMARKS.

The latter part of the preceding Letter contains suggestions of the utmost importance. Our brother may be assured that we have no hope of effecting the great objects we have in view, by the mere process of re-organizing the churches after the primitive model, and excluding the supporters of chattel slavery. By no means! Nothing but "*character*," christian character in its fullest and largest extent, and powerfully maintained, can avail any thing to the purity or even existence of a Christian Church. The very definition of a Christian church, (as we have often affirmed) is a congregation of faithful men, regenerated by the spirit of God and walking together in holy fidelity and love. Without these elements, there neither is nor can be any such thing as a christian church. And all we mean by church organization is the union of such elements in their appropriate form, *separated from* all other materials, and so constituted as that the form of organization shall harmonize with christian character, and facilitate instead of obstructing the attainment of christian ends. The organization supposes the previous existence of the sound materials to be organized. The organization cannot produce them, any more than the process of ship-building can produce the live oak. Neither can the form or process of the building ensure exemption from decay. The organization may be very important to the ends of navigation, nevertheless. And certain forms may be adapted to these ends while others are inconsistent with them, and even with the proper character of the ship, and its safety in a storm at sea.—Now if there are no suitable materials, no true christians, in the churches of the existing sects, then there is no foundation for a call upon any of the members of such churches to come out from their corrupting influence and act together, that is, to re-organize.—But we have supposed the case to be not quite so bad as that.* If these are true christians in corrupt and apostate churches then they are to obey the divine mandate, and "come out" from them, not in order to become christians, but in order to act, in this

* We confess, however, that we find ourselves coming under the impression that comparatively little will be done towards the restoration of pure christian institutions in our country until God raises up a new set of evangelists with their hearts deeply imbued with the spirit of a living christianity, who shall be totally divorced from the old sects, and who shall build up new churches, composed chiefly of new converts.

particular, in a manner becoming christians, not as a grand specific to secure themselves from corruption, without any other safe guards, but as an important condition and means of guarding against apostacy, nevertheless.

And in judging of christian character, neither Anti slavery, nor anti masonry, nor anti intemperance, nor anti Papacy, nor anti prelacy, nor anti- Presbyterianism, nor any, nor the whole catalogue of *mere negatives* can suffice, however anti christian may be the things that are opposed. True christianity is positive in its character. It is holy love and obedience to God, holy love and fidelity to mankind. Where these exist there will be active opposition to all that is perceived to be opposed to the will of God and the good of mankind; not merely to certain forms and names of moral evil among men. The man who zealously opposes some specific sins and settles down quietly in others, shows that it is not sin, but only some of the inconveniences of certain forms of sin, that disturbs him. And the man who is willing to carry out an acknowledged principle of divine truth in only one or a few specific directions, and not in others, gives evidence of a similar defect.

FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

A subscriber in making a remittance for the Investigator, says; "I should be glad if I were able to give you twenty times as much, to help you, in your self sacrificing course to reform a time serving ministry and church—

"I see that Mr. Phelps' exposure of the evasions and subterfuges of the A. B. C. F. M. on the subject of slavery has so disturbed the 'semi lunar sardel' gentlemen that Dr. Bacon of New Haven has taken up the pen in defence of that distinguished body, in the N. Y. Evangelist. This subject of slavery, like the ghost of Banquo, will not down at the bidding of the D. D.—Mr. Phelps deserves the thanks of the community, for this exposure."

FROM ILLINOIS.

A well known minister of the gospel, whose name we are almost tempted to give, writes:

"I accord with you, I believe, in most or all of your views, as to church organization and government; and the more I think of it, the more important it appears to me. The Investigator is as welcome to me as any paper I receive. I preach, substantially, the doctrines you inculcate. I see no half way ground between Popery and the equal brotherhood you advocate, and I preach it not only to my church, but to the Association, though

in consequence of this, and the abolition and other heresies, I am pretty much of an exile."

[The sooner you are "an exile" from clerical associations, brother, the better!]

FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

"The cause of abolition, I believe, is on the advance, in northern Pennsylvania. We are doing only a little, to be sure, where we should do a great deal. Yet the leaven is working, in spite of the opposition of pro-slavery churches and slavery ridden politics."

So writes a subscriber to our paper.

FROM CONNECTICUT.

A christian brother, in Connecticut, writes to his friend in this state, a letter which has been handed us, and from which we venture to select a few extracts.

"Is it not the fact that we have a time serving and world pleasing ministry, who, with few exceptions, instead of being watchmen and leaders, are behind the Church?—Moral cowards, who with Jeremiah's dumb dogs, will not bark? I know this is strong language, perhaps too strong but my prayer to God is that they may be roused from their lethargy. You are aware that I stand alone, in my own church, on the subject of slavery, that, politically, they have done their best to crush me; that further persecution awaits me, even from the church of which I am a member, as I have good reason to believe; that the pro slavery spirit is so strong, connected with ignorance and superstition, that only the over ruling hand of Providence can prevent it. But I have met opposition before, and when I am satisfied I am right, I have faith to believe that he that is for us, is more than he that is against us. I endeavor to attend the Monthly Concert, regularly, and if I get a chance to speak, I endeavor to pray heartily for the slave. I am well aware that it does not set well on the hearers, but I cannot help that. I believe strongly in the efficacy of prayer, and that it frightens the slave holder more than any thing else."

It does not require the spirit of prophecy to account forth great dearth and coldness that pervades the churches, and the consequent mourning, with the harp on the willow, among sincere and devoted christians. Our churches need reforming, almost as much as those in Martin Luther's day, and those who attempt it will meet with similar opposition.—But be of good courage. We shall reap if we faint not, even here, if we are spared a few years. If not, we shall reap, hereafter in the upper temple, where we shall rest, and sing anthems of praise."

[Thus writes a brother, unknown to us,

who could not have imbibed his views from our little "Investigator."

FURTHER FROM ILLINOIS.

Another brother writes as follows: "Previous to subscribing for the Christian Investigator, I had my eyes opened to see, (though not distinctly) men as trees walking. Now, by the Lord's mercy, I am able to look with new eyes, and I trust I may add, to speak with a new tongue. Formerly, I was an Episcopal Methodist [what a name!] I withdrew from their communion and rallied with others under the name of Wesleyan Methodist [Not right yet!] I am like Noah's dove, I must return to the ark of God's own planing, before I shall be at rest. There remaineth a rest for the people of God. My prayer is, Lord Jesus, receive me to thy people's rest!"

[This Letter gives the particulars also, of the dismissal of a Wesleyan preacher from employ, by vote of the Conference, because "he believed in Church Independency and Christian Union." It was then proposed that another brother who was named, should take the vacant post of labor, but alas! it was discovered that he, too, had fallen into the same heresies! The writer then proceeds:]

"The day dawneth, the light is breaking.—We have some brethren in these parts who will not bow down to Baal nor serve him.—They are resolved to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free; nor are they to be stunned with the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" God give you good speed, my brother, for I believe you are in the right, and I have prayed and do pray that the boldness of the lion may be yours, in the great work of emancipating, not only the poor slave from servile chains, but also the Lord's people from hierarchial despotism. What a state of things, in this nineteenth century! God's long forbearance preserves us from his sore judgments. Yet the christian should not despair. In due season we shall reap, if we faint not!"

So writes our distant brother, whose face we have never seen in the flesh. The prayers and sympathies of distant brethren greatly encourage us in our arduous work.

FROM JEFFERSON CO. N. Y.

"College Theology, in its adulterous connexion with practical atheism, has engendered its legitimate monster, and Rev. D. de stand god fathers and sponsors at the baptismal font of "Innocent Organic Wickedness!" Such an attitude assumed by those who claim to be the commissioned expounders of modern Christianity, requires, indeed,

an "Investigator" with powers to send papers, and authority to expose the high treason to humanity to the scorn and gaze of an intelligent community.

Such a tribunal is to be found in your Investigator, and let its searching examination be pursued, until this mystery of iniquity shall be revealed, and the Christianity of the Bible shall be reclaimed from the corruption of the time serving and popularity courting votaries of these schools of the prophets.

ANOTHER WORD FROM ILLINOIS.

An aged brother writes thus:

"Antislavery leaven has fully and to comparatively small extent worked in the community into the strides of oppression have advanced rapidly, and with apparently accumulated force. Are the friends of humanity any thing more than witnesses for truth in the hands of God, for the purpose of aggravating the doom of the wicked, and hastening the filling up of the cup of divine wrath which may the sooner (who can tell?) be poured out without mixture on the judicially infatuated transgressors? Cannot you and the people of God be encouraged and comforted, by complying with the direction in Is. 26. 20. 21.?"

"Come my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee, lest thou be as it were, for a little moment, as the indignation be over past. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall discover her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator. July 1846.

S. Bishop, Honeoye	0.50	F. Shipperd, Troy	1.00
J. Ingraham, Bristol	1.00	S. Hale, Union	1.00
Centre	1.00	Corcoran	1.00
H. Gilbert, Schroepell	1.00	N. Bouton, Virgil	1.00
W. R. Burt, Palermo	0.50	S. B. Franklin, Honeoye	1.00
J. W. Taylor, Bristol	1.00	H. Lord, Fowlerville	1.00
Centre	1.00	J. Codding, Gooding's Grove, (Ill.)	1.00
A. Gilbert, Fulton	0.50	C. Probert, Palmyra	1.00
C. Barker, Copenhagen	1.00	S. Burpe, Lima	1.00
J. Mosher, Canandaigua	3.00	A. Painter, N. Haven	1.00
J. Cole, Salisbury	1.00	Con.	1.00
S. M. Boothe, N. Haven	0.50	J. Holt, Sherburne	1.00
Con.	0.50		
S. Boothe, Davenport	0.50		

☞ The friends of this publication will be that we need additional support.

MARRIED—At Manchester, Ontario co. N. Y. 1st. by William Goodell, of Honeoye, William Dorr minister of the gospel at Gaines, Orleans co. to Mr. A. Barnes of Manchester.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES, Vol. IV.—No. 8.
WHOLE NUMBER, 52.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO: N. Y. AUGUST, 1846.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, FIVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

ISSUED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

Subscription for one year, or the twelve
issues, always in advance, and free of postage

person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay without expense to the publisher, shall
receive for his services:—Or, if procuring six
shall have two copies for his services:—Or,
if ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION,

any particular number will be sold, separate from
the series, as follows, viz:

dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
papers for, 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

Sermons for the Times.

BY WILLIAM GOODELL.

ON I.—MARTYRS AND THEIR PER-

Secession by the death of
T. Torrey, in the Penitentiary of
N. Y., May 9, 1846.—Preached at Hon-
eoye, on Sabbath, May 24, and at
Honeoye, sabbath, July 12, 1846.

They cried with a loud voice, and stopped
and ran upon them with one accord, and
of the city, and stoned him. And the wit-
nesses threw their clothes at a young man's feet
who was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, call-
ing on God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my
spirit. And they stood up, and cried with a loud
voice, saying, Let us kill him, because he says
that he will destroy this temple, and will
change the place of the sanctuary. And when
they had thus conspired against him, they
killed him. —Acts vii, 57—60; viii, 1.

Account of the martyrdom of Stephen,
in connection with the context, presents a
picture similar in its essential features, to
the lives of bloody persecutors of good
men of all ages. False accusations are first
made against men obnoxious for their virtues.
Witnesses are not wanting who, for
the sake of their own safety, give them their sanction. A great ex-
citement and a loud clamor are next raised.
The doors of the people are then closed, and
they are shut out of access to them, as much as pos-
sible. By common consent all their
sympathy and protection, and their leisure,
are adjusted themselves to the
destroying them. Thus it was with
Stephen, and thus it was with our beloved

When tracing this parallel, I shall notice
the characters of the martyrs; 2, the
characters of the persecutors; 3, the
causes of the persecution; 4, the ways by

which many who are not active in the work
of persecution become necessary, as Saul
did, to the death of the martyrs.

I. THE CHARACTER OF THE MARTYR.

Of Stephen it is recorded that he was a
man full of the Holy Ghost. This is equiv-
alent to saying that he was emphatically and
signally a friend of the poor and the wronged.
For though men without piety may from va-
rious motives espouse the cause of the oppres-
sed, yet all who are truly pious will do this
of course. No man can be full of faith and
of the Holy Ghost, of whom this may not be
affirmed. Whenever the great Refuge of the
oppressed, the God of the poor and needy
fills any man with his spirit, he fills him
with the same benevolent affections that con-
stitute his own moral excellence. Every
man filled with the Holy Spirit is filled with
holy love to all men, especially the poor and
wronged; is filled with holy hatred of all sin
and especially the sin of oppression. It is
therefore recorded that when the cry of des-
tination was heard among those of the disciples
who on account of pride and national preju-
dice had been overlooked, neglected and de-
frauded, in the distribution that should have
been made to them of their common share of
divine bounty; and when a selection was to
be made from among thousands, of seven
men, peculiarly qualified for prompt and ener-
getic action in righting these wrongs, the first
named of this committee of redress, distin-
guished by the historian, in a particular men-
tion of his christian attainments, was this first
martyr of the christian faith; it was Stephen.

He was evidently distinguished for bold,
resolute, vigorous and effective action. His
varied gifts, versatile genius, sanguine tem-
perament, and free and ready address, en-
abled and prompted him to attempt and to per-
form what other men would have accounted
rash or impracticable, and thus he ran into
dangers to which his brethren did not expose
themselves. Eloquent in his speech, he was
still more so in his deeds. In disputation he
could so silence his adversaries that it only
remained for them to gnash upon him with
their teeth, attempting no answer but bloody

revenge. His faith armed him with power.
In the records even of primitive achievements
his works among the people are noted with
expressions of "wonder." Fanatical, vis-
ionary, enthusiastic, disorganizing and trans-
cendent as he was reputed to be, he could nev-
ertheless instruct his traducers, in the rud-
iments of religion; could illumine, as with heav-
en's own lightning, the pages of their church
annals; could make them feel that their own
theological creeds (to them dead formulas,
but to him living energies) were the decrees
of their own condemnation; could show them
that the painted veils they pretended to honor
by building their tombs and garnishing their
sepulchres were but the predecessors of those
in their midst, whom they now sought to be-
tray and murder. In administering these
faithful reproofs he did not scruple to de-
nounce them as "stiff-necked, and uncircum-
cised in heart and ears, always resisting the
Holy Ghost, as did their fathers." Yet the
meekness and gentleness of his Master dwelt
in his bosom, and gave him, in the presence
of his murderers "the face of an angel." The
patience of Jesus Christ made him steadfast.
His eye was lifted to heaven. He saw the
glory of God and of the Savior; of this he
bore testimony in his last hours. He com-
mitted his spirit to his Redeemer. He prayed
for his murderers, and fell asleep!

Such was the picture drawn of Stephen,
eighteen centuries ago. My argument does not
oblige me to claim for our martyred brother
Torrey that, in all respects, he was the equal
of Stephen. But who can have failed to
recognize, in all its essential characteristics,
the oneness of the picture? Who can now
read the story of Stephen, without thinking of
Torrey? Or who, for a century to come
will read the story of Torrey, without being
reminded of Stephen? I must not incur the
hazard of a vain repetition, by attempting his
portrait. I will only inquire, who, among
the thousands of his brethren, was more bold
or more gentle? Who more fearless and
more docile? Who more manly, or more
child-like? Who more formidable, or more
forgiving? Who else could have conceived
the ideas which he translated into successful

action? Who, in our times, has thus hazarded *himself* for the good of *others*, not counting even his life dear unto him? Who has better understood the Church history or the Church creeds of his fathers? Who has done more towards the reproduction of that history? Who has more intelligibly articulated that glorious creed of disinterested benevolence, in self sacrificing and unequivocal deeds? Who more triumphant in achievement, or who more submissive in suffering? Who has filled a post of more glory, in redressing the wrongs of the injured?—Who has fought, or who has fallen, more like a Stephen than *he*? A cold and calculating age, whose very reformers have scarcely yet learned the import of the words heroism and martyrdom, may carp or may cavil, may talk of recklessness or of rashness and bless themselves for their *prudence*, the like of which, in the Messiah, had left the world unredoomed? Millennial generations will do justice to the memory of Torrey.—They will see, what we are so slow to believe that what we call rashness in the martyrs of our own times we call heroism in our fathers. So thousands counted Stephen, a madman, with eulogies of Jeremiah upon their lips.—And this leads me to consider,

II. THE CHARACTERS OF THE PERSECUTORS.

The chief persecutors of Stephen were for the most part, very religious persons, as *they* understood religion; and it was their religion—such as it was—that made them the persecutors of Stephen. Yet they were neither heathens nor heretics, disorganizers or promoters of schism. They were professedly worshippers of the one only living and true God. They received the scriptures then extant, as coming from God, and with them they received the revolutions therein made, concerning the true religion, its institutions, its doctrines, and its rituals. They were strict in the observance of these, and especially of the sabbath. They revered the regularly authorized teachers of religion. The chief promoters of the persecution were the Rabbis, the Scribes, the chief Priests, the most learned and distinguished of those teachers. Not a few of them, if not a majority, were Pharisees, the most orthodox sect of the times, whose theological views, for the most part, were correct, as the Saviour himself testified.

They were zealous, moreover, not only in the observance, but in the propagation of their religion—active, enterprising, and unwearied in their missionary endeavors, compassing sea and land to make one proselyte. They were recognized as the devout and pious of their times, by those with whom they were surrounded.

But they were, nevertheless, radically corrupt and defective, in the sight of God, and in the view of all who had learned to know the tree by its fruits. All their fair appearances and professions only made them like whited sepulchres, full of uncleanness and putrefaction. While they idolized the *rituals* of their religion and boasted their *orthodox faith*, they made little or nothing of fundamental morality and humanity. They held to the articles of their correct creed as being true and beautiful “in the abstract” not as furnishing the guides of their every day conduct.

They received honor one of another, and loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. Hence they could not believe the most plain and simple of the divine messages sent to them. They loved the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, to be called men of Rabbi—Master—titles approximating to those of “Reverend,” “Doctor of Divinity,” in our times.

They had not learned to place more value before sacrifice. They were scrupulous to pay tithes of the most insignificant herbs in their gardens, but omitted the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faithfulness. They exalted the traditions of the elders to a level with the word of God, or rather above it, laying great stress on Rabbinical commentaries glosses, decretals, precedents, usages, customs and arrangements which God had never taught, authorized or established; and even in some cases, they made the divine law of none effect, by their adherence to their own traditions and church standards.

They were subtle, sophistical, ingenuitous plausible *causists*, intent, constantly, on furnishing such perverted expositions, explanations, modifications and distinctions, in their teachings of the law, as should favor hoary and time-honored abuses, accommodate the rich, flatter the great, shield popular and profitable vices, cover over their own rapacity, turn off the edge of pointed and faithful reproof, and allow men of rank and wealth in the church, in such departures from the true and right—in

the abstract” as they might find agreeable and convenient. They could authorize the want of a sufficient “corban” or “gift” to the Lord’s treasury, (which they expected priestly emolument,) and thus release the dutiful child from yielding the support of a helpless parent. In this way they lay a demoralizing doctrine that the strictness of the divine law may be relaxed, provided the transgressor acts from good motives, that inalienable human rights may be trampled upon, without reproof, provided the treasury be duly replenished, and provided so that the aggression be not committed “the sake of gain!” So curiously discriminating were they, and so nice were their distinctions, for these ends, that they would make the man a debtor to the redemption pledge, if he had sworn by the gold of the temple, while they released the man who only sworn by the temple, forgetting that it was the temple that sanctified the gold! *King cars to secure the gold of the temple, sanctity or purity had little place in their thoughts, and those who could pledge gold, very readily controlled the church in its enterprises without heeding them; they could only pledge their widow’s mite, their godly lives and their prayers! To result, at least, all their teachings were. Whether they had learned to distinguish between modern accuracy and precision between “rational” and “organic” sins, the history does not inform us, but they evidently heeded not stern rebukes for sins committed in the places of the church and the state, nor did they tolerate the uncompromising reproof of such sins!*

For, not a few of their number, elevated among them, were deeply implicated in such sins themselves. The high political and ecclesiastical, which they prized, they could render available for heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, and lay them on men’s shoulders, and put a thorn with one of their fingers. They devour widow’s houses (if not the widows themselves) and for a pretense, make prayers. Their iniquities they had interwoven into the very texture of religion and claimed impunity in them. They made a covenant with death, with hell were in agreement, under falsehoods hid themselves, and imagined that the flowing scourge should not reach

they made clean the outside of the cup and platter, they were within full of excess—rioting upon the spoils of war—thanking God that they were not other men—like publicans and impenitent—& looking down on the lower classes of society with ineffable contempt, accounting pollution to associate or to eat with them. They prided themselves, moreover, upon parentage—their pious and pilgrim ancestors, their descent from the prophets and martyrs of ancient times—they magnified their race, their caste, despising other races, and particularly one proscribed race [Samaritans] as their inferiors. They had a spirituality that was devoid of humanity. In their clerical tours from Jerusalem to Jericho, they could see their fellow men and even their own countrymen, fallen thieves, stripped, wounded and half dead (if not sold like brute beasts) and pass on the other side, too holy to attend to such secular concerns! Thus they left it to the heathen (Samaritans) to render that assistance to their countrymen that they ought to have rendered themselves, and possibly (though not recorded of them) they may have heard the cry of “foreign interference,” and stigmatized the work as being “infidel,” which a Samaritan could perform.

These were the men who could “stir up the people,” invoking “popular indignation” against the reformers who sought “the deliverance of the captives”—holding them “justly to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures;” casting some of them out of the synagogue, suborning false witnesses against others—setting in solemn “council” some, committing them to prison, and putting others to death.

These were the men through whose means a suffering martyrdom, by violent hands, the influence of such men, the rabble of the salons demanded the release of Barrabas—not Jesus! Moulded by the influence of just such a class of religionists, the sentiment of Maryland, and of this nation, demanded the release, by executive pardon, of a noted slave-trader, but not the release of the philanthropist, Torrey! Public opinion governs quite as authoritatively here as in Judea; and public sentiment is as easily moulded by our religious teachers as by theirs. If it be said that Torrey was sentenced by an ecclesiastical but by

a civil court, it may be answered that the sentence of the civil court was necessary before Jesus could be put to death. Yet he himself predicted that he should suffer these things from the “chief Priests;” and Peter, afterwards laid the same sin to their charge. Had there been no spirit of persecution in the church and the priesthood, no sentence of death against Jesus had been granted by Pilate, who earnestly sought to release him. And “certain of the synagogues arose and stirred up the people against Stephen.”

Equally true and undeniable is it, that the persecutions that have been, as far as practicable, carried on, in this country, against active abolitionists, for the last thirteen years,* breaking out into frequent acts of violence, sometimes attempting legislative suppression, resulting in the scourging of Dresser, the spoiling the goods of Tappan, the flight of Geo. Thompson from the country, the temporary scattering or arrest of many others, the imprisonment of Prudence and Reuben Crandall, of Walker, Mahan, Work, Thompson, Burr and Torrey, have been instigated mainly by ecclesiastical influences and efforts. No persecution recorded on the page of history can be more clearly identified with similar causes than this. It is no indiscriminate and wholesale charge against all the American clergy and churches that I prefer. I speak only of those in respect to whom it is *undeniable true*, and whose numbers, wealth, stations and influence have given them, (abating temporary and local checks and feeble general restraints,) a leading and preponderating power. I do not forget the minorities who have attempted to stem the current, for then should I forget the victims of the persecution I am describing, and the friends who have succored them. I do not forget that nearly all the serious sufferers under this persecution have been pious christians, members of churches, and that the two most signal martyrs were distinguished ministers of the Gospel! This fact confirms my statement that it is a *religious persecution* to which our martyred Torrey has fallen a victim, and that religionists and religious teachers, (as in almost all religious persecutions) were the instigators of the persecution! It is an aggravation—and no palliation—of the offence that it has been perpetrated, from the beginning, upon members of the body of Christ—members of the same denomination and local churches with

*I ought to go further back and describe the persecution of the Christian Slaves of different denominations—now upwards of 200,000 in number, forbidden by members of the same churches, to read the Bible, to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences, and even to enjoy the sanctities of the family state—for two centuries past.

the persecutors—members who are conjured, as being members, not to “rend the seamless garment of Christ,” and “disturb the peace of the churches” by their “agitations” in the rebuking of sin!

Volumes might be filled with the evidences of these statements, but must I briefly remind you of a few outlines. Religious editors and orators, laymen and clergymen, long time in advance of other editors and politicians, invoked “popular indignation” against abolitionists, appealing to vulgar prejudice and selfishness, and falsely charging them with impure, bloody, incendiary, and treasonable designs, predicting political disasters, the dissolution of the union, the disturbance of commercial relations, the “taking away of our place and nation” by foreign arms—closing their presses and synagogues against reply—using their “Colonization meetings” (professedly for missionary purposes) to this end, thus fomenting riots and mobs—occupying the principal pulpits in N. Y. city, for months while the great riots of 1833-4 were in process of contrivance, and enacting similar scenes at Canterbury, at Boston, at Philadelphia, (as afterwards at Alton,) publicly boasting, and in print, of the popularity of the Colonization society and the public sentiment against abolitionists, as exhibited in these tumults—one prominent clergyman declaring that if the fanatics would set the country in a blaze, they were entitled to the first warnings of their own fire—another recommending that they be excommunicated by the churches, and left to be disposed of, by the public in other respects—another, long after the riots, endorsing publicly the sentiment that abolitionists should be met with “Dupont’s best” gunpowder and “cold steel”—then, when the mobs grew unpopular, suggesting in their theological quarterlies, the legislative suppression of the radicals, as “justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures;” and finally, rewarding with literary and ecclesiastical honors and promotions one of the chief fomenters of the Alton excitement.—To this hour, the most violent and bloody of these threats have been unrebuked, except by abolitionists, and the authors of them are held in the highest esteem with their brethren. The martyr Crandall was arrested and persecuted at Washington city by a now canonized saint of the Colonization society, as the heroic sister of the victim had been, in Connecticut by similar agencies before.

Is it strange that in a country moulded by religious influences of this sort, to which even the reformers have lent their support, a Torrey should have fallen a martyr to his philan-

thropy? During his imprisonment, and within a few weeks of his death, some of the leading journals of the principal sects, at the North, were filled with the most bitter, malignant and fiend-like slanders against him; and, to crown the climax, his remains, after his death, could not be brought, for the decencies of christian interment, into one of the principal temples of worship, of his own sect, in the "city of the pilgrims!"

Shall we congratulate ourselves—or is it a relief of the picture, that *all* who avow the faith of Torrey are not sharers in his fate? Do they all exhibit his self-denial and his courage? Or when did a religious persecution devour *all* against whom it was raised? Is there no persecution without a general suppression or banishment, as at the repeal of the edict of Nantes? Or shall it be placed to the credit of our own leading city clergymen, in 1834, that, not having the civil and military arm under their control, they could not repeat the similarly planned tragedy of St. Bartholomew's eve? that in 1840, only *one* of their obnoxious ministerial brethren, has fallen into the hands of their bloody allies? And besides, who does not know that the most cunning and effective persecutions are those in which only a *few* bold spirits are selected for ecclesiastical or civil arrest, that their more timid brethren may be weakened and overawed, subdued and terrified; that the dominant clergy moreover may have the credit of retaining some of the pious reformers in their communion, especially when their numbers, their money, their services, and their influence, in their churches, cannot easily be spared? There are wide districts of our country and imposing ecclesiastical connexions, in which, were the hated abolitionists *all* excluded or cut off by persecution, (few and comparatively poor as they are) not half of the prayer meetings could be kept up, not half of the sabbath schools conducted, nor half of the clergymen sustained!

In the persecution that arose about Stephen all were not molested. In Luther's time the great majority of his adherents pursued their avocations in safety, and often held stations which the persecuted sect in America, at this time, cannot fill, driven as they frequently are, from even the teaching of common schools.

The persecutors in Stephen's time were too cunning to cast out the great mass of the disciples from the synagogues. And modern

*There can be no reason to doubt that if the standard of secession from proslavery and persecuting churches had been promptly and generally raised by christian abolitionists, immediately after the murder of Lovejoy the spirit of persecution would have been checked before now, and Torrey's life have been saved. The continued support of those churches must inevitably encourage

persecutors have learned better than to keep up and extend the dreaded "agitations" by such sweeping and impolitic measures.

III. We are next to consider the *Grounds* or *the Persecution*. And here I may say negatively,

1. It was not because Stephen, or because Torrey, or their associates, had departed from the faith of their fathers. They were among the most strenuous and consistent vindicators of the faith.

2. It was not because they taught any new doctrines, essentially distinct from those taught by their fathers. Stephen's teaching accorded with the teaching of Moses and the prophets, whom his persecutors professed to revere. The teachings of Torrey and his associates correspond with the teachings of Porteus and Wesley, of Edwards, and Hopkins, and Emmons, whom their persecutors profess to honor and to follow. The most obnoxious of their doctrines, this entire nation, in the very act of affirming its separate existence, declared to be self-evident, and the document and its author are almost idolized, on account of that very declaration.

3. It was not on account of any disputes between the parties on these grounds. The persecutors of Torrey and his associates commonly admit their doctrines to be "true in the abstract!"—that is to say, universally and unchangeably true! They claim to be as warmly attached to those principles as those whom they persecute. This claim, on their part, still more fully identifies them. In their characters, with the persecutors of Stephen, who professed to be waiting anxiously for the coming of the Messiah whom he preached. The great *object*, of Israel's redemption, they were forward to affirm, was as dear to *their* hearts as it could be to *his*.

4. It was not because the evils attempted to be overthrown by the reformers were not admitted by their persecutors to be evils of a deadly character. Nor was it because they did not truly desire to find some panacea for these public evils! The persecutors of Stephen would as gladly have averted the catastrophe that was hanging over them, and which finally reached its crisis in the destruction of Jerusalem, as would Stephen himself!

Their patriotism and their humanity, they flattered themselves, was not a whit behind his. They only differed from him in respect to his *measures*! Such violent agitations! Such burning reproofs of rulers and priesthood, for their organic sins! The pouring of so much contempt on the leading clergy! The disturbance of the peace of the synagogues! Who could blame them for their resolute opposition to all this? And how

izers were running at large, proclaiming other king besides Caesar?

5. It was not because the persecutors had not been taught to expect, and were naturally expecting great events, great and unprecedented revolutions and radical changes, in connexion with the deliverance anticipated. The persecutors of Christ or Stephen were not only impressed with belief that their promised Messiah was at hand; but they expected that he would personally interpose and rescue them from the yoke. The persecutors of Lovejoy and Torrey, in like manner, had been trained in belief, (and professed it), that the latter glory of the church was at hand. For before the outbreak of the present persecution the religious anniversaries in May, at York, and in Boston, were much occupied with this subject. From the lips of Rice, Spring, Beecher, and McAuley, such orators as Theodore Frelinghuysen, most vivid and gorgeous descriptions, most heart thrilling and rousing addresses, congratulations, were eloquently poured forth, to use the words of one of them, were fanned with the wings of the angel, in midheaven and having the evangel of the gospel to preach to all nations and kindreds and tongues! How delighted were the editors, with these orations, until the disharmony of the churches was marred by the mad project of giving Bibles to the heathen and raising them above the low level of idolatry!

And they understood, too, that the Millennium, believed to be so near at hand, would introduce great social and political as well as spiritual and moral changes—in particular it would establish "free governments" and "ruins of despotisms"—throughout the world. Not a bible, or tract, or missionary meeting could be held, without appeals to conversions like these, in aid of the grand enterprise of converting the world! The "empire" of the missionary colonization society, in Africa, was to furnish one of the golden links in the chain of means to be employed for the final extinction of Slavery was to be.

Nor was it expected that the church would be honored with such achievements as first making great sacrifices—encountering marked opposition—enduring severe trials and passing through a fiery ordeal, a refining process—and, perhaps, wading through the destined Canaan through a Jordan of blood! How awfully sublime! how terribly glorious! how resistlessly inspiring, from sabbath to sabbath, on these very topics, were the sermons of Dr. Spring! The same Dr. S.

with the southern throat of "cold steel!" Heaven be praised that those sermons were not forgotten by some who heard them, even in the darkest hours, when, in the same city and under the impulse of colonization meetings, graced by the approving presence of the same preacher, the predicted persecutions were in part encountered. How remarkable were these prophecies! Not Balaam himself, who loved the wages of unrighteousness and perished among those whom his own lips had condemned, could utter predictions more inimitably graphic and glowing!

How, then, it may be asked, shall we account for the events that have taken place? On what grounds has the persecution been raised, and for what cause? One answer will suffice, for the persecution of Stephen, and the persecution of Torrey.

1. The characters of the persecuted and of the persecutors, as already described, and as fixed by imperishable records, furnishes us with the sure key for the solution of the whole problem. Such persons as the persecutors of Stephen and of Torrey, will always persecute those of opposite characters, because their testimony and their good works reprove them. Thus Cain persecuted Abel, because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous.

2. A more ritual or formal religion, however well adjusted and regulated, will always persecute a religion which insists upon and exemplifies *practical godliness*, a religion that uses the forms and institutions of religion only as means of promoting righteousness and mercy, instead of resting on them as an end.

3. A religion of mere abstract speculations, theories and notions, however correct and exact, will always persecute a religion that honestly reduces those abstract truths to consistent and uncompromising practice. It is the "measures" of good men, and not the self-evident principles which shape those measures, that give deadly offence. No man would ever be persecuted for his mere faith, if it was not found or feared that his faith would be shown by his works.

4. A religion of mere emotions, frames, feelings, sentimentalities, raptures, veneration, romances, picturesque and poetic imagery (and even Romanism has no lack of these) will always persecute that homely every-day matter-of-fact religion which consists much in the discharge of vulgar duties to our fellow men, growing out of the natural relations and existing incidents of life. A religion which either overlooks the heart, or else, under the pretense of cherishing a heart religion, gives credit to a goodness of heart that does not reach & correct the life, will

always hate and persecute a religion by which the hollowness of all such deceptive shams and semblances are reprov'd and exposed.

5. A religion which (like the religion of Rome, and the religions of heathenism,) expends all its strength and fulfils its mission in maintaining the *religious worship*, technically so called; which, at stated seasons, their deities require, and then allows the worshippers to go out into the world and live as they list, serving their lusts as much as they can without open scandal, till the next season of worship, will always persecute a religion that insists upon doing all things, at all times, and in all places, in social, domestic, commercial, and political life, to the glory of God. True religion, which insists upon a virtuous and holy life, reprov's and exposes all religions that tolerate dishonesty and immorality, and is therefore persecuted by them.—The persecutors of Stephen, of Luther, and of Torrey, are perfectly at agreement, here.

6. Religionists, whatever may be their creed, hopes, frames, or professions, who are, on the whole, conformed to the world, in haste to be rich, emulous of vain show, desirous of worldly distinctions, and aspirants after high stations, will instinctively idolize wealth, seek popular favor, court men of power, and thus ally themselves, in all their commercial, social, political, and ecclesiastical relations, to whatever is aristocratic and oppressive. Caste in the church, caste in the state, caste in artificial society, caste as founded on race or color, being all of the same nature, and sustaining each other, will find effective supporters, in worldly and wealth-coveting professors of religion. But pure christianity being the opposite of all this, sympathises with the poor, rebukes all oppression, pours contempt upon the pride of caste, wages war with all aristocracies, monopolies, unrighteous exactions, and unequal arrangements, whether in religious, political, social, or domestic life. It comes, thus, of necessity, into direct and hostile contact with a worldly religion, on whose side there is power, and never fails to share, along with its other victims, the weight of its iron arm.—Who can dispute the correctness of the picture? Or separate it from the story of all persecutions of the true religion? Or deny its applicability to the persecutors of Stephen and of Torrey.

7. The persecutions of Stephen expected a Messiah who would make a great show in the world, and confer great dignity and distinction upon their church, their Priesthood,

and their nation. In the honors and emoluments of his kingdom, they, expected to share largely themselves. As their religion was the true religion, their church the true church, their nation the peculiarly favored nation, and they themselves the acknowledged guides, governors, ornaments and patterns of that church and nation, how could it be otherwise than that their coming Messiah would hasten to honor them as the chief instruments of the work he was about to perform? Had they not as valid a reason for these expectations as our dignified orators at May anniversaries had for supposing that the Millennium was about to be ushered in, under their auspices?

Little did they dream that help was to come out of Nazareth! from among the lowest of the people! from among fishermen and carpenter's sons! That, so far from calling themselves to the chief seats in his kingdom, his first, his indispensable work would be to proclaim the gospel of deliverance to their victims, to unmask their own hypocrisy, to condemn their pride, and denounce their oppressions!

Little did they imagine that he would indotify himself with the poorest, the most crushed, the most bruised, the most injured, the most despised, the most ignoble, the most hated! That from among these, the very objects of their disgust, the victims of their rapacity, the butt of their sacerdotal derision, (whom religion itself, they thought, could not elevate to their level) he would select the prime ministers of his kingdom, thus confounding the wise, abasing the honorable, and overwhelming the mighty!

How could they brook the claims of a Messiah like this? With his toil hardened hands, with his sun burnt visage, without form or comeliness, without literary pretensions! How can he understand letters? How can he guide and "teach us?" In what school of the prophets has he been educated? "Away with such a fellow from the earth!"

The duplicate of the portrait need scarcely be drawn. How could our modern clergy conceive of a millennium that should not originate with them, and elevate them, their Priesthood, and their sect? How could they have anticipated reproofs; or how could they endure them? How could reformers arise except from among the clerical caste? Or be carried on, but by direction of Ecclesiastical bodies? How could they submit to be lectured in ethics, and counselled concerning measures, and corrected in their mistakes by printer's journeymen, by mariners, and

mechanics, by shop keepers and farmers? How could they welcome a reformation that would offend the rich to whom they cringed, and elevate the poor whom they scorned? How could they open their synagogues to the lectures of uneducated and unappointed laymen, and even to fugitive slaves? How could they but regard such innovations as hostile to themselves, calculated to impair their clerical dignity, and degrade their caste? In all this, could they fail to see, (as all such religious teachers think they see, in such cases) an attempt to pull down religion, as they understand that term? Or is it marvellous that the vampires that fatten on such a religion should tremble and be enraged at the prospect of its fall? How could a pure religion be introduced without its overthrow? Has the world ever witnessed such a thing? Little as most reformers (including even the Luther and the Zuingles) especially in their incipient movements, have perceived it, the sacerdotal conservators of gory abuses in all ages have always been seen, in the earnest rebukes of those abuses, an indirect assault upon the corrupt religion that has fostered them. No beasts of prey are more sagacious in their instincts, and in this view, it cannot be denied that the persecutors of christian reformers have always acted on the defensive, and are entitled to all the considerations that such an excuse can furnish them.

Christ knew that no day of Pentecost could quicken into life the entombed church, until, by means of his scathing rebukes, the public confidence in the scribes and Pharisees could be shaken, and they knew that nothing short of his crucifixion could save them from disgrace and defeat. We come now to the inquiry,

IV. In what ways do men, not active in the work of persecution, become accessory, as Saul did, to the death of the martyrs?

This inquiry is a weighty and practical one, to which all who count themselves moderate men, and candid spectators of undue excitements, should carefully attend, lest, peradventure they should be found at a post of less dignity and security than they had supposed. There is no reason to think that Saul, or especially, that the great majority of the Jewish church and clergy, when they witnessed the death of Stephen, or heard the report of it, over thought of asking themselves whether or no they were personally responsible, in any degree, for the deed. The most of them, doubtless, would as confidently have repelled the imputation, and perhaps, on as good grounds, as the majority of religious professors and teachers of this country, at this hour,

would repel the charge of having been accessory to the murder of Torrey. But what is the real state of the case?

"And Saul was consenting to his death." In what manner did he manifest his consent? He was not one of the chief priests who stirred up the people against him. He was not one of those who suborned false witnesses against him. He was not one of the mercenary and perjured wretches who thus testified. He was not one of the officers who arrested him. He was not one of the council who condemned him. He was not one of the executioners or rioters who stoned him. It does not appear that he was present except at the very close of the tragedy, to which curiosity may have drawn him. Not until after the death of Stephen do we hear any thing of the persecutions of Saul. He was but a "young man," a retired theological student, and there may now be many pupils at our Princeton and our Andovers who could not more confidently or plausibly plead "not guilty" of the death of Torrey, than could Saul of the death of Stephen.

But "he kept the raiment of them that slew him," "The witnesses," who were to cast the first stones, "laid down their clothes at a young man's feet named Saul." They may have selected him, accidentally for this service, as they must have done it in haste. And he allowed their clothes to lie at his feet where they had put them. On these scanty specifications the whole charge was based. Such a charge now on so slight a foundation, would raise a fresh clamor of "anandor." Quite remarkable is it that, in this connexion, the record does not designate Saul as a pupil or disciple of the Pharisees, a supporter of their authority and their arrangements, aspiring to the high places of the sect, in their gift, and in religious fellowship with the conspirators. This would have been making out a much stronger case against him. But there needed no mention of this. He kept the raiment of the murderers, and this was sufficient evidence against him. It does not appear that he had ever voted for the members of the council, knowing their character, and thus placed or retained them in power, yet an act far less significant and unequivocal, was enough to show his position. When they laid down their clothes at his feet, he was silent. He tacitly took charge of them, by permitting them to remain there. Without a word of remonstrance he retained his position, and thus left it to be fairly inferred that he did not very strongly, object to their movements.

If in addition to the mere trifling service of letting their clothes lie at his feet, he had

handed to them a refreshing cordial or even a cup of cold water, if he had nerved their hands by timely supplies of food, if he had slipped handfuls of gold or silver into their pockets, or had subscribed to the salaries of the priests while they "stirred up the people," if the historian could have certified us of all this, we should not wonder that he charged him with consenting to the death of Stephen. But was it not "extravagant, uncharitable, and denunciatory," to bring such a charge against a zealous professor of religion, a candidate for the ministry, a promising son of the Holy Church, on no other ground than the fact that he did not roughly and impolitely forbid some respectable gentlemen, members of the same church, to deposit, for a few moments, their outer garments in his keeping? The act was theirs and not his. And how could he help their laying down their clothes on the ground where they pleased? "What good would it do" for him to demur? Would it have prevented them from executing their purposes? Even had he loudly responded "Nay! Nay!" was he not in the minority? And why should he "throw away his vote," especially after the case was decided, and verdict and sentence recorded against the prisoner? Did he owe no allegiance to "the powers that be?" and what right had he to obstruct the execution of their judicial decisions? And might he not, by keeping their garments propitiate the good favor of the most merciful among them, who would select the smoothest or the softest stones?

In this way, Saul and his apologists, like their successors, might have reasoned. But God know, and all discriminating men may know, the hollowness and the heartlessness of such excuses. The common judgment of men in all ages has held Saul responsible for the death of Stephen, because he kept the raiment of them that slew him.

And who are they at whose feet the false witnesses and those who "stirred up" the people against Torrey and his associates, have instinctively and confidently laid down their raiment, and found it safely preserved in their hands? The raiment of a man is that which protects, shelters, and adorns him, which covers his nakedness, and gives him respectability and currency among men. Their good name, their official stations, their ample means of keeping up appearances, of covering up their uncomeliness, and of repelling assailants, their reputation for piety, goodness, and wisdom, these are the princely robes in which the murderers of Torrey have arrayed themselves and which are in danger of becoming soiled in such foul work, unless

carefully preserved by the *sanctity* of their apologists who surround them! By whom are these choice garments kept securely, while the murderers of the faithful are busied in their bloody work? By whom, so effectually as by those who still cling to them and honor them? Who hold fellowship with them in the church, who revere and sustain them in the Ministry, who promote them in the state, who endorse their oppressive and persecuting religion by co-operating with them in efforts for its propagation and support who patronize their missionary and proselyting endeavors, who contribute to their Colonization and Tract and Missionary Societies and Boards, who yield subjection to their church sessions, their Presbyteries, their Synods, their General Assemblies, their Associations, their Conventions, their Conferences, their Bishopricks, through the machinery of which they wield their anti christian and persecuting and corrupting power? Who place their sons under their Theological professors? Who seek, for themselves, religious instruction at their lips and through their presses? Who look for religious consolations and aids by the ministrations of their anointed hands? Let all arch beware lest they come, most emphatically, under the condemnation of Saul, who kept the raiment of him that stoned Stephen! "Brethren! I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers. Repent ye, therefore, that your sins may be blotted out, where the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."

And let all who have seeing eyes and hearing ears wake up, at length, to a clear and vivid apprehension of the fact, that now, in our nineteenth century, and in America, as truly as in the age of Luther, and of Stephen, there are, struggling for the mastery, (a life and death struggle) wrapped up to a great extent in the same church organizations, clothed often with the same ritual forms, and uttering mainly the same church creeds *oppositional and mutually hostile religions*, as diverse as those of Saul and of Stephen, as opposite as light and darkness, as irreconcilable as Christ and Belial; as far removed from each other in their final results, as the high Throne and the deep pit, the one the son of the bond woman and the other of the free, the one waging a relentless and bloody yet crafty and seductive persecution against the other, and even adroitly absorbing the funds and the voluntary co-operation of its hated victims to its own support! And when did Jesus Christ give his disciples leave to support a persecuting Church?

High time were it at length, to make a dif-

ference between the precious and the vile, the clean and the unclean, between him that serveth the Lord and him that serveth him not! High time were it to hear the voice of divine wisdom, "come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues." High time were it to "revive again the stone out of the rubbish," to dig deep, and to spread wide!—For "the street shall be built again, and the walls, even in troublous times," "Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts by righteousness." But let no man assure himself of a share in her glory, while his voluntary position marks him as consenting to the murder of her martyrs! In religion there can be no middle ground, and no neutral. In times of persecution, especially, a man's position must be known by the standard under which he chooses to be marshalled. All professors of religion must take their stand *some where*, and maintain it.

They must either endure a great fight of afflictions, by being made gazing stock both by reproaches and afflictions, while they become the companions of them that are so used—taking joyfully the spoiling of their goods, not despising the bonds of the persecuted, or being ashamed of their chains"—*this* must they do, or else identify themselves with the persecutors and consent to the death of the martyrs. God, who knows no middle ground will regard them as being on the one side or the other; and alas! for the fearful and unbelieving, the timid and the hesitant, the time serving and the compromising, whose neglect to identify themselves with the *right*, shall leave them in companionship with the *wrong*! "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not unto me."

Let all, then, whose course is such that they escape persecution, inquire earnestly whether they are not wanting in fidelity to Jesus Christ! For "all who" in times like these "will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more they of his household?" "It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master;" and "if I yet please man, how am I the servant of Jesus Christ?"

Let all the truly faithful emulate the example of the martyrs, and work while the day lasts. "Fear not them that kill the body, and afterward have no more that they can do: but rather fear Him who is able to cast both soul and body into hell!" How pitiful the case of those who conciliate their fellow men at the expense of the divine favor—who re-

tain their good name in the church on earth only to lose the new name of the faithful, in the New Jerusalem above! The Lord give us the spirit of one who could exclaim—"Oh Abner! I fear my God, and know no other fear."

And finally, let all men compare and weigh the claims of the true and the false religion! The religion of deliverance to the captive, and of "good tidings to the poor," on the one hand—and the religion of despotism, of worldliness, of pride, of enmity, and of persecution, on the other! Which of these religions, friends and neighbors, will you choose? Which will best secure the divine favor—the liberties of your country—the appreciation of conscience—the peace of a dying hour—the goodly fellowship of the prophets and noble army of the martyrs—the smiles of the great cloud of witnesses by whom even now we are encompassed? Choose ye, this day whom ye will serve! If the Lord be God, serve *Him*. But if Baal, and Mammon, and Moloch, serve *them*!

Christian Investigator.

HONOLULU, AUGUST, 1846.

SPECIMENS OF CORRESPONDENCE.

(Continued from our last.)

AND YET ANOTHER.

A minister of the gospel (we suppose him to be) from the same state (Illinois) writes as follows:

I have seen but few numbers of the Investigator, and those few have awakened in me a desire for a more intimate acquaintance.—Says Pilate to Jesus, Art thou a king then?—He replies, I came to bear witness to the truth: every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. May God bless you and assist you in all your efforts in investigating the christian doctrines, may you know the truth, and communicate it to others in so clear a manner, that they shall believe and obey it.—I am one of those who have acted with the Liberty Party since its organization: And I am firmly convinced that one of two things must take place. Either we must compromise our principles and adopt a system of expediency (false so called,) or we must have a Revival of Christ's Religion; and the now popular Religion that fellowships iniquity and takes pleasure in evil doers, must be destroyed by the brightness of his coming whose name is TRUTH. God gives us the latter.

FURTHER FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Brother Goodell:—The Investigator ought

to be much better sustained than it has heretofore been. The proslavery churches of our country must be revolutionized, or all is lost. The Liberty Party can never triumph until the apostate churches are reclaimed. (1) How Anti-Slavery men can be zealous and active in the cause of Liberty and still retain their ecclesiastical standing in proslavery sectarian churches, is to me almost a mystery. (2) One thing seems quite plain, such friends of the slave very much dilute, if they do not wholly neutralize, their Liberty politics, by their proslavery religion. Another thing seems equally evident. Persons retaining their membership in proslavery sects, with very few exceptions, gradually become indifferent to the claims of the slave. They retrograde rather than advance in the true Liberty Faith. Churches tolerating slave-owners at their communion ought not to be countenanced as churches of Christ. Can those friends of the slave who hold such churches in their fraternal embrace hope to hide their inconsistency from the keen scrutiny of the world or of the slave holder? It will be seen plainly enough that, if the slave holder is morally qualified for membership and communion in the body of Christ, he may also be qualified to hold civil office. He may be a Judge, a Governor, a President; and hence the Liberty Party, in proscribing slave holders, is wickedly ultra! I would by no means dissuade any one from joining or adhering to the Liberty party. Every good man should be found there. But the standard of Christianity should certainly be as high as the standard of the Liberty Party. That party owes its origin to sheer necessity. The great inconsistency, not to say wickedness, of praying for the slave's liberation, and yet voting for his chains, was seen and felt, and truth and right reason pointed to a different course. To abandon proslavery parties in politics requires oftentimes great sacrifices. But the duty and importance of abandoning them, in the latter case, is proportionally increased. I may be wrong, but I cannot readily resist the conviction, that those who fraternize with the great leading ecclesiastical organizations of our country, such as General Assemblies, General Conferences, Triennial Conventions, and the like, with all their diversified ramifications, whether North or South, ought to withhold their political activities with the Whigs

or Democrats. (3) If they do otherwise they do it at the expense of their consistency. As a matter of fact we find the members of proslavery churches all among the Whigs or Democrats, and this is just what we might reasonably look for. The importance of coming out of the convents and caverns of the monks of our day is not seen and felt as it should be by many at the present time. The sovereignty of the ballot is dwelt upon. The sovereignty of the ballot will do little only as it knocks Christians out of their proslavery connections, and places them in their church relations, upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. The ballot can free the slave only by freeing the church first. (4.) It is found, as a matter of existing fact that the church is in such deep mire, as to render it absolutely necessary to go out of her to seek successfully the means of her reformation, or the reformation of our country from the ruinous consequences of Rum, Slavery, and Heathenism. But I forget myself. When I took up my pen I only designed to say enough to renew my subscription to the Investigator. I hope the Great Author of all good will bless you with health, with your wonted mental vigor, and with the means of prosecuting your labors both orally and editorially, as a watchman on the walls of renovated Zion in our land.

Our little church here is at length established on the principle of congregational independency. You probably recollect that at the time of our secession from the Presbyterian church we organized under the form of a kind of modified Presbyterianism. (5) and that you kindly wrote me a letter giving your views somewhat in detail. We are increasing slowly both in numbers, and I think in moral influence. The mother church in excommunicating us for daring to leave her, fired her largest gun first, and has since considered us killed, and given us no further attention. Soon after we left, they procured a very popular preacher, have full attendance at sermons, and abolitionists who remained in that church are morally mesmerized so that they can neither speak the word or move to an abolition meeting. But still some of them are ill at ease, and another secession may take place when least looked for.

Notes on the preceding Letter.

1. No:—or until true churches are formed in their stead.

2. The "mystery" is in process of being solved already, in many places, by the disappearance of that zeal and activity, or else, by a splintering of pro-slavery ecclesiastical ties.

3. They are preparing to do so, at this moment, to a great extent, in the state of New York.

4. Church reform is first, in the order of nature, and a reform in the state next.

5. It is well that you have got beyond that, now, brother. Christianity must be free herself, before she can make others free.—[Editor.]

LEONARD BACON, D. D.

A correspondent of the Utica Liberty Press, writing from N. Haven, says, of Rev. Leonard Bacon of that city:

"He makes loud professions of being anti-slavery, still you will see in the commencement of his first article, he roundly condemns the Liberty Party, still he never preaches against slavery, and seldom if ever pointedly alludes to it in prayer."

I have attended his church 6 months; I have never heard a slip against slavery in any of his sermons or evening lectures.—Yesterday was fast day, and the anti-slavery tone of Gov. Baldwin's fast proclamation, and the occasion, seemed to open the door wide for him; yet although he preached both forenoon and afternoon, long sermons, still not a slip relative to slavery in the sermons, or a syllable against it, in either of his prayers. *He anti-slavery!* but will neither preach, vote, or pray against it."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, July 1846.

M. Keith, Winfield,	\$0.50	J. W. Sawyer, 12, Byron,	1.00
G. Thomas, do	0.50	D. Pease, Oswego,	1.00
J. Copeland Jr, Pontonville, Mich.	1.00	E. Gilbert, Honeoye,	1.00
C. Hoyt, Ithaca,	1.00	W. D. Babbett, do	1.00
J. Clapp, Honeoye,	0.25		
E. C. Fisher, Arcade,	1.00		
		Total	\$8.25

The friends of this publication will see that we need additional support.

Reformation Tracts, now in hand; and for sale by Wm. Goodell, Honeoye, Ontario Co., N. Y., No. 1, Lehigh, and a Meeting, 8 pages, at \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 2 & 3.—Are you a Christian, and the Christian's High Calling, (both on one sheet,) 2 pages, \$1.00 per hundred.

No. 4.—Arise and Build, 4 pages, \$0.62 per hundred.

No. 5.—Fellowship with Unrighteousness, 2 pages—\$1.00 per hundred.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor and Publisher.
Honeoye, Ontario county, N. Y.

Printed at the Countryman Office, (Perry) N. Y.
Where may be had every

Cards, Blanks & Handbills
together with every description of Book & Job Printing

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. IV—No. 9.
WHOLE NUMBER, 53.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. SEPTEMBER, 1816.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IV, 23.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AT TEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
parts, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
send the money without expense to the publisher, shall
receive a copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sent, separate from
the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

per dozen,	\$0 50	Sixty papers,	\$2 00
per copy,	1 00	One hundred papers,	3 00

CHRISTIAN ANTI SLAVERY CHURCH CONVENTION IN BOSTON NO. II.

In our April number we gave an account
of the proceedings of this convention as
reported from the Emancipator, to which we
appended some remarks. A friend in Mass-
achusetts writes us concerning some further
particulars, as reported in the Liberator for
March 6, which had not reached us, till our
friend loaned us a copy. Dr. Mann, of Bos-
ton, it seems, proposed such an amendment of
Mr. Lovejoy's Resolution respecting the ne-
gro pew, as should prevent the apparent im-
plication that a house thus arranged should be
recognized as "a house of God." He moved
as an amendment the words, "or mammon,"
after the words "house of God," in the reso-
lution. The Resolution and amendment
were then laid on the table, Mr. Colver and
other Clergymen insisting that such remarks
were not allowable. Sometime afterwards
Dr. Mann offered an additional clause, to
Resolutions &c. reported for adoption: viz.

"That the gospel of Christ is essentially a gospel of
good tidings to the poor, and deliverance to the oppress-
ed, therefore those ministers who do not make these the
essential objects of their ministry, are not ministers
of Christ, and those Churches which neglect these ob-
jects, are not Churches of Christ, and we call upon all
who value the purity of Christianity to withdraw fel-
lowship from all such institutions and to establish in
their stead, true churches of Christ."

The mover "explained his position, and
said that he was not a come-outer, nor a
Garrisonite. He was a member of a church,
in good and regular standing." "He desired
not to overthrow, but to purify, and to build
up, what he did was from a sense of duty to
Christ and to his church which he loved."

"Rev. Mr. King opposed the clause. He had a
strong feeling of personal regard and Christian fellow-
ship for the mover, with whom he had labored and
still labored, side by side, in this cause, but the clause
contained the principle of come-outism, notwithstanding
the mover's opinion, and could not receive his sanction.
Several other clergy men spoke against the clause, and it
was then rejected."

We are acquaint- ed with Dr. Mann. He is
a prominent member of the Liberty party,
and, as we suppose, is still a member of the
Episcopal Church, unless he has recently
changed his connection.

These facts are important to be laid up,
and pondered upon. Nothing can be more
evident than that the rejection of this clause
involved a rejection, either of the doctrine
that slave holding is essentially sinful, or, of
the doctrine that Christian Churches, in order
to remain such, must consist of regenerated,
godly persons, zealous of good works, or, of
the doctrine that Christians are bound to se-
cede from impure, corrupt and apostate
churches.

The first of these positions, involves a
renunciation of abolitionism, the second, a
renunciation of the Puritan or Evangelical
orthodoxy, as commonly taught, sermo-
wise and creed-wise, in New England.—
The third, involves a renunciation of both
Puritanism and Protestantism, and sends us
back, not only to Lambeth, but to Rome.—
A sad case, if Baptist and Congregational
ministers are behind Episcopalians in per-
ceiving this!

Another thing is equally plain: A rejec-
tion of that proposed clause of Dr. Mann, is
virtually, and in principle, equivalent to a
rejection of the ground of those who com-
plain of the course of the American Board
and its Missionaries' course in respect to the
Choctaw, and Cherokee Churches. If, even
in the light beaming on the puritan churches
in Old Massachusetts, and in the very heart
of the antislavery movement, her enlight-
ened ministers and Churches can retain either
an apparently neutral or a proslavery position
without forfeiting their title to Christian fel-
lowship and Christian support, in the name of
common equity and of common sense, what
significance or meaning can there be in the
demand that the poor Choctaws and Chero-
kees shall take a higher stand, on pain of

being thrown out of the pale of Christian re-
cognition and fellowship!

No marvel that nothing was said in the
Convention about the position of the Ameri-
can Board! No marvel that we hear noth-
ing of that Anti Slavery Missionary Con-
vention, that was to have been held in New
England, and for the calling of which a
Committee was appointed in Boston, at the
time of the Great Eastern Liberty Conven-
tion, in October last.

It needs no gift of prophecy to foresee
that this fatal spirit of temporizing in Old
Massachusetts, MUST BE SPEEDILY
BROKEN UP, by somebody in that state
connected with the Liberty party, or the day
for holding Liberty Conventions in Massa-
chusetts, will have gone by.

One further item of the Convention:

"In the Evening, the Rev. Mr. Adams,
vindicated the ministers of Massachusetts
and of New England from the charge of
being pro slavery. Said they all hated
slavery, but did not know how to work against
it, but were inquiring"!!!

Did not know how to go to work against
"the greatest abomination in all the earth!"
Have they no Bibles?

"Were inquiring!" The exclusion of
the "herald corpse" of the martyred Torrey
from the Park-street church was a specimen,
doubtless, of their "inquiring!"

Sermons for the Times

BY WILLIAM GOODELL.

SERMON II.—CHRIST'S PROHIBITION OF KINGLY DOMINATION.

"And there was also a strife among them which of
them should be accounted the greatest. And he said unto
the kings of the Gentiles exercised lordship over them,
and they that exercise authority upon them were called
benefactors. But ye shall not be so; but he that is
greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he
that is chief, as he that doth serve."—Luke, xxii, 24-27.

By another Evangelist, the words are recorded thus:
"Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over
the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their
great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall
it not be among you; but whosoever will be great
among you shall be your minister, and whosoever of
you will be chiefest, shall be servant of all."—Mark x, 42.

In seeking instruction from these words of
the Great Teacher, let us endeavor to ascer-
tain, in the first place, the import of the pro-
hibition contained in them; and then consider

in *no reasons* upon which the divine prohibition must have been founded, along with such attention to *objections* as may be useful; and finally, *apply* the subject to such practical purposes as the times seem to require.

I. THE IMPORT OF THE PROHIBITION.

The narrative connected with the text informs us that the disciples, in common with their countrymen had high and lofty conceptions of the kingly power and authority that would be held and wielded by the *select few* who should be favored, by the Messiah, with prominent stations in his kingdom. They thought it needful to settle the question, at an early day, which of them should be appointed to wield, exclusively, these kingly prerogatives. James and John, the two sons of Zebedee, inflated by maternal partiality, were emboldened to solicit, for themselves as their mother had also solicited for them, the high stations to which they aspired. They were, doubtless, conscious of possessing, as they seemed to have possessed, distinguished qualifications and gifts. They expected, therefore that their claims would be recognized, and that their fellow disciples, of lower attainments, would instinctively and reverently bow down to them.

This, according to the philosophy in which they had been educated, was nothing more than was manifestly their due, and they doubted not that their Divine Master, holding the same sentiments, would readily confirm and ratify their claims. On some occasions he had favored them with an intimacy to which few were admitted, and this may have confirmed their fond impressions.

The answer, they received in the words of our text. And the first thing that strikes our attention, on reading it, is the directness with which it contradicts the *entire theory*, upon which their expectations had been founded.

He does not tell them that there were other disciples whose superior gifts entitled them to the precedence which they sought. Such an answer, very probably, would not have been in accordance with the truth. He does not tell them that at some future time, before leaving them, he would make and announce the selection they had desired. This he never did, unless his words on a certain occasion, to Peter, are to be construed into the charter of that papal supremacy of which neither he nor his fellow disciples ever appear to have been conscious. He does not tell the disci-

ples that it was *their* business to find out which of their number was distinguished for such rare and overwhelmingly princely qualifications as should mark him as the anointed of high heaven with regal powers, and then reverently bow down to him. Such a prince, except in their Messiah, they seem never to have discovered or recognized; nor does the subsequent history reveal to us, either who *was* or who *ought* to have been thus distinguished by his fellows. No answers, therefore, of this description, did the applicants receive, something like this however, in reply to the inquiry, which of them should be greatest, might have been expected of the Savior, in connexion with his non compliance with the request of the two sons of Zebedee had he held the sentiments that a heaven-commissioned *few* are entitled to stations of supremacy & authority over the *masses* of their brethren. And the mere absence of any such explanation of his refusal would be, of itself, presumptive evidence that he did not hold such a sentiment. But we are not left to the mere negative and inferential evidence that might be thus gathered.—The Savior manifestly embraced the opportunity to tell them explicitly and pointedly that no such sentiment could find a response in his heart—that no such arrangements could have a place in his kingdom. To sit on his right hand and on his left, was indeed in reserve for those for whom it was prepared.—That only a *select few* would sit on his right hand, he does not intimate, and he has elsewhere assured us that *all* his friends will, one day, be placed upon his right hand, as all his enemies will be found on his left. And however one star might differ from another star in glory, no such kingly authority over each other as they have anticipated, could have place in his kingdom.

That the applicants grounded their expectations, on the notion that the God-gifted *few* were to hold authoritative sway over the *many*, is too evident for debate. Without this notion, it would not have been possible for them to have cherished any such anticipations.—But with that notion nothing could be more natural and seemingly proper. If a *select few* were exclusively, to wield kingly powers over their brethren, how important that they should at once occupy their stations, or at least, hold themselves in readiness for the services! How important, that those by whom they were surrounded should be ready to take *their* proper level, and be admonished by the Divine Teacher to do so!

Equally manifest is it, that, so far from conveying, either by implication, or by silence, any tacit approbation of that notion, the

Savior proceeded, in the most unequivocal manner, to cut up the entire theory itself, the roots, to prohibit all practical conformity with it, among his disciples—to represent, once, and forever, in his household, all lofty aspirations. He first calls attention to the fact that among the Gentile nations and among them, it was common to regard a *select few* as clothed with kingly authority over the *masses*. (And, assuredly, if the principle had been a correct one, the Savior would have reverted to it as a model for imitation, instead of pointing to it as a beacon to be avoided.) These exalted personages were called "Kings." They exercised "lordship," dominion, control, power. It was theirs to *compel* by authority, and not merely to persuade and allure, by their teachings & their example. They did this, as in their *own right*, and not as holding under God, their just powers, by the consent of the governed. They were "called benefactors." They claimed to confer favors on the masses of mankind by the controlling them. And all men, (so the philosophy of the times assured them) *should be thankful to get themselves governed*.

Such were the usages with which the disciples had been familiar. "Ye know" all this said the Savior. This is the school in which ye have been trained, and this is the philosophy ye have imbibed. But I give you to understand, distinctly, continues he (and they listen with breathless astonishment) that these usages are altogether corrupt, that this philosophy is false and superficial, that in his kingdom nothing of the kind shall be tolerated for a moment. "*So shall it NOT be among YOU!*" Ye shall have no such "lords." Ye shall recognize no such "kings." Ye shall exercise no such authority, nor approvingly bow down to it. "Call no man on earth your Master"—"Be ye not servants of men." "And be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren"—equals, endowed with equal rights. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood; kings all of you, and reigning together with kings. Ye shall not exercise authority upon one another, nor 'lord it over God's heritage' nor 'have dominion over each other's faith.'" Not even an inspired apostle may do that!

Thus instead of establishing kingly authority among his disciples, Christ prohibits it.—Thus does he "put down all authority and power" and institute the sacred democracy of his empire, founded on the "holy equality of souls before God." And if ever Hindoo's consider their Juggernaut so exalted that his worshippers, of all castes, become equals in his presence, alas! for us, Christians! if we

learn our equality in the presence of God and Eternal Life," the "light of world"—the "image of the invisible God!" In what manner, it may be asked, did it provide for the exercise of those supernatural powers with which some of his disciples, distinct from others, may be supposed to have been gifted? Suffice it to say here, ever those diversities of gifts were, they not of such a degree of character as to foundation, in his view, for the exercise of ship, authority, control, kingship, magistracy, rabbi-ship, on the part of any one of them, however gifted, for all this he has for- with a distinctness and emphasis not to be understood. And on a farther consid- eration of the text it will be found that he has provided scope for the exercise of the choicest without the exercise of any such author- ity or control.

That is greatest among you, let him be the younger, and he that is chief, as he is in the service." "Whosoever will be first among you, shall be your minister, and he that is chiefest shall be servant of all." Remarkably does the precept illustrate and harmonize with the prohibition! How clearly the thing to be done by those who are distinguished powers, are put in con- trast with the things they so commonly aspire to which they must not do! The prohibition, the ambitious aspiration, is kingly. The precept, the appropriate vo- luntary attendance, and humble service. Do you claim, demands the Savior, to wield distinguished powers? Do you think yourself born to command?—What, say you, our proper position—that of kings, exercising "authority" designated "benefactors"—to whom it is a privilege most reverently to bow down?—No means; responds the Savior. If you have the power you suppose you do, your position is that of servants. You are not to assume authority on the mere exercise of your powers. You are to take the position of servants and minister to your brethren. Of exercising authority upon them. Of guidance and protection you can do so by your teaching and example, which all hear and imitate you, will be affirmed by you, of course. But as to authority, that does not belong to you, an official station, unless those who find you in your services in that direction, give you a commission you to perform it, for even then, in the highest ex- ercise of official functions, you are to con- sider yourselves the servants of the people—the "youngest," the least intelligent. Instead,

of grasping a scepter or mounting a throne, or putting on a mitre, let the strong- est, the most venerable among you wait, as a servant should wait, the bidding of those whom he is to "serve." If called, by the assembled brotherhood—the masses—the Church, to the special work of stated public teaching, (in distinction from the mutual teaching to be con- stantly exercised, in every well ordered con- gregation, by the common brotherhood) then let him give himself to the work of such stated teaching—not as a "lord" or as a "king," "not as having dominion over their faith," but "as a steward of the manifold Grace of God." Let him be the "minister," the "servant," the "messenger," ("angel") the runner on errands for the Church, not a Rabbi, Master, or "Father" (Pope) over them.

Let all who wield distinguished powers or occupy official stations in the Church (aye! and in the State!) understand the position which the Supreme Ruler of Men has assigned to them. They are "servants of all"—ser- vants of the masses—servants of the people (not indeed their slaves, their serviles, their panders) but their brotherly servants doing la- borious work for them, and ministering to their wants. And if they cannot learn their position as "servants," but must needs aspire to be "kings," lording it with authority over their equal brethren, then let it be understood, notwithstanding all their high powers, that the real spirit of their station, has, as yet, no thorough lodgment within them. They are as- piring after that which the sole King in Zion will no more accord to them, than to the sons of Zeboden, James and John. Let them hum- ble themselves, become as little children, lest they fail of attaining to any position, at all, in the Kingdom of heaven.

Such, I apprehend, are the teachings of the Savior, in the text. This is the substance and meaning of the passage before us, drawn out into the detail of amplification or paraphrase. And this corresponds, as our quotations and allusions show, with the general scope of his doctrine, and the spirit that pervades the New Testament, from beginning to end. The Epistle to the Hebrews is chiefly occupied with proofs of the sole High Priesthood of Jesus Christ and equal priesthood and brotherhood of all Chris- tians. And when John was about to bow down reverently at the feet of the superhuman mes- senger, of more than earthly power and dig- nity, who had shown him what no son of Adam could have revealed to him, was promptly admonished to desist. There was no oc- casion or place for hero-worship, even there! "See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-ser- vant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of

them that keep the sayings of this book: we worship God."

We come now to consider, as was proposed,

II. The reasonableness of this lesson of our Great Teacher. 1. It is pertinent, just here, to extend the remark, just now made, and to notice the congruity, propriety, and fitness of the lesson contained in the text, an account of its corresponding with the spirit of the Christian religion. Every where it exalts God and Christ. Every where it represses human ambition, and humbles the loftiness of men. It must be reasonable that the arrangements of Christ's Kingdom, including the position and activities of his most gifted disci- ples, should be seen to be in harmony with his grand de- sign, and with the aim his people should cherish. Any thing like kingly dominion among them, would exhibit a manifest anomaly and discrepancy, which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to understand or to recon- cile.

2. The essential equality of mankind, and especially of all Christians, renders the exer- cise of kingly authority among them by one another, very manifestly gratuitous and im- proper. As in water, face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." "He hath made of one blood all nations." "He fashion- eth their hearts alike." In his sight all the nations of the earth are as grass-hoppers. I do not say, (nor does my argument require it) that no differences are to be observed in the capacities of men. But I do say that it is common to magnify these differences, to idol- ize some for their superiority and to despise others as being inferiors, far beyond all the bounds of sobriety and reason. God, who sees mankind as they are, sees no such measure- less distance as men are apt to fancy, between a simple peasant and a Newton. The powers which God regards as most essential, are nearly the same in both of them. And the more deeply and extensively any man studies human nature, coming into sympathy and free inter- course with the humblest of his brothers, and estimating men by the essentials rather than by the incidents and appendages of manhood, the more will the idea of human equality be impressed upon him, the more will great men dwindle into the neighborhood of common di- mensions, till, at length, he will hardly know where to find or how to extinguish them, lit- tle tempted to bow down, awe struck, in their presence. The more we learn to ap- preciate that which being essential is univer- sal in our common humanity, the less shall we be inclined to throw it into the shade by exalting, in our imaginations, the more attrac- tive and imposing specimens of it, at the ex- pense and to the comparative degradation of

the masses. In saying this, we are far from forgetting or rejecting the rule of estimating all things according to their real worth in the realm of existence. We only demand an honest and impartial application of that rule, and maintain that the result of the comparison will fully justify our Savior's absolute prohibition of kingly domination among his disciples.—*"This is doubtless one of the hardest lessons for men to learn, for all men are either servile or aspiring, or both at the same time."* Yet the lesson must be learned before either the church or the world can come into harmony with the laws of Christ's spiritual Kingdom.

The equality of Christians is still more complete and indisputable. The inequalities forced among men arise chiefly from their departures from God, and are witnessed, in different communities, very much in proportion to that departure. The regions of densest moral darkness are those in which the many are most degraded and most absolutely controlled by the more intelligent few. These inequalities it is the business of Christianity to remove.—*"So far as it obtains sway, just so far they either are removed or are in process of removal; and the equalizing process must go on, until every valley is exalted, and every mountain brought low; till none shall need say to his brother, know ye the Lord, for all shall know him, from the least to the greatest."* As nothing but sin can forbid mental development, or dispose men to neglect or to pervert the proper use of their faculties, and as it is chiefly to their suppression, neglect, or perversion that the present comparative depression of the masses is to be traced, so the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit are to be recognized as incomparably the most efficient means of the mental as well as moral elevation, and consequent equality of powers and capabilities among men. In the most essential points of knowledge, the very highest of which our natures are capable, the most illiterate christian convert, the veriest babe in Christ is vastly wiser than the profoundest worldly philosopher unilluminated by divine teachings. And when, in his turn, such a philosopher becomes himself the subject of the same divine influence, he soon discovers that the very highest knowledge to which he can now lay claim, that which he most prizes, and for the preservation of which he would gladly count all his other knowledge as mere dross is a knowledge which he holds in common with his obscure brother, who, from the very depths of human ignorance, has stepped into the kingdom of light before him, and who is perhaps able to tell him many things which he

much needs to know. This statement becomes rational and trust worthy when we reflect that in regeneration by the Holy Spirit a radical change takes place in the heart—the affections, the dispositions, the temper, the voluntary exercises, the free choice, the determinate volitions of the man. For *"out of the heart,"* as thus defined *"are the issues of life."* *"As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."* It is the heart of the man that makes the man, and that defines the man. In the heart lies the spiritual vision, and if the eye be single, the whole body is full of light. A renewed heart is an enlightened heart, because it is a healthful heart, restored by regeneration to a healthful tone, loving what is lovely, hating what is hateful, desiring what is desirable, choosing the good, refusing the evil, and seeing objects as God sees them, which is the same thing as seeing them as they are; wherein lies the comprehension of all knowledge. What a foundation is thus laid for an equality among Christians! They are all using and thus exercising and invigorating their powers by their healthful exercise.—And they all regard the great objects of spiritual and moral investigation in the same light, they cherish the same aims, and pursue the same ends. They are fellow heirs of the same kingdom, fellow laborers in the same vineyard, children of the same Father, followers of the same Savior, purchased by the same redemption, enduring together the same trials, fighting the same warfare, and destined to the same triumph. What place for kingly domination over each other, can be found among these?

3. The Supreme authority of God and of Christ over all men, an authority mutually recognized by all Christians, the common relation that each sustains to him, the infinite distance between each one of them and the sublime object of their obedience and adoration, bringing them, by that same infinite distance into close proximity and common equality with each other; these considerations, as already intimated, should impress us with the incongruity and unsuitness of kingly authority among men over each other, and especially over and among Christians. This is intimated by Christ himself, as a reason against sacerdotal authority. *"Do not ye called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."*

4. A similar impression may be derived from a consideration of that individuality of existence and of responsibility which our own consciousness reveals to us, which is so impressively and continually taught to us in the Scriptures, distinguishing the christian

religion from all others, and marking in the broad seal of Him who knew what man, and who created him, and will bring each one of the species into judgment for own personal deeds. A religion which merges the individual in the body corporate which should release the subject or the citizen from responsibility to conscience or God, in deference to more human authorities ecclesiastical or civil, which, on grounds these could shelter the obscure, ignorant or individuals from the blame of their participation in social, public, organic sins—no religion might indeed admit of authority and kingly domination, not only in the State but in the Church. There would be no discrepancy, but a perfect agreement between such a religion and the exercise of legislative and priestly power over the many by the few. All this might indeed be demanded resulting from a religion of that stamp. It is not, however, the religion of the Bible. It exhibits opposite features, and produces opposite results. It allows no man to forbid a multitude to do evil. It demands martyrdom rather than the practical surrender of the minutest conscientious conviction, in accordance with the demands of any man, who may be the station he occupies. In deference to such demands, its direction is *"Fear not them that kill the body, neither shall they have no more that they can do: rather fear him who is able to destroy soul and body in hell."* Very rarely such a religion cannot permit the absolute dominion of man over man, and especially of the few over the many. *"If they of the Gentiles"* or those among Christians who aspire to *"exercise lordship"* over their fellows, could stand in the place of those they thus control, in the day of the final reckoning and award, there might then be some show of reason in their pretensions; since they cannot do this, they can be no right to occupy a position, or to wield authority which implies and teaches absurdity. And no man, bound to the will of God, to be judged there, himself, for his deeds, can have any right to recognize the authority of any such lordlings. If he be a man himself, on his own behalf, responsible to his Maker, as an individual to his own acts, if he be *this*, and not a mere agent to his neighbor, nor an implement of government, nor a drop to be lost, or absorbed, in the ocean of human society never hereafter identified; if he must be shielded from the control and domination of those who

authority" like "the Kings of the Gentiles." This shield Christ throws over all men, and especially his disciples, in the text, and in his other teachings to the same purpose.

5. In thus insisting on the rights of *individuals*, as attested by the responsibilities with which God has invested them, we do not forget nor displace the rights of *Society*—(in other words, the rights of the aggregate masses of men, connected and social beings,) as equally attested by the responsibilities with *Society* or Social Communities are clothed, responsibilities revealed to us no less by the Providences of God than by the teachings of the Scriptures.

Those who would subject *individual* man to the "authority exercised" by the "lords of the Gentiles" are sometimes forward to magnify the rights and responsibilities of *Society* as though these were identified with the rights and responsibilities of those who assume, as of a "divine right," in virtue of their superior powers, to act in the name of *Society*, even without its authority to do so. A moment's attention will reveal to us that such assumptions are as subversive of the rights of *Society*, (or social rights) as they are of the rights of *individuals*.

The rights of society, or social rights arise out of the fact that human beings, on account of their social nature, exist in *Communities* defined either by their localities, their necessities, or objects of rightful pursuit; and from the fact that communities thus existing, occupy positions, sustain relations, and incur responsibilities which can be predicated of no more individuals, however exalted their characters or comprehensive their knowledge, or gigantic their powers. This is true of the communities which we call *Churches*; and of the communities we call *States*. As no one man or select clique of men can, in matter of fact, be the Church, or the State, so they cannot inherently sustain the responsibilities nor rightfully enter upon activities appropriate to those masses of men in their social capacity, without leave and authority from them. All the authorities rightfully wielded by magistrates in the State, and by officers in the Church, are indeed derived from God who ordained them; yet they are, derived nevertheless, through the people, and by the consent of the governed, because it is the *entire mass* of the people in the State, and the *entire body* of the assembled brotherhood or Church whom, in the first place God holds responsible for the proper action of those Communities; inco it is the *whole* community and not a mere fraction of it, that constitutes its exist-

ence, that shapes its position, that defines its relations and the duties growing out of those relations. The relations and the duties of a Community to the individual members of which the Community itself is composed, lie at the foundation of a great part, if not the whole, of its proper action. How manifestly absurd then must it be to suppose that the possession of any rare gift or princely powers, however ample, invest any more *individual* or select few, in that community, with all the legitimate functions, relations and responsibilities of the community itself! The belabored official who mistook himself for the corporate establishment on whose behalf he was commissioned to act, announcing himself pompously, over his cups "I am the Neponassit Factory," was guilty of but a slight mistake, in comparison with hundreds, drunk but not with wine, whose actions if not words proclaim, "I am the Church," or "I am the State." Yet all this absurdity is endorsed by the old yet scarcely exploded theory of the "divine right" of prelates—the "divine right of kings."

By the plagues of Egypt inflicted on each family in the nation, and by the overthrow of the hosts of Pharaoh along with their monarch in the Red Sea, God taught, most impressively, and at an early period, for the benefit of all coming generations, the great truth that he holds the *entire mass* of a community responsible for its public acts, that he invests the *people* with an authority the proper exercise of which they may not with impunity neglect—no—not even in deference to any despotic forms of government or assumptions of power which their apathy, or indolence, or stupidity, or so usualty may induce or permit. Universal history, down to the present hour is filled with repetitions of the same lesson. The sovereignty of the people, under God, is a first principle of civil government. The people of Israel sinned in desiring a king like the Gentile nations around them, and while God gave them their request in righteous judgment, he forewarned them of the certain results, and protested that in choosing a King they had rebelled against Him! No marvel then, that the Messiah's Kingdom should admit, among his disciples, of no kingly power! And if none of Christ's disciples may lord it over their brethren, in the Church, where the government is only declaratory, admonitory and passive, nor claim the inherent or exclusive right of thus governing, independently of the brotherhood, (as though they themselves were not subject to the common government of all of them) how much less may they presume, on the mere basis of their rare gifts,

to wield civil government, which involves personal infliction and compulsion!

The order and polity of the Christian church as Christ instituted it, and as the New Testament Christians understood and administered it, was the most perfect and practical contradiction to the claim of kingly and priestly power, affording not the least scope for their exercise. It was only by appointment of the assembled brotherhood, that official stations in the church could be held. We have a minute statement of the popular vote when the bishopric and apostleship vacated by Judas were to be filled—the same is true of the election of Stephen and his associates. No man, not even the divinely inspired apostles themselves, assumed to govern the churches, in their own name, and of inherent right, in virtue of their high powers. Paul disclaimed holding dominion over their faith, and instead of himself excommunicating the gross offender in the Corinthian church, he only exhorted the assembled brotherhood (not the official) to do it. The duty to be performed was *their* duty, and could be discharged by none others except by *them*. It was the disapprobation of the brotherhood, and not of the pastor merely, or even of the apostle, that was needful to be expressed. The assembly itself must needs "put away from among themselves, that wicked person," or it would be found that as "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" so the entire church, if neglecting its duty, would become contaminated by him. It was to the assembly, the congregation, the brotherhood, the church, the mass of associated disciples themselves, in their separate local gatherings together, though only two or three of them could be thus collected, that Jesus Christ committed all the binding authority that he left with men in and over his Church on the earth. If the incorrigible offender would not hear the Church, (that is the *masses*, the *brotherhood*, few or many assembling together) there was provided no other court of jurisdiction or appeal. He was to be held as a heathen man and a publican. And whatever the brotherhood should thus, in his name, bind or loose on earth should be ratified in heaven.* And in this church, and among this brotherhood, there were to be no lords, nor kings, "exercising authority," but "that which would be chiefest should be servant of all."

The rights of *Society*, therefore, in the Church and in the State, as well as the rights of *individuals*, can be preserved and exercised only in the absence of that kingly authority and power, which Christ forbids in the text.

6 The prohibition will likewise be en-

* See 1st 3 chapter of Matthew.

forced by a proper conception of the nature, objects, ends, design, and limitations of all governments administered by and among men, whether in the Church or in the State.

If government consists in guidance and protection (a definition sometimes used,) it is evident that government is not to be monopolized by the select few, still less, by the gifted ones. No one man, and no select senate of men know enough, or are wise and good enough to wield exclusive and undivided powers over their fellows, for this would be unlimited power, irresponsible power, and nothing short of infinite wisdom and goodness could suffice for its safe exercise. No man nor body of men may be thus trusted. And since all men can do something towards guiding and protecting their fellows, it is manifest that nothing short of the participation of all and of each, in their measure, can secure the protection and the guidance that are needed.

The end of Church government is mutual edification, counsel, co operation, watch-care, assistance, instruction, reproof, admonition, and if need be, in the last resort excommunication, that the body may be preserved pure. This requires the joint action of all, which excludes kingly authority, of course.

The chief end of civil government is the preservation and security of *individual rights*—those same individual rights which have already been shown to be *infringed* and *invaded* by kingly power; so that no place for any such power can be found in civil government, without *defeating* instead of securing its grand end. And if civil government be claimed as the conservator of the rights of *Society*, as distinguished from the rights of individuals, a similar remark will apply. For kingly authority has been shown to be as subversive of the rights of society as of the rights of individuals.

"To execute judgment between a man and his neighbor" requires no kingly power of the one over the many, or of the few over the masses. That work is most secure in the hands of those to whom it appropriately belongs. It is for the community to protect one portion of its members from the aggressions of another portion, and unless the community provides his protection, it is seldom or never provided at all. Whoever estimates, duly the imperfection of man, and the vast extent of his wants for which no human administration of government can provide, will become deeply impressed with the narrowness of the field that can be covered by a government thus administered—the folly of expecting from it all the protection and guidance men need, and the consequent error of those who, for such ends, would recognize in the wisest of men, a kingly power over their fellows.

7. The corrupting nature of kingly power in the State or (which is of the same nature) priestly power in the Church, furnishes another strong reason for the divine prohibition in the text. The most plausible plea for such authority is the fitness of committing ourselves to the 'wisest & best' dominion. Unfortunately for this theory, the wisest and best of our race are not good enough, in the first place, to be entrusted with the exercise of kingly or priestly control. And those who are *most* fit, would be almost certain to become *less* fit, by the possession and exercise of such power—the power of exclusive and authoritative control. So universally admitted and proverbial is the corrupting tendency of its exercise, that we may be warranted to infer the impropriety of placing either ourselves or others under the influence of so resistless a temptation.—The annals of the Church furnish a striking commentary upon the wisdom of Christ's prohibition, and the danger of the slightest departure from the strict letter and spirit of his words. Christ knew before hand, what the event has proved, that the "*exercise of authority*" by one portion of his disciples over another would corrupt his religion, enslave his church, and usher in the reign of that 'Man of Sin' whose dominion is yet to be destroyed—yet in no possible way but by the utter repudiation and overthrow of all kingly power among Christians.

8. Christ himself is the sole Head and King of his Church, and his glory he will not give to another. A human priesthood in the Church, has always been found the grand rival of the one sole high Priesthood of Christ over the Church. The very pith and core of the Anti-Christian apostacy, in the Romish and other communions, lies just here.* No excellency of speech, no acquirements in knowledge, no inspiration of genius, no spiritual attainments, either imaginary or real, no powers of man or of angels, no miraculous gifts, can warrant the "Man of God" to imagine himself "born to govern" authoritatively over his equal brethren in Christ's house—nor can he be safe or innocent in attempting it. No species of pride is more ensnaring than the pride of genius, the pride of intellect, the pride of talent, especially when they become connected with spiritual pride.—And the theory that a divinely commissioned few are born to wield authoritative control o-

* Hence the anti-evangelical character and tendencies of "High Church" pretensions, while all the Evangelical portion of the same communions are known as "Low Church"—rejecters of high priestly claims. A careful perusal of Dr. Pusey's celebrated Sermon on the efficacy of priestly administration of sacraments, will show that the doctrine is essentially founded on a rejection of the Supreme Divinity and sole High Priesthood of Jesus Christ.

ver the many, is directly and manifestly calculated to seduce men of rare gifts, of choice powers, and of high attainments, into this fatal error, which has eclipsed and cast down so many who were once bright lights in the Church. Instead of being inflated by such theories, let them be rather admonished to think soberly, to esteem others better than themselves, and not to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think. Such divine admonitions are quite as much needed now, as they ever were. And now, as formerly, they are quite as much needed by the most *gifted* as by the *weakest* of Christ's flock. Very clearly it was for the special benefit and guidance of such, that Christ uttered the words of the text.

9. It may be added that this notion of the divine right of the few to govern the many, so far as it is imbibed by the masses, tends to render them servile, and inattentive to the responsibilities resting upon them, in respect to public affairs. "Our wisest and best men, as we judge them to be, have deceived thus and so. What are we that we should reverse their decision?" "Have any of the rulers, (our recognized wisest and best) at any time believed on him?"

If it be said that the masses are unfit for self-direction and self-government, it may be answered that the doctrine of the divine right of kings is directly calculated to make and to keep them so. The slaves it is said, cannot take care of themselves, the citizens cannot govern themselves nor without kingly supervision, direct their own private affairs; and the churches without priestly domination would run wild. But how shall the slaves learn to take care of themselves, how shall citizens, or how shall church members learn to do what they are never to attempt doing, because a God-gifted few are divinely empowered to do it all for them?

In the church, what a vast amount of talent is unproductive, because unemployed; uncultivated, unexercised, and scarcely recognized as existing! And all because the church must be governed exclusively by the select and gifted few, superior, in most cases (if they are superior) to the rest of their brethren, for no reason but because their talents have been more exercised, while their brethren have been allowed no opportunity of the kind. In civil affairs, what stolid ignorance and stupidity arise from the notion that civil government can be understood only by the heaven-gifted few, and that it needs to

established only by the few whose exclusive business it is to attempt to it!

If the masses are unfit for self government, and must therefore be controlled by the authority of kings, then certainly they are unfit to select their rulers, and ought not to be entrusted with the task. If they are too ignorant of state matters to have a voice in their management, they can know nothing of statesmanship, they are incompetent to select their own statesmen, and statesmen alone, already in authority, must do it for them.— And just so in the christian church. If the common brotherhood are incompetent to administer church discipline among themselves, they are incompetent to choose their religious teachers, and a regular succession of clergy must make the selection for them, since quite as much theological knowledge is needed for the latter task as for the former. Passive obedience to civil rulers and implicit faith in religious teachers result, of necessity from the doctrine of the divine right of prelacy and the divine right of kings. This is in fact, that doctrine, so fully developed and openly held in Europe for centuries past, and even down to the present time. And no modern modifications of the doctrine, even in our own country, believe it from the same tendency. Thus, the functions of the ballot box are sometimes ascribed, not as investing the persons elected with any authority derived through the people, but only as signifying the loyalty of the people in recognizing their God-gifted kings, whom they are reverently to bow down.— Among the arguments urged in disparagement of the people's powers of self government, we are often cited to the injudicious objections they sometimes make, of their rulers; an argument equally pregnant against the use of the ballot at all! The panic expressed on every proposal for extending the suffrage, reveals the latent leaven of the old doctrine, and so do the guards and checks thrown by clerical bodies around the free exercise of religious teachers, by the christian brotherhood, untrammelled by priestly intervention in the form of previous licence and frequent ordination by the privileged caste. The superintendency of religion by civil government is among the natural tendencies of the inevitable results, of the doctrine of kingly power. If a few are God gifted with the power of controlling the many, then their power is exclusive power, unlimited irresponsible power, as has already been observed.—

This doctrine of kingly power is opposed to the idea that the functions of civil government are restricted to the simple work of preventing aggressions on human rights, that civil power is limited to this narrow field.— It looks to a general "paternal care" of the government over the governed, that is of the few over the many, and it assumes that whatsoever the community needs, this civil government (as thus constituted) is competent and bound to provide. If the interest of the community or of the government require a proper direction of the industry of the people, of the commercial activities of the people, of the education of the people, of the religious teaching of the people, and the religious belief of the people, and these cannot easily be separated, then the government, it is said, is bound to superintend all these, is bound to provide for, and enforce them.— Some who plead for a portion of this superintendency do not desire the whole, but the principle that admits of the one, admits of the whole, and no good reason can be given why civil government may not, and in fact must not, ultimately, superintend the one, if it superintends the other. Indeed, the very idea of restricting or even defining the powers of civil government at all, is scouted by some of the most philosophical among the advocates of kingly power. "Why would you enchain civil government?" they demand "as though it were a brute, beast, and not give it a free scope for the exercise of its beneficent powers?" The truth is, kingly power, whether wielded by "the lords of the Gentiles," or the lords of nominal Christendom, in direct violation of Christ's commands, has been a brute beast from the beginning, "stamping down and treading under foot" our common humanity, and it is high time it were not simply enchained but removed, that equal and legitimate governments of the people might occupy its place.

10. The wrongfulness of exercising kingly authority over men, is manifest from the fact that it is not doing unto others, as we would have others do unto us. No man of intelligence and true manliness of character loves to be placed under the exclusive lordship and authority of others. This is true, not so much of those who hate just and salutary restraints as of those who cherish the liberty consistent with equal and wise laws. Such an one always feels himself degraded and wronged when he is compelled to submit to others the decision of questions touching vitally his own personal responsibilities and in which he knows they have no right authoritatively to interfere. No such man ever wished in his own case, to have the government dictate to him what he is to believe, or how he is to worship, or how he is to direct his industry and dispose of his products. And hence he can have no right thus to dictate to his fellow men. All manly and true christian men feel, moreover, their right and duty to participate in that social government, political and ecclesiastical, which society ought to exercise. And hence no heaven gifted few have a right to shut them out from that participation in which they must know they themselves would wish to share, if they stood in the

same place, and wielded only the same degree of intellectual and moral power.

11. The wrongfulness of exercising lordly power is manifest from its pernicious effects as already, in part, disclosed. Such power, being exclusive, and therefore unlimited, is nothing distinct from despotic power. The demoralizing and anti-christian effects of despotic power, it were superfluous, to urge, whether in the church or in the state, or in both combined, the tendency is always the same. Its character may likewise be inferred from the known tendency of Christianity to check and destroy it. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." And liberty displaces kingly domination, of course.

Other considerations might be added, but these may, for the present, suffice.

The consideration of objections, together with some practical applications, of the doctrine, must be reserved for another opportunity.

From the American Freeman.

OUGHT THE LIBERTY PARTY TO SUPPORT MEMBERS OF PRO-SLAVERY CHURCHES FOR OFFICE? NO. I.

This question, propounded to us by a Southport friend, we proceed to answer. The importance of the subject will be an excuse for the length of our reply.

The question is one that does not appear to have been thought of at the time of the organization of the Liberty Party. The founders of that party had one particular object in view, the accomplishment of which they made the end of their organization, and in determining on the means to be employed, they of course contented themselves with selecting only such as seemed best adapted to secure the end proposed. That end, was the divorce of the general government from slavery, (only as a means, however, to a still further end, viz: the complete and speedy overthrow of that abominable system,) and consequently, the end being political, the means were to also, and had respect only to the political relations and actions of men. The test of membership was the abandonment of political parties then existing. Farther than this, the founders went not, for farther than this the times had not gone. It is true that many, even then, had turned their attention to the pro-slavery churches, and some had gone so far as to insist on the duty of seceding from them, in order to consistency of character as abolitionists, but none thought of saying that a man must come out of such churches, in order to his being considered a Liberty man, and a proper person to be supported by the party as a candidate for office. But in the onward march of events, and in perfect accordance with a law governing the progress of all reformations, the case is now greatly altered. And the question with which we sat out, is rapidly becoming a mooted one, among those who intend that their actions as well as words shall tell against oppression. Many, in various portions of the country are asking it, and the discussion which is the result, is by no means confined to the lips of private individuals, but is making its way extensively into the public press, numerous articles on the subject having already made their appearance in several of the Liberty papers. Nor is this

all; for with the discussion has also come action even now; there being many who have co-operated with the Liberty party, who now stand aloof from it, solely on account of its nomination and support of those, who, though staunch Liberty men, are yet connected with the pro-slavery churches. Nor is the number of these seceders so small as to be of no consequence, nor are they all men of little or no influence in the party, for there are extensive sections of the country, where the principle is being adopted, and among those who have given in their adhesion to it, are some who have made their names honorable, as among the strongest pillars of the Liberty organization. Only a few weeks ago, we had occasion to chronicle the withdrawal of Edward Smith, of Pittsburg, than whom few have been more ardent and untiring in their efforts in the liberty cause, or more eminently successful in making the party what it now is. And the reasons which he gives for his course, are of a character that can hardly fail to exert a powerful influence upon the minds of many in different parts of the land.

Under these circumstances, it cannot but be evident to all, that a careful examination of the question which we have placed at the head of this article, is of the utmost importance.—The question itself, is one of no common magnitude, and even if it were not so, the effects which have already resulted from its discussion, and still more, those which we may expect will result, are of such a nature as not only to justify, but also to require, the investigation. The truth upon this subject, whatever it may be, cannot but concern all true abolitionists, since it cannot but concern three millions of slaves, and even a heathen could say, "Whatever concerns man, concerns me."

But in what we shall say, we wish it distinctly understood, that we do not pretend to dogmatize, nor undertake to pronounce authoritatively on the point in controversy.—Rather we wish to be considered as throwing out hints for our readers, and inviting them to examine and decide for themselves, that in a matter of such moment, each one may be prepared to act as his own sober judgment and honest convictions of duty shall dictate. Our remarks are made without much reflection, and therefore will necessarily be very desultory, as we opine will be fully apparent before we have done.

That we may get at the bottom of the subject, we are led to inquire in the first place what is the fundamental principle of the Liberty party? For if supporting members of pro-slavery churches be not in accordance with that principle, then it is clearly wrong. Doubtless the Liberty party has many foundation principles, but if there be any one more prominent and universally admitted than the others, it is that it is wrong to vote for a pro-slavery man. On that point, all Liberty men are agreed. It is the cardinal feature of the whole system. Take that away, and that system falls at once, and there is neither vestige nor ruin left. Here is common ground. The only question then, is, whether a member of a pro-slavery church is a pro-slavery man. Not whether he must be.—Not whether some, nor many of the members

of such a church are pro-slavery, but whether they all are. An affirmative answer to these points, must of course decide the other in the negative. And the meaning we attach to the word pro-slavery, evidently must decide the whole. What then is its meaning? Many seem to think, that no man can be pro-slavery unless he believes slavery to be right, and wishes and labors for its perpetuation.—But this certainly cannot be true, for then it would follow, that in matters of religion no man could be a hypocrite, provided he thought he was a Christian; in other words, there could be no such thing as deception. Most surely a man may wish to be anti-slavery, may mean to be so, and may honestly think he is so, and yet be doing those very things which prove him to be otherwise. Pro-slavery means for slavery, in favor of it, supporting or upholding it. Of course then there is such a thing as pro-slavery in fact, as well as in heart, and pro-slavery too, in fact, without the heart. In other words, a man may do things, which favor slavery, and yet not know it; he may uphold the system in fact when he opposes it manfully in intention.—Of course, then, we do not deny that there are a great many members of pro-slavery churches, who are in heart thorough going abolitionists, and sincere Liberty men; but the question is, whether by their connection with these churches they are not exerting an influence, which in reality is against the slave. If they are, then the fact of their honesty of intention no more destroys the pro-slavery character of their conduct, than the honesty of many of the whigs in voting for Henry Clay, proves that they may not properly be called pro-slavery men. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and "actions speak louder than words."

(To be Continued.)

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, SEPTEMBER, 1846.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

ALBANY, Sept. 4th 1846.

Dear Readers,—We have just held our "second convention for Bible Missions." It occupied Wednesday and Thursday, the 2d and 3rd, inst. The special object was to discuss the proper principles and methods of conducting Christian Missions, and enter into such arrangements as might be found necessary for promoting them. Brethren were in attendance from remote and distant parts of the Country. J. H. Payno minister from Illinois, presided. From N. Y. City we had Lewis Tappan, Theodore S. Wright, A. A. Phelps, and C. H. Ray, from Williamsburg, S. S. Jocelyn and J. R. Johnson, from Connecticut, Josiah Brower, (formerly missionary at Smyrna) J. W. C. Pennington and W. W. Patten. These brethren were mostly connected with the Union Miss-

ionary Society and represented its claims.—Pros. Mahan, from Oberlin, represented the Western Evangelical Missionary Society.—Statements were also made concerning the West India Missionary Committee, at Boston, Dr. Lafon, formerly missionary at the Sandwich Islands, and C. S. Renshaw, from the Jamaica Mission were also in attendance together with President Gagon, and other well known friends of the cause. Much earnest discussion was held, characterized by a spirit of great brotherly kindness. The result was the conclusion that a new organization ought to be formed, which was accordingly done, under the name of the AMERICAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION. One of its distinguishing features is the encouragements and facilities it affords for the operations of local missionary Societies, Churches, and other bodies who may choose to appoint and sustain their own missionaries communicating with them through the Committee and Treasurer of the association at New York City. At the same time, the Committee is simply commissioned to honor the responsibilities of a Missionary Committee in the employment of missionaries, under such regulations as were thought proper to secure Christian freedom of missionaries and mission churches from the exercise of exorbitant and irresponsible power. The anti-slavery character of the organization, we trust, will not come into dispute and its position in respect to "organic sins" and fraternization with apostate Churches, it is hoped, will be found to contrast strongly with that of the American Board. Its Constitution will be published along with the proceedings of the Convention, together with an address, and perhaps, other interesting documents. The members of the Convention at the close of their sittings, were highly gratified with the interview and its result. Let the friends of Christian Missions turn their attention to this new association, and if they find it deserving of their confidence, assist it by their co-operation and their prayers.

WM. GOODELL

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, September, 1846.

T. Hopkins, Scotia, N. Y.	80.50	L. Tappan, N. York.	
H. Drasser, N. York	1.00	J. Brower, N. H., Conn.	
J. M. Ward, Albany,	1.00	S. Wells, Peterboro	
J. Harrison, Troy,	1.00	McCarrick, Rome,	
J. H. Payno, Half Day	1.00	P. Field, Charlestown,	
Illinois.	1.00	Mass.	
R. T. A. Alberty, Alden	0.50	A. Mahan, Oberlin,	
Ill.	0.50	S. T. Comstock, Torr,	
J. Alberty Lockport,	0.50	Mass.	
J. Roberts do	0.50	E. Twing do	
R. Anderson, Gaines	1.00	J. Conledge, Hartford,	
S. Joiner, South Barre	0.50	Conn.	
H. Wright, London	0.50	J. Mead, Greenwich,	
A. Tenney, Yates	0.50	Conn.	
R. O. Shepard No	0.50	W. Cotton Wamp-	
Ridgeway,	0.50	ville for Self, & H.	
A. Hutchinson, Gaines	1.00	H. Hall, Lenox,	
L. Gaylord, Soda,	1.00	E. Hawley, Bingham-	
C. Arnold, Honeoyo,	0.50	ton,	
S. Towbridge, Kent-	0.50	J. A. Northup, Low-	
vill Ia.	0.50		

The Editor expects to be absent from home two months, Sept. and Oct. Letters and remittances will be attended to, on his return. Some letters received just before his leaving home, have to be deferred for the same reason, the books being in the hands of the printer at a distance from the Editor's residence.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. IV—No. 10.
WHOLE NUMBER, 51.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. OCTOBER, 1816.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANTE, IX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR. TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve
numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and
pay the money without expense to the publisher, shall
have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six
subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or,
procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his
services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separate from
the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

One dozen, 60 50 | Sixty papers, 60 00
Eight papers for 1 00 | One hundred papers, 3 00

Sermons for the Times.

BY WILLIAM GOODELL.

ON II. CHRIST'S PROHIBITION OF KINGLY POWER.

See Luke xxii. 24—27 and Mark x. 42.

[Concluded.]

Having considered the import of Christ's
prohibition in the text, together with the rea-
sons for such a prohibition, we now proceed,
as proposed, to the consideration of
OBJECTIONS.

Among the objections urged against the
doctrine advanced we may notice the follow-

1. It is demanded—Are not some
gifted with just such qualities as are adapt-
ed to the work of governing? Distinguished
wisdom, power, magnanimity, heroism?
Are not such men born to govern? Can
they exert themselves, give appropriate exer-
cise to their characteristic powers, without
ruling, whatever may be the circle of their
activity?

In answer to this objection may perhaps
be gathered from what has already been said;
it may be proper to add that so far as gov-
ernment (that is, protection and guidance) is
exercised and afforded by correct teach-
ing and examples, it is doubtless true that those
who are distinguished for the gifts described
are divinely commissioned to govern, yet even
government requires for its highest effica-
cy the consent of the governed, without which
it is powerless either to guide or to protect.—
The divine right of teaching, in those who
are qualified, so far from conflicting with the

doctrine of this discourse, conflicts rather
with that view of civil and ecclesiastical gov-
ernment which grows out of the opposite doc-
trine of the divine right of kings and prelates,
which knows of no limit to their powers, and
accordingly vests in either one or both of
them, the right to select teachers for the peo-
ple, which is equivalent to the right of deter-
mining who shall teach, and who shall not
teach. And thus, the civil or ecclesiastical
authorities to whom the people must reverent-
ly bow down, must decide whether or no those
may teach whom God has commissioned and
qualified for that very purpose, and whom,
were it not for this impertinent superintenden-
cy, the people might be disposed to receive.
Though never so well disposed to
select wisely, the civil or ecclesiastical offi-
cials, like other men, are liable to err, and if
the authority rightly appertains to them, then
it does not belong to the people, and they
have no right to select for themselves! So that
it is the doctrine of the divine right of prelates
and kings, and not the opposite doctrine main-
tained in the preceding discourse that con-
tradicts the divine right of the wise hearted to
teach all those who will be instructed by them.
It is only in the absence of kingly authority
and lordship over the people, that all of them,
including the wisest and best, can have free
scope for the exercise for the powers adapted
to guide and protect.

And this leads me to the further remarks
that all men are in some measure and that
most men are, in a considerable degree, gifted
with such qualities as are adapted to govern,
if they will take the pains to improve them,
and if they are permitted to do so. And hence
no one man nor select few, should be recog-
nized as holding, exclusively, this prerogative
of governing.

But in respect to authoritative control and
government, involving judicial decisions in the
name of the community, whether in the
Church or in the State, the discipline and ex-
clusion of offenders in the one, and penal in-
flictions in the other, enough has already been
said to show that the work belongs, inherent-
ly to the masses, and not to any individual or
select few, however gifted, unless deriving

their just powers, under God, from the peo-
ple themselves.

Obj. 2. It is said: We are not to confound
government with misgovernment, nor sham
kings with real kings, nor protection with op-
pression, nor the abuse of kingly power with
its proper exercise. And hence the tyranny
exercised, whether in Church or State, or in
the two combined, is not to be cited as an ar-
gument against the just and appropriate use
of their powers, nor urged as a reason why
these powers should be abridged. Let us
rather (say the objectors) content ourselves
with demanding that humanity and that justice
(in the persons of our "wisest and best"
whom we may discover to be true real kings,
and recognize at the ballot box as such) shall
have their full sway. Let us never imagine
that any thing short of the reign of humanity
and justice will bring forth their fruits. And
let us cease from the miserable expedient of
devising checks and balances against the
abuse of power, when the only thing needed is
the full and appropriate use. The form of
government is of little or no consequence.—
It is the just administration of government
that we need.

Answer. It is true that government is not
to be confounded with misgovernment nor the
abuse of power with its proper exercise. It
is true that a proper administration of govern-
ment is the great thing needed, and true like-
wise that no forms without the living presence
of humanity and justice can avail any thing.
Yet it is true, nevertheless, that some things
commonly recognized as government are, es-
sentially, misgovernment—that there is a
power the very exercise of which is an abuse
—that there are forms of government which in
themselves are contradictions of humanity and
violations of justice, inasmuch that the fruits
of righteousness, except in very stunted meas-
ures, cannot grow out of them.

Humanity is contradicted and justice is vio-
lated in the very fact of that kingly authority
of the few over the many which Christ for-
bids in the text. Human nature is essentially
the same in all men, and the complete subjec-
tion of one man to the control of another, and
especially of the many to the few, is a prac-

Error in Argument

tient contraction of that truth. It assumes and rests upon the falsehood, either that the governed are *less* than human, or that the governors are *more*. And justice is violated because the authority that rightfully belongs to all, and should be wielded in common, is monopolized by a few. It is likewise a practical contradiction of humanity and a violation of justice for any government, ecclesiastical or civil, and wielded either by the few or the many, by "Society" or by cliques, to usurp the authoritative control and direction of individual activities *beyond certain definite bounds*. God intended individuals to be *self-directed*, in the discharge of peculiar duties resting upon them and in which society has no occasion or right to interfere.

The right to use our own faculties, to direct our own industry, to dispose of our own earnings and products, to choose our own teachers, to form and express our own opinions, to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences, to teach those who will receive our teachings, *these* are personal rights, essential to our moral agency, in the free exercise of which, in any manner not inconsistent with the equal rights of others, civil government, which involves compulsory restraint, cannot intermeddle without impairing and infringing them, thus becoming an aggressor instead of a protector.

It avails nothing to plead that the security of human rights and the existence of civil government itself depend on the industry, education, religious trainings and faith of the citizen. All this is true, and equally true that the security of human rights and the existence of civil government, nay, of human beings, themselves, depend on many other things. Civil government cannot provide or control. The state of man's hearts and the condition of the atmosphere, essential as they are, lie beyond the reach of governmental supervision, but not more so than individual industry, education and religious faith. A Monarchist may remind us that "no free State was ever upheld by its own coercive power."

The thing cannot be, any more than matter can be self-moved. To overlook this, is simply to forget that man is not omnipotent, and that civil governments are to be administered by men. Is it not marvellous that men that are by no means atheists should forget that civil government cannot do *all* for us in the way of protection and guidance, that needs to be done—that it can cover only a

very *small* part of the field covered by the *divine* government, and that the *divine* origin and sanction of civil government for certain purposes and within certain bounds, does by no means prove the right of civil government to attempt all that the *divine* government proposes.

The divine institution of civil government, so far from furnishing an argument for the competency of civil government to cover the whole ground of the divine government, proves the very reverse. If civil government derives its authority from a higher power, then, like all other derived governments, it is a *limited* government, of course, unless it can be made to appear that the Creator has abdicated his throne in its favor, for no supreme government can be supposed to delegate away the *whole* of its power, nor more than a *small part* of it to governors of very narrow, inferior, and limited powers. In order to maintain the sentiment that civil government is not circumscribed within narrow limits, which it were usurpation to transgress, it must be made evident that civil government is *undirected* from a higher source, and rules in its *own right*. Just in proportion as the government of God is kept out of sight, does the sphere of civil government become *enlarged*, approximating to ubiquity, and *unlimited* control. And just in proportion as God's government is kept in view, do the functions of civil government become narrow, and circumscribed. This we see, every day. Those who forget God, imagine that they are bound to obey the commands of civil government, "right or wrong;" but those who remember and honor God, understand their duty of judging for themselves whether or no the mandates of civil government ought to be obeyed. A limited civil government is the necessary result of the fear of the Lord. And as to the complaint that civil government cannot be preserved, nor its ends reached, without invading the original personal rights that have been mentioned, it may well be dismissed. If civil government cannot exist, or reach its ends without the *evident* subversion of those very ends, then let it cease to exist. Let us never resort to so miserable an expedient as that of sacrificing the end for the preservation of the means.

Similar remarks may be made in respect to church government. The end is of more importance than the means, and the rights of the

individual members of Christ's body are not to be sacrificed for its preservation or benefit. The right to teach, to select our teachers, form and express opinions, and to follow the dictates of conscience, are to be preserved unimpaired. This remark is not to be construed into a denial of the right of the assembled brotherhood to admonish the erring, and to withdraw fellowship from those who depart essentially, in doctrine and practice, from Christian faith, and cannot be reclaimed. Every individual has an original right to do as he lists. It is no invasion of other's rights, but only an exercise of his own. But the remark does deny the right of any one Christian, or a portion of them, to dictate, authoritatively, those matters, for *other* Christians, admitted and recognized to be such. It *does* deny the right of any church ruler, or any assembly of Christians to impose authoritatively any terms or conditions of church membership and privileges, other than satisfactory evidence of Christian character and faith in Christ. Whoever does this, assumes the kingly authority in the church that Christ forbids, and one Christian has no more right than another to shut acknowledged Christians out of the Church, or to "lord it over their faith" while they remain there.

Obj. 3. It is objected that power begets responsibility and that *might* is therefore a measure of *right*. The right "the strong govern the weak," it is said, results from the duty to guide and protect them.

Answer. (1) So far as the auspicious guidance and protection of teaching and example are concerned, it is true that the wisest, who are strongest, are bound and commissioned to form more of it than those who are less wise and strong—but not to perform those services *exclusively*, since they do not possess all wisdom and strength. The weakest and simplest are able and bound to contribute their share. So that the right of exclusive government, even in this sense, cannot pertain to a few, to the exclusion of the many. Besides, the wisest have no power thus to guide and protect, by their teaching and example, without the "consent of the governed." The power, after all, is to be derived through the consent. The very principle, therefore, assumed in the objection, confirms our doctrine that the *right* (along with the *power*) of the ruler, comes under God, through "the consent of the governed." Let any of the even gifted few, who doubt this, make the experiment and see, whether they can guide and protect men by their superior wisdom, without their consent! Christ himself never

or promises to do this! He protects those who consent to his sway over them, and who voluntarily obey the truth.

(2) So far as authoritative and compulsory government are concerned, it is equally certain that no individual or select few, however strong they may be, can hold the exclusive right of governing, even upon the maxim, that might begets right! The wisdom of Solomon tried with the strength of Sampson could enable no one man, nor select senate of men, to rule a nation without the consent of the masses, nor protect it—no! nor even protect themselves—without their assistance! And thus the claim of kingly authority, as derived from the maxim that might confers right (however sound that maxim might be) falls to the ground. No human governors can govern without "the consent of the governed," and therefore, according to the maxim itself, they can have no right to do so, since the right cannot go beyond the might.

(3) But the maxim itself may be questioned, meaning is not very clear; but as the phrase has been commonly used and understood, it veils a falsehood instead of a truth. It is true that the mere power of doing a certain thing conveys the right of doing that thing. For then all men have a right to do every thing they have done, for they have done nothing which they had not power to do! Might confers right, or is synonymous with right, when nobody can be convicted of wrong doing for they have not acted beyond the scope of their powers. It is not creditable that this is what good men mean by the maxim, when they affirm that might confers right. When we shall explain their meaning, they will be better understood. Thus much they do seem to intend, that the power to govern confers the right to govern. Tyrants and aggressors of all ages have pleaded that same right, and in construction of the maxim it is not difficult to understand. The Saxons had power to conquer England, and therefore they had a right to conquer and govern it, and their posterity were God gifted, and thence God commissioned to extend their government over Africa and India. The weaker nations whom they subdued lacked the power and therefore the right to govern! This has been said by philosophers and believed by moralists and common men. Something like this seems more abhorred at by Carlyle, the great modern champion of the maxim that, might begets right. The conquest of Mexico by Cortez and the second attempted conquest by our own government, as well as the authoritative control of the Africans, have been gravely justified on the same ground. They are incapable of self-government, it is said, and we of the noble

Anglo-Saxon race, are God gifted to govern them. To be sure (it is sometimes added) we must take care to govern and not misgovern—we must not crush but protect. It is nevertheless our vocation to govern. All this seems plausible, upon the principle that the mere power to govern, confers the right. But is the principle a sound one? Can it be reconciled with the prohibition of Christ, in the text?

How do we know that might confers right? "God has almighty power, and he has a sovereign and universal right to govern." Very true! But does it follow that the right is predicated solely upon the power? How do we know that his right to govern has not some other basis than his mere power? The two things go together, we know. Is it therefore certain that the one is founded on the other, and that power first, and right afterwards, as its consequent, is the true order?—Is power so undeniably more excellent and lovely than right, that this precedence should be awarded to it? How does it appear that right is not the primary idea, instead of power? Does the Bible make more of God's power than his righteousness? Does he claim authority merely because he has power? Examine and see. "The Lord is a God of righteousness. He governs in righteousness. His precepts are right. Who knows but what the chief foundation of his authority lies here? In that case, the demand—"Are not my ways equal?" acquires a meaning quite distinct from the demand—"Have I not the power?"

A definition of power may indeed be made, which would identify it with the right. The supreme power, it may be said, is goodness, benevolence, love. And these confer the right to govern. Very good! But goodness, benevolence or love, does not authorize the kingly authority of men over men. It forbids them! We have the mandate in the text. Let this be obeyed; and "the divine right of kings" and prelates will soon become obsolete. "There is none good but God," and he only can govern absolutely and in his own right.

When certain philosophers taught, in Paul's time that gain is godliness, he immediately contradicted them by affirming that godliness is gain! Did he only amuse himself with a mere play upon words? Did he teach the identity of godliness with gain? Did he only vary the language and retain the meaning of the sophistries he exposed?

By no means! They placed gain before godliness. He placed godliness before gain. They taught that gain (advantage, happiness)

was the supreme good. He taught that godliness (virtue, holiness) is the supreme good. They taught that any thing that was profitable was therefore virtuous and god-like. He taught that nothing but the virtuous and the god-like, could be profitable to man. They taught the same doctrines of utility and expediency that have been taught for nearly a century past, with such blighting effect by Hume, Hobbs, Goodwin, Voltaire, Paley, and Dr. Taylor of N. Haven. Paul affirmed that philosophy to be the "perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds."

Without affirming the cases to be parallel, it may be inquired whether a similar transposition of terms might not improve the maxim under review. Instead of saying that might confers right, suppose we say that the right is clothed with resistless power. Instead of looking after the might in order to ascertain the right (as some look after the expedient in order to ascertain the just) let us rather find out what is right in itself, and ask, with whom has God invested the right to govern, not doubting that the necessary might will be found there, in the end. The responsibilities imposed upon individuals, afford a sufficient guaranty of the corresponding powers of self-direction in individuals. The responsibilities resting on the associated masses of men afford equal proof that God has conferred corresponding powers on those masses. Their neglect or abuse of those powers, and the disasters that may follow, God knows how to resist and dispose of, as well, in their case, as he does in the case of the select few on whom he may have conferred distinguished powers. He can manage to control his universe without the exclusive activity of either of them.

Obj. 4. It is objected to the doctrine that rulers "derive their authority, under God, from the consent of the governed," that the popular choice confers on the men selected, no new powers, and that men not heaven-gifted to be kings cannot be transformed into kings by this process.

This objection would have more weight, if Christ had intended to provide for any kingly power over mankind, by their fellows. As he did not intend it, but has forbidden it, we can afford the inconvenience the more easily.

It is doubtless true that no people may choose incompetent men to administer government for them, but this evil would not be removed by the prevalence of the sentiment that rulers do not, in any sense, derive their authority from the consent of the people.—God does not miraculously select them for us.

He obliges us to use our own eyes in the selection. Suppose we should say that by the ballot-box we only recognize, but do not authorize our rulers who are to govern us?—They govern us, nevertheless, and we have to abide the consequences of our bad selection, in the one case, as well as in the other. And the God-gifted few with their exalted powers, are not likely to come to our relief, and govern us, beneficially, without our consent.—Whatever may be their powers, they do not become our rulers, either in church or in State, until they are, somehow, installed into office. And if we should relinquish the right of choosing our rulers, and let them provide their own successors, we should seldom be blessed with men of the proper qualifications, by that means, as the experiment has proved.

Obj. 5. It has been objected that in discarding the "divine right of kings" we discard the divine right and bending authority of civil government and reduce it to a mere human compact.

This objection cannot lie against the doctrine we maintained, which is that God has invested society or communities of men, with such responsibilities and duties, growing out of their natural relations, established by him, as lays a foundation for a government, the officers of which shall derive their authority, under God, from the appointment of the community. Here, then, (but no where else) is a firm and sure foundation for the divine authority and sanction of government. Take away the link of popular sovereignty, as thus explained, and the chain by which the civil magistrate would bind his authority to the divine throne would be found altogether defective. The "succession" either in Church or in State, cannot be made out! You have dethroned civil government and Church government, and left both of them impostors and cheats! With the simple exception of the man of Nazareth, no human being has ever exhibited the credentials requisite, on the principle that the masses, irrespective of their consent, must be authoritatively controlled by the heaven anointed one. [And it is a remarkable fact, which should have been noted in its proper place, that even he refused, all qualified as he was, to supplant the arrangement which the community had made for its government, by allowing his zealous disciples to proclaim him king. Fresh evidence, that he, as a man, would not wield civil power, without the consent of his countryman.] Where then, it might be demanded, are the credentials of your heaven anointed magistrates? By what visible insignia shall they be revealed to our vision? What are the marks by which the men are to be known

in whom are vested the tremendous powers of controlling their fellows, and giving them laws? Constitutions? Legislations? Judicial decisions? Whence their binding authority and force? Thus reasoned the infidel Goodwin, by whose philosophy happiness was the supreme good, and utility, virtue, and duty, were but an outcome of consequences.—*Society*, he affirmed, had no right to interfere with his calculations of consequences! Having thus denied to the people—the community—the right to punish crime, it was easy for him to deny the right of any select few who might assume the prerogative. Admit that right in the people, and you may then trace it to the magistrates whom they appoint. Church government and discipline, too, must be seen to inhere in the common brotherhood, in the first place, or, most assuredly, they can be found to be authorized no where else! As a government among men, therefore, derived from God, must be limited, and well defined, in its scope, and jurisdiction, so likewise, it must be traced through the *consent of the masses*, in order to exhibit its *divine authority and sanction*.

APPLICATION.

The practical uses of our doctrine have been partly exhibited already, and every reflecting mind will readily extend the hints that have been given. Yet the bearing of the subject is too extensive and important to be lightly dismissed.

1. Our subject disposes of the much disputed question whether there be any thing essentially sinful in the mere exercise of despotic power, provided it be not abused.

Let this question be distinctly understood.—It is not whether it is wrong for a man to have the *physical strength* that would enable him, if so disposed, to exercise despotic power. Nor whether he is to be blamed for having those powers of *intellect* which would enable him, if so disposed, to bring his fellow men under his exclusive and authoritative control. Nor whether it is sinful for him to live in a community whose usages, legislative enactments, and judicial decisions, would enable him, if so disposed, to exercise despotic power over a portion of his equal fellow men, while, at the same time, he openly condemns and discountenances these usages and laws, and does not avail himself of them, to wield despotic power.

But the simple question is, whether a man having the physical and intellectual powers described, and being enabled by existing usages and laws, may innocently avail himself of these facilities, and use them in exercising a despotic control over his fellows, so long as he only exercises without abusing his power?

It is very common to say that there is nothing morally wrong in the mere exercise of such a power, provided it be not abused. This doctrine is avowed on a great variety of occasions, and for the justification of a great variety of practices.

Some say there is nothing sinful in the mere exercise of despotic authority, in a State, provided that authority be not abused. They say that Christianity does not forbid disciples to exercise the absolute authority of the eastern monarchs, where all the power is in the hands of a single person, (and those whom he confides it during his pleasure, where the power of the supreme monarch is not limited by any constitutional restrictions, and where the power descends, in hereditary succession, from father to son, and all without the consent of the subjects. It may be the duty, they say, of a young man, heir to such an authority, if converted to Christianity, to continue in the exercise of such an authority, taking care not to abuse it, and wielding it for the good of his subjects.

Some say there is nothing sinful in the exercise of absolute authority in the Church. The Pope, as successor of St. Peter, they think, is divinely commissioned to exercise such power. Others, who cannot exactly affirm this, maintain that the Church has the right to make the arrangements that are made, for confiding this power to the Pope. The authority, by this theory, resides in the Church universal, in the first place, but in the Pope and his successors, duly elected, lawfully exercise the control. The office of the Pope is elective, and Roman Catholics in America commonly say that although he is indeed the successor of St. Peter, yet he is elevated by the suffrage of the Cardinals to act for the Church as our President elect acts for the people, (tho' people by the by, not choose the Cardinals) the power of the Pope is derived through the Church, and can see nothing wrong in the simple fact of his exercising authority over the church universal. The Cardinals it must be supposed (as is commonly professed) admit the right resting upon them to select the "wisest and best" of those who are eligible by the laws (or Constitutions) of the church. Whether doing this, they suppose they confer powers on the person elected, or only acknowledge and reverently bow down to the Lord's anointed, the result is much the same. The doctrine of the "divine right of kings" is a fortune, along with the worship of the Church heroes who hazarded their lives in the persecutions, indisputably gave rise to

authority of the Pope. And probably in the most instances the selections were well made. For is it easy to see why the theory of Papal (or furtherly) supremacy does not become at least plausible, when once the "divine right of kings" comes to be believed among Christians. And why?" It might be asked, "should the abuse of an institution be made the pretext for its abolition?" Thus Roman Catholics in America do reason. To meet successfully the advocates of Papal authority, must we not repudiate the "divine right of kings" and for prelates?

Others, as in the Greek Church, regret the Papal authority, but confide the exercise of somewhat similar powers, to a select number of ecclesiastical dignitaries—making their church polity very much what that of the Romish Church would be if the Cardinals, on the demise of a Pope, should refuse to elect a successor, and assume the joint government of the Church themselves. In case of being suddenly puzzled and discordant (as is often the case) to find out their God-gifted hero, a head taller than his fellows, suppose the Romish Cardinals should adventure upon this expedient, as the prelates of the Greek Church formerly did, and suppose the Roman Catholic Church like the Greek Church, should yield to its tacit assent. We should only have a change of the form without a relinquishment of the principle of priestly domination. The divine right of kingly authority in Christ's house would still be retained.

Some, who reject the Papal authority as anti-Christian, and who object likewise to the polity of the Greek Church, maintain, nevertheless the divine right of *Episcopacy*, or of diocesan Bishops, superintending a number of local churches and their presbyters, or pastors. In the church of England, this Episcopal power is in some measure responsible to the reigning monarch, as appointed head of the Anglican Church. And so the English monarch stands in place of the Pope. In America, a General Episcopal Convention, in which the clergy and laity are both represented, hold a degree of superintending power over the whole Church, thus supplying the place of the English monarch. In all these arrangements the principle of lordly authority over the mass of the brotherhood, is nevertheless maintained. In defence of this practice, (as also in the Romish and Greek Churches,) the grand plea both in England and America, is the innocence of exercising despotic power, provided the power be not abused.

Some who reject Episcopacy as unscriptural and dangerous, because it elevates some Clergymen over the heads of other Clergy-

men, can nevertheless perceive no danger, nor departure from Scripture, in the elevation of the Clergy, as they are called, over the laity, that is, over all the rest of the common brotherhood of Christians! By some of these, the power of the church is made to reside in Church Session, the pastor included, and presiding. Over a number of these Church Sessions is the Presbytery, over a number of Presbyteries is the Synod, over a number of Synods, is the General Assembly, composed of Clergy and Elders, from whose decision, as from the decision of the Pope, there is no appeal. This is the polity of Presbyterianism. And those who object to its despotic features are met with the answer that it is only in the abuse, and not merely in the exercise of such power, that the evil lies. And the mere abuse of a power is no argument, say they, for the disuse of it.

Some who reject Presbyterianism, retain in a Church Committee, nearly all the powers of a Presbyterian Church Session. In addition to this, in some instances, a Consociation, composed of an equal number of Clergymen and lay delegates (thus giving to one Clergyman as much power as to the entire number of the church he presides over!) supplies, substantially, in some respects, the place of the Presbytery. Besides this, there is the association of Pastors of a number of neighboring churches, who assume without direct authority from the churches to "license" all candidates to the ministry in the first place, and then, when from among these "licensed" ones, a church selects its pastor, the usage, equivalent to law, requires that he be ordained by the Clergy and their approbation of the candidate (though previously "licensed") is necessary to his "orderly" settlement as pastor! Then comes the General Association of Pastors of perhaps an entire State, with its supervision of the County Associations, and its Pastoral Addressed to the churches under their charge." This is the Congregationalism of Connecticut. In Massachusetts and other States, the "Consociation" is discarded but the rest is retained. And all is defended on the same principle that it is only the abuse, and not the mere exercise of such power that is to be condemned.

Thus the exercise of despotic power is justified, in the Church and in the State. It would be strange if individuals, conscious of wielding adequate powers, should not profit by the lesson thus preached to them, and conclude that there is nothing wrong in the mere exercise of despotic power, provided it be not abused. This accordingly, is the plea set up by the Slave holder, and set up especially, in

his behalf, by the very persons who are most intent on wielding similar powers, in the Church and in the State, and skilled in urging on the same principle, their own lordly claims. As specimens of these reasonings we might select the celebrated argument in the Biblical Reporter and Princeton Review, in the Autumn of 1844, and extensively circulated in an extra of the Princeton Whig—also, the essays of Leonard Bacon, D. D. of New-Haven, in the N. Y. Evangelist, in 1840. In both of these papers the ground is distinctly taken that there is no sin in the mere exercise of despotic power, provided it be not abused.—Direct references are made to the despotic power of the Eastern monarchs, and the innocence of exercising such power, without abusing it, is distinctly affirmed. And thus the American people, and the many ambitious aspirants among them, including Slave holders, are unequivocally told by our religious teachers that the subversion of our liberties, and the establishment of an absolute despotism in its stead, would be no sin, provided such despotic power were merely exercised and not abused! The current notion idea of what would constitute an abuse of despotic power may be inferred from the ordinary action of our "Ecclesiastical Courts" as well as from the common belief and testimony of such ecclesiastics that the Slaves in general, especially those in the hands of Christian slave holders are, in general, well used! If the future Caesar and Constantine of America, in the innocent exercise of despotic power shall but treat the mass of American people equally well, he may calculate, it would seem, upon a hearty welcome and without reproof unto the high places of the American Church! All this, on a soil once trod by a Witherspoon and a Stiles! ‡

Now all this apology or rather defence of the exercise, without the abuse, of despotic power, in the church, in the state, and on the plantation, becomes plausible enough on the principle of the divine right of the powerful

¶ "And can the liberties of a people be thought secure, when their principal safeguard is removed—the belief that those liberties are the gift of God, that they cannot be violated but with his wrath?"—Jefferson.

Will it be said that our liberties would not be violated by the "exercise" of a despotism over us? If not, then the theology of Jefferson is of a higher standard than that of Princeton and New Haven!

‡ Dr. Witherspoon of New Jersey, a clergyman, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, with its self evident truths. President Stiles wrote a book against the divine right of kings, and vindicating the Judges who sentenced King Charles to death, for exercising despotic power. Those who have read the book (seldom met with now) can remember, perhaps, whether it was only the abuse or the "exercise" or even "claim" of despotic power, that the writer condemned. The claim of the British Parliament "to bind the Colonies in all cases whatsoever" was the claim of despotic power, and this claim the revolutionary fathers resisted to blood.

to control the feeble, of the gifted few to govern the inferior many, and especially, to do this without their consent! If this doctrine be true, what shall prevent those who have the power, and who think themselves the wisest and best, from having all things in their own way? And what help or hope is there for the masses of men? Who has ever known despotic power exercised by men, without being abused? Who are fit to be trusted with such power? And how can we, even in theory, separate the exercise of such power from its abuse? No man ever claimed or vindicated the *abuse* of power? And few men exercising despotic power were ever convinced of their *abuse* of it, until convinced that the exercise *itself* is an abuse. The case of the slave holder is not the only one, in which it is found, by experiment, that the things commonly complained of, as abuses, are inherent in the system itself, and it may well be questioned whether despotic power in the church or in the state can ever be maintained or exercised, (any more than on the plantation without the perpetration of injuries which must be acknowledged to be such. In order to maintain the exercise of despotic power in the state the civil and political rights of the people must be taken away.—In order to maintain the exercise of despotic power in the church, the religious rights of the brotherhood must be infringed. In order to maintain the exercise of despotic power on the plantation the personal rights of the slave must be denied. In all these cases, the exercise of despotic power becomes itself an abuse, a wrong. A "despotic" ruler is "absolute in power, independent of control from men, constitution or laws." The exclusive claim of the gifted one or few to govern the many, without their consent, must certainly be described as the claim of despotic power, and the writers already cited as defending it, do not hesitate to use that term. But by whatever term the claim is described, the grand question of the age is whether the claim and exercise of such authority is sinful?

This question is most explicitly answered in the affirmative, by our Savior, in the words of the text. "The kings of the Gentiles exercise authority upon them, and are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so."

"Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you." Tell me not, he seems to say, that ye will not abuse your authority, and

* Noah Webster—To this definition it may be added that constitutions and legislative enactments become, of themselves, despotic, whenever they infringe, impair, or supersede the exercise of natural and original, personal rights.

therefore ye may lawfully exercise it. To "exercise authority" to "exercise lordship" over your equal brethren, is the very thing I have prohibited. Among my disciples, I will have none of it. Ye shall exercise no such authority in the state. Ye shall exercise no such authority in the Church. Ye shall exercise no such authority over your laborers, who reap down your fields. All ye are brethren, and one is your Master, even Christ.

Despotic power in the church, in the state, and on the plantation, are one and the same thing in nature, though differing in degree, and all alike are forbidden by Jesus Christ, who will allow of the exercise of no kingly authority among his subjects. The autocrat the prelate, the slave holder, have no right to "exercise authority" over their fellows.

The claim of political despotism is the claim of exclusive, unlimited power. The claim of ecclesiastical despotism is the claim of exclusive unlimited power. The claim of holding human beings in chattelhood is the claim of exclusive unlimited power. The theory, in each case, makes no account of the consent of the governed. In each case it is found that the supposed right of the strongest the wisest the best. In each case, the claimants; in varied positions; may somewhat vary the extent of their demands, and realize, in different degrees, the consummation of their desires.—Kingly authority over others, nothing more, nothing less, is the end in view, and is bounded only by that power which is made the measures of right. If the power extends to chattelhood, the right is held to extend there likewise, and if the claim of chattelhood be the most outrageous form of the claim, it is chiefly because it most completely answers, the ends of unlimited power. To recognize, verbally, the manhood of my brother, and then claim or exercise unlimited and absolute power over him, is but adding insult to injury.

2. We may trace the cause; origin; progress, consummation, fruits and relics of the great anti-Christian apostacy, the Man of sin, exalting itself above God. Its canonizing of saints, its worshipping of angels and of the virgin Mary, its priestly domination, its papal supremacy, its alliance of church and state power, its divine right of prelates, its divine right of kings, its denial of the rights of the equal brotherhood, its contempt of the people, its taking away the key of knowledge, its suppression of free inquiry, its control over literature and religious teaching, its "forbidding to buy and sell," its "forbidding to marry" all this, and the like of it, whether in the church or in the state, in the Romish communion or out of it, springs from one com-

mon cause, namely, the false philosophy and the ambitious aspirations that Christ exposed and reprobates in our text. Kingship in the state, Rabbinship in the church, Lordship, "authority," dominion, the control of the princely few over the many, of the strong over the weak, of the subtle over the simple. Here, worthily follows, of course, Rabbis, kings, prelates, saints, angels, Did they not wield kingly powers? Were they not heaven commissioned to govern? Is it not a privilege to get ourselves governed by them? And shall we not be impious unless we reverently bow down to them? Do we not, in bowing down to our "wisest and best" proceed upon the very same principle upon which we bow down to the Creator himself? And is it not as irreligious to refuse the proportional worship of the one, as of the other? Such was the process of the principle, and the results are before us! Sixteen centuries have developed them!

3. We infer, the democracy of Christianity and the Christianity of democracy, a topic that demands volumes! A Christianity including democracy; and a democracy defined by Christianity, are destined to revolutionize and bless the whole earth.

4. In the light of this subject, the true nature, design, extent and relative position of civil government and of church polity become apparent, and may be easily traced.

The Church and the state, with the powers appropriate severally to each of them, arise of necessity, and in the most natural manner out of the wants of man as a moral and social being, in a state of departure, as he is to so lamentable an extent, from a loving conformity to the original law of his being, the law of equal and impartial love. Were that love fully restored, in every human breast, there would be little remaining to be done, either by the church or by the state.—No rights being infringed, no necessity would remain for arrangements for the protection of rights. Some occasional division (perhaps) of labor for public objects, would be all that would be left for civil government to superintend, and whether even this would be needed, may be questioned. And when none shall need say to his brother "know ye the Lord, for all shall know him from the least to the greatest," the mission of an associated brotherhood of good men or church, if not at an end, will be very essentially reduced.

The two institutions contemplate the necessities of human beings, in the existing condition of things. Men are found to in-

to each other's rights; and it is therefore necessary that there should be public arrangements for the protection and security of those rights. Public wants are to be provided for, and it is needful that the burden be apportioned equitably between the individuals of whom the community is composed. The duty of providing for this equal security of rights and this equal apportionment of public burdens, very manifestly rests on the community at large, and the right of participating in the discharge of the duty, is commensurate with the duty itself. All men are created with equal rights and hence the duty and right of making and wielding the proper arrangements for these ends pertains to all. Hence the foundation of civil government, deriving its just powers under God, from the consent of the governed, its powers being limited, of course, to the ends already described. If a community becomes so stupid, brutal, and vicious, that it cannot provide such a civil government, the benefits of it cannot be enjoyed.—

The case admits of no remedy but through the attainment of a better character, and God has provided none. The lawlessness of the many, or of the few, or of the individual, on a larger or smaller scale, follows of course.—

A mob is an unorganized despotism, and a despotism is an organized mob. The two are identical in character, the one should not be recognized as a civil government, of divine institution, any more than the other; and both have always been curses and scourges of mankind yet in the mixed and confused state of things in this world, arrangements called governments have often been of a mixed character, partly governmental, and partly despotic or mobocratic, and thus producing mixed results.

In a civil government of the character here described as appropriate, there is no violation of Christ's prohibition of kingly power; for no individual rights are infringed and each has his proper share of the power, at once governing and governed.

The same may be said of Church organization, polity, and discipline, on the New Testament model, where each is subject to all, and to each, the spirits of the brotherhood being subject to the brotherhood. The institution of the Church is needed to supply

From the nature of the case, communities for such objects must have some assignable extent of territory, to be determined by natural boundaries, social affinities, language, &c., or implied consent.

the defects of civil government, and especially to cover another and a distinct field of human responsibility, unless taught the principles of equity, the community at large will not frame and administer a just government. But the community whose inattention and ignorance renders this teaching needful, cannot be supposed qualified and disposed to provide and supply such teaching, though they might, to a great extent, be influenced by it, if supplied. For the purpose, therefore, of maintaining the public virtue and intelligence requisite to the existence and proper use of civil government, as well as to supply the moral guidance needed in their domestic affairs, (and which civil government cannot appropriately or fully superintend) it becomes necessary that the wise and good should associate for this object. Especially is such an association needed by the higher spiritual wants of man, as an accountable being, destined to an immortality of existence, living in a state of brief probation, hastening to the awards of the final judgment, yet, (until reached by the spiritual influences needed,) dazed in trespasses and sins, under the condemning sentence of the divine law, unacquainted with the divine methods of redemption, or averse to the merciful remedies provided! And to this, the mutual need of further instruction, admonition, watch care, council, guidance, and co-operation, which good men need among themselves.

How evidently is *this* field of human responsibility distinct from that of civil government, tho' perfectly in *harmony* with it!— And how preposterous and absurd are those religious establishments by law, or those usurpations of priestly power over the state, by which the proper functions of both civil and ecclesiastical polity are either lost or marred, by being intermingled! civil polity grows out of the common responsibilities in social life, of *all* men, without distinction.— Church polity grows out of the peculiar social responsibilities of *Christians*. The common brotherhood of all mankind is the basis of citizenship in the *state*. The common brotherhood, by a spiritual new birth in Jesus Christ, is the basis of membership in the Church. The *state* wields coercive and penal power for the protection of men's natural rights. The function of the Church is purely *suasive* and spiritual. All that civil government can do for the Church is to protect its members in the enjoyment of the same rights

which all men hold in common with them.— The church, as the salt of the earth, and, the light of the world, was designed to teach political duties along with all other duties, to those who will receive her teachings, and thus she may guide and protect the state. All men residing in civil society are the subjects of civil government because the community has a right to restrain all men from violating the rights of their neighbors. No one is subject to church discipline who does not voluntarily become a member of the Church, because in the discharge of their personal responsibilities all men have a right to decide whether or no they will enter into particular Church relations, subject to God only, the sole lord of the conscience, for a right decision of the question.

When the *state* (that is, the entire community) assumes the province of dictating articles of religious faith, forms of worship, and methods of Church polity, providing religious instructors and taxing the people for their support, then is witnessed, in any nation now existing, the subjugation of the Church of Christ if any such church therein exists (and especially if it submits to it) to the control and superintendency of a world lying in wickedness, the very same wicked world that it is the business of the church to teach, to evangelize, to disciple! How any spiritually minded Christians can assent to this arrangement, it is difficult to conceive.— Such a supervision amounts, of necessity to a religious persecution, to some extent, of all dissenters from the established religion, and civil liberty along with religious liberty, is violated, of course.

When the church or its canonized saints, (its supposed "wisest and best") assume, on the score of their superior sanctity and God conferred powers, to seize, unbidden by their fellow citizens, the reins of civil government, demanding the exclusive right of control, and teaching that "earthly dominion is founded in grace"—then is witnessed the phenomenon of the invasion of human rights by those who should be the expounders and the advocates of human rights. Then is witnessed an exhibition of the spirit which Christ sought to repress in the two sons of Zebedee, James and John. Then are witnessed aspirations after a power which Jesus Christ, the Great Head of the Church would not wield, refusing, as he did, the offer of his little band of adherents to proclaim him a king.

5. We see that constant vigilance is necessary, in order to the maintenance of our

civil and religious freedom. The theory of the divine right of prelates, and of the divine right of kings, which, in the literature of Protestant Christendom, at least in America, had been considered exploded and obsolete, has been recently revived, with great zeal, not only by Romish and Anglican prelatists, exerting an influence in America, but in a far more palatable and philosophical form, in the powerful and effective writings of Thomas Carlyle. Let all Christians understand their position, and stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ maketh his people free.

6. We see what a mighty contest is in reserve before existing systems of anti-christian domination in the church, in the state, and in the domestic relations of employers and laborers, are dethroned. All these are violations of Christ's prohibition of kingly power. John beheld, in the visions of Patmos, till these "thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of Days did sit" as supreme. The contest will be a fearful one, but Liberty and christianity will prevail. "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" who has forbidden lordly dominion over men.

7. The subject reminds *all* men, the most weak, the most timid, the most obscure, the most unlearned, of the important responsibilities resting upon them as individuals, as social beings, as members of society, in respect to public affairs. Every citizen of the state, every member of the church, however stunted his powers, is charged with a portion of the duties of the church and the state, of which he forms a constituent part. These duties, the masses of men and the majority of christians are accustomed to overlook. So far from thinking themselves charged with the responsibility of political and ecclesiastical measures, in the communities to which they belong, they often think that in the walks of private life, it is enough for them to conform to the laws of the state, and the regulations of the church, whatever they may be! This stupid and stupifying notion is part and parcel of the doctrine that public affairs, ecclesiastical and civil, are to be shaped and moulded only by the heaven ordained and God gifted few, who alone are

capable of understanding and directing such high concerns! Pass now from Italy through Spain, France, England, Scotland, Wales, and the North American states, and you shall find that just in proportion to the depth and comprehension to which the doctrine of priestly and princely domination extends, in the minds of the masses of men, just in that proportion shall you find them unintelligent, and regardless of public affairs never dreaming that they have any responsibilities to honor or duties to discharge, in respect to the laws of the state or the canons of the Church. Under arrangements that forbid their doing any thing in the Church or the state, but at the bidding of their superiors, and guided (if guided at all) by theories in which all these rights are denied to them, even to the extent of denying that their governors rule through their consent, how is it possible or credible that they should retain clear and deep impressions of their own responsibilities for the moral wrongs of the state and the spiritual corruptions of the Church? Make our own citizens believe and feel that political power and authority do not reside in them, and then see whether you can make them feel guilty for the iniquities of the state? Go into those religious communities where the prelatical principle most prevails, and tell them of the corruptions of their sect. What is to them? They will bid you preach to their *priests*, in whom church authority is vested! Who has ever heard of any Anti-slavery or Temperance agitations in our Romish and Episcopal sects, agitations in which *the people* in those churches have attempted a church reformation?—Go among those Presbyterians who are content with the Presbyterian powers of the church session, or those so called Congregationalists who are willing that the Pastor should be the church, and that clerical associations shall control the Pastor, and see whether you can enlist *them* (however annoyed by existing abominations) to move a step in the work of church reform, beyond, perhaps, a humble and useless petition to their "lords" who rule over them! And what can you say to them, if you may not remind them that the *authority*—the power—the responsibility rest, primarily in the *masses*? On the principle that "might confers right and responsibility" (the very doctrine of those who deny popular sovereignty) it is most manifest that the masses, unless the rightful authority resides in them, are not to be held responsible for public affairs!

What an amount of holy and godly activi-

ty will be saved to the church and the world what exploits of Christian achievement will be witnessed, when once the great body of citizens and christians shall see and feel that they form a part of the state and of the Church, in whom are vested responsibility and power. But this can never be done, so long as the notion prevails that scarcely one man in a hundred has any thing to do in the matter of church government, nor one in a thousand with state and national affairs.

8. Along with this lesson of increased activity and usefulness, growing out of a deepened sense and widened sphere of responsibility, for the masses of men, and the common brotherhood of Christians, our subject carries along with it a corresponding lesson of meekness and self-diffidence to the most gifted, and of brotherly love and honor to all. Let the brother of low attainments rejoice in that he is exalted, but the richly gifted in that he is made low. For the want of reverent attention to Christ's teachings on this subject, the rarest gifts in the church have often become productive of the greatest mischief. The splendid eloquence of Apollos, the acute metaphysical reasonings of Paul, the bold and heroic enterprize of Peter, if they did not tempt the possessors themselves to undue self-exaltation, appear to have given occasion for those partizanships among their admirers which Paul himself is pointedly reproves.—A disposition to glory in her great men has been, in all ages, one of the besetting sins of the church. And few men of rare gifts, especially those of a popular cast, have been found proof against the seductive influences that have thus beset them. Connected with this popular tendency to idolize splendid talents, is the disposition to throw off personal and social responsibilities by transferring them to a select few. Hence the decline of holy activity and watchfulness, the silent and unperceived decay of piety, in the masses. Hence too, the gradually accumulating power of the church in the hands of the ministry, a process, that, when once commenced, knows no bounds. Among Church Historians it has become a proverbial remark that the most brilliant geniuses and accomplished scholars in the church have introduced the most absurd and pernicious errors, and fomented the most disastrous divisions—thus enacting over again, the same scenes that the great lights of the heathen world had done before them, evincing that the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, and that great talents bring great temptations. That many have been led, from these causes, to undervalue scientific knowledge and to decry or envy men of rare talents, is doubtless true, but this is only another specimen of the evils arising from the theory and practice of lordly authority among Christians. Let the holy brotherhood of the saints be preserved by the humility of the gifted and by the fidelity and activity of all. Then will rare gifts become rare blessings, instead of snares, and the whole body of Christ, the feebler members along with the stronger will make increase, to the edifying of itself in love.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series, Vol. IV—No. 11.
Whole Number, 53.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. NOVEMBER, 1846

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive a copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—Or, procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any of any particular number will be sold, separate from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Per dozen, \$0.50 | Sixty papers. \$3.00
Eight papers for 1.00 | One hundred papers, 3.00

THE TAKING AND CHATTELIZING.

1. Can God rightfully allow the taking of human life?

2. Can God rightfully allow the holding of men as chattels?

Prof. Stowe, in his reply to Mr. Phelps (see Christian Recorder, May 1) undertakes to draw a parallel between the war and slavery, for the purpose of proving that the same God who commanded the Israelites to conquer the Canaanites may have permitted them also to hold slaves. These are his words:

"The Hebrews were permitted to carry on wars, under certain regulations, and they were commanded to wage an exterminating war against the Canaanites." "Question not God's right to exterminate a wicked nation, by any means he chooses to employ, nor do I question his right to permit men to wage war on each other, but I think he must have at least an equal right, to allow one nation to make slaves of another as to command one nation to exterminate another."

Now a little reflection on this subject may lead to the recognition of certain principles which Prof. Stowe seems to have overlooked, or which he has failed to apply properly, in the case in hand.

God never commissions any intelligent agent to do that which is morally wrong, in the very nature of things, to be done at all, which, on that account, it would be an abridgment of the divine character, to attribute to God, as his act. But that which is thus morally wrong, in the nature of things, and which God himself sees proper to do, and which he may do, himself, he never commissions any of his intelligent creatures to do for him, without committing any sin against himself, or subjecting them to the imputation of wrong doing. And this may be true, although the act performed may be

such as no created being would have a right to perform without a divine command. For it is not true that mere finite creatures, subjects of the divine government, have a right, (without an express divine command or permission,) to do or to attempt doing, all that God may rightfully do and which he sees proper, by some instrumentality, or by his own direct act, to do.

2. It is always morally wrong, in the nature of things, to treat any intelligent moral being with injustice, to invade those essential and inherent rights of his being which are inseparable from his moral nature. It is always morally wrong, in the nature of things, to treat any intelligent moral being, contrary to his nature. God himself cannot do this, any more than he can contradict himself, and cease to be God. And he can never authorize or command any of his intelligent creatures to do so.

These principles are sufficiently evident.—Now for the application of them.

1. It is not morally wrong, in the nature of things, for God to take away human life.—He gave it in the first place, and every moment of its continuance is an extension or repetition of his gratuitous gift. It was for God to determine, before hand whether he would create man, in general, or whether he would give life to any human being in particular. He was under no obligation to non-entitle, to make some things of them. He made our bodies, and he has a right to unmake them. He is the Father of our spirits, and he has a right to keep them connected with our bodies, as long as he pleases, and then transfer them to another state of existence. All this, he would have a perfect right to do, even if we had not forfeited our lives by transgression.

God does take away human life, and no one can deny it, without coming very near to a denial of the existence of any being who could properly be called God. • Whether he

• Mr. Charles Spear, one of the Editors of "the Prisoner's Friend" zealously pleading for the abolition of capital punishment, in a letter published in the Liberator, some time since, takes this ground, and denies that God has any right to take away human life—asserting that human life terminates, not by God's act, but only in consequence of the "laws of decay." But who enacted

and who executes those laws? And for what purpose were they enacted and executed? Did the laws create and execute themselves? Or did "Nature" or "Chance" do it? Who is Nature? Or what is it, as do I in the regular operation of God's Will? If Nature or if Chance made the laws of man's existence, must they not have made man himself? What even now, then, is there of the existence of God? If life terminates without the agency or the will of God, who knows whether it did not commence without his will or agency? Mr. Spear was driven to this avowal, by following out the distinction of the new sect, viz. that the taking of human life, say, that all physical penalty (as some have it) is *malum in se*, wrong in the nature of things. If this creed were true, Mr. Spear would be correct, and God must be regarded as having retired from the work of his hands, if indeed he ever made any thing, which is left doubtful. Now capital punishment may be right, or it may be wrong. The question must be settled by a simple reference to God's revealed will. Such arguments as that of Mr. Spear proved nothing but the stupidity and semi-athicism of those who employ them.—Yet Mr. Spear is not alone. We have Doctors of Divinity in abundance, who labor slavishly, themselves, to make it appear that the "laws of nature" "the laws of man," &c. do pretty much all that is done, so that there is not much need of God's doing any thing! Prof. Stowe does not exactly say, with Mr. Spear, that God has no right to take away human life. He says, expressly, that he does not question that right, nor his consequent right to employ others to do so. Yet he thinks they cannot fulfil their commission without "a necessary violation of almost every precept of the decalogue, of every principle of the N. Testament!" Quite an inexplicable a puzzle as that of Mr. Spear. And his sentiment seems to be that God has no more right to take away life than he has to enslave, to chattelize!—Prof. Stowe's pupils, we should think, would be very likely to finish their theological education with Mr. Charles Spear.

takes away human life by physical agents, by what some call the "laws of decay" whether he commissions invisible spirits or spirits connected with visible bodies, like ourselves, to do the work for him, or whether he does it by his own direct act, without employing any instrumentalities at all, it is equally *his act*. In taking away human life by either of these methods, God does nothing which is *wrong in the nature of things*. He does no man any *injustice*, for all men deserve to die, and were it otherwise his removal of them to another state might be conferring an additional favor upon them, as is the fact, in the case of all good men. Even if death were annihilation (as it is not,) no *injustice* would be done on the part of the Creator, (even if we had not forfeited life by an abuse of it) for God is under no more obligation to continue our existence to us, than he was to create us at first.

Neither does God invade or subvert any of the inherent and essential rights of our being when, by such agents as he pleases, † He

† The reader may note, here, if he pleases, how important is the orthodox doctrine of the *absolute sovereignty of God*, in order to a successful vindication of the inalienable rights of man. Those rights grow out of that sovereignty and are defined by it. By asserting God's absolute right over the lives of men, we are enabled to meet one of the most plausible arguments against man's inalienable rights.

dissolves the connexion between the soul and the body, and removes us to another world.—We have no more right to stay in this world longer than God pleases, than we had to come into this world before he gave us existence and placed us here. Our right to be here is simply our right to be where our Creator placed us, and from whence none of our fellow creatures have a right without *His* authority to reject us. No man holds his life, his being, or his earthly location (call it which you please) on any other tenure than this—the *divine will*. And when my Maker wills my departure from this globe and from this tenement of clay that I call my body, then my lease of them has expired and I have no right to remain in them a moment longer.

Nor does God treat any man *contrary* to the original and essential law of his nature, his moral and accountable being, but strictly in accordance with it when, by any method he pleases, he removes him out of this world, and transfers him to his final award. The very nature of the man, the object of his creation, the needful process of his progressive development, the full exercise and expansion of his powers, his possession of the appropriate fruits of his activity forever, the proper adjustment of all the relations he sustains, with the responsibilities, whether honored or dishonored; that have grown out of those relations, the due position to be assigned to the man in accordance with the *character* he has thus formed, in a word the proper treatment of the man as a man, a free, moral, accountable being, an heir of immortality, endowed with God-given and inalienable rights; all this, imperatively requires that God should in some manner and at some period, transfer the man from his incipient to his matured state.—What is there in all this, as an act of the Creator, that looks like an invasion of the rights of his creature, a violation of the laws of their *nature*, an iniquity, a moral wrong, in the nature of things?

There is nothing. And consequently God can rightfully authorize and command any of his creatures, at such times, and under such circumstances as he chooses, to take away human life, without either committing, authorizing, approving, or even tolerating, any moral wrong. The question (if it be a question) whether he ever *has* done this, the additional questions, when, where, how, to whom and for what reasons, and to what extent, he has done, or still does this, whether Joshua was commanded to conquer the Canaanites,

whether the Hebrews were ever authorized to engage in other wars, whether Noah was commanded to inflict capital punishment for murder, and if so, whether that institution be now in force, whether defensive wars, in the present age of the world, are ever lawful, *these*, and similar questions are to be decided in the light of Bible records; Bible precepts, Bible principles. There may be some intricacy in some of these questions, and good men, in the present stage of the discussion, may disagree; until they have learned to discard educational and other prejudices, and think soberly. But no conclusions on that subject, or on the subject of slavery can be trust-worthy that involve the affirmation of what we know *is not true*, viz. that God cannot rightfully take away human life, that he cannot authorize men to take away human life without authorizing that which is morally wrong, and opposed to the Bible: or that men if thus authorized and commissioned to do God's work are only to be tolerated in the Church, because God thus deals with "organic sins" or "social wrongs." No man, however learned, can be regarded as a safe teacher of Christian ethics, of Christian theology, or of reliable logic, who can say, with Prof. Stowe:

"War is a *necessary* violation of almost every precept of the decalogue, of every principle of the New Testament."—(while at the same time he says,) "In the progress of society, war sometimes seems *unavoidable*"—(and again,) "The Hebrews were *permitted* to carry on wars in certain cases, and under certain regulations, and they were *commanded* to wage an exterminating war with the Canaanites."

It is not possible that *all* these statements can be true. The God of the Bible could not have "commanded" a "necessary violation of almost every precept of the decalogue, of every principle of the New Testament." Persons who shudder at extremes, and are horrified at ultraism, should beware of running into absurdities, and extremes like these. A little attention to first principles would have saved the learned Professor from this predicament.

(2.) But the act of *slave holding*, if by that term you mean the practice of holding slaves under the tenure of the American slave laws which define and fix the servile condition in this country, (the only practice known among us by that name) is an act morally wrong in

the nature of things. For it is treating an intelligent, moral, and accountable being as injustice to hold him "entirely subject to the will of a master" (an erring fellow creature "to whom he belongs.") It is a contradiction of the fundamental law of his being, as a free agent, to hold him as "goods and chattels personal, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever." It is an invasion, an absolute denial, of those inherent and inalienable rights which grow out of his obligation to obey God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

It is impossible therefore, in the nature of things, that God should ever be a slave holder himself, or authorize the act of slave holding. God takes away the lives of all men whenever they die, but he never holds a man, and never can hold a single human being as a slave.

A slave is a human being over whom a fellow man asserts an absolute and unlimited right of control, a control not restricted or defined by the paramount claims of God, a control denying these paramount claims, being an unlimited control, and by subjecting every act of the slave to the volition of another human being. By the very terms of the definition itself, therefore, a definition solemnly enacted by slave holders, and necessarily assented to, by all who hold slaves under that tenure, a *slave holder* can be no other than a *human being*. God, therefore, cannot thus be a slave holder, because he is not a human being, and he cannot hold a warrant the holding of any men in a condition subversive of his own moral authority over them.

And the authority which God does exercise over all men, including slaves, is in its very nature, the very reverse, and moral antagonism of the claim set up by the slave holder.

The slave holder claims men as "goods and chattels personal," a claim which denies their immortal nature and ranks them precisely "with things and not with sensible beings." When God says "all souls mine" he denies instead of affirming chattelhood. He affirms their immortal nature, and forbids them to be ranked with more things and brute beasts "to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever."

The act of slave holding is treating a slave contrary to his moral nature. It always treats men according to their nature, and therefore he never treats a man as a slave.

God's claims over all men, including slaves, identical with the claims of reason and conscience. All his demands are fulfilled by fidelity to these. By subjecting them to the control of reason and conscience, he therefore clothes them with the right of free agency, and authorizes them to act according to the dictates of their own consciences.—Whenever the slave holder imitates God, in these particulars, the act of so doing emancipates his slaves and he ceases to be a slave holder.

To hold a man as a slave is to counteract the object of his creation, to impede the process of his progressive development, to cripple the proper expansion of his powers, to deprive him of the appropriate fruits of his activity, to contradict or nullify the natural relations he sustains, to prevent the discharge of the duties growing out of those relations, to deprive him of the proper opportunity of forming a virtuous character, to refuse him a position in accordance with sound character and merit, even if he is entitled to that position—in a word, it is to treat him as if he were not a man, but the mere appendage of another man, to deprive him of the benefits of probationary training in this world, and the glories of redeemed and perfected humanity in the world that is to come. What a perfect contrast is this, to the benevolent purposes and arrangements of God in terminating the probationary state of human beings when he sees best! A contrast that should deeply impress us with the truth that God is too good and benevolent, too just and too holy to be a slave holder: that he could not become one without contradicting himself, and ceasing to be a being of righteousness and truth! How then can he "allow" any human being to be a slave holder? Will he "allow" a worm of the dust to hold a control over his fellow worm which even the common Creator of both could not hold over them, without committing moral wrong?

God never reduces men to slavery, even as a punishment for sin, because he will not do wrong, in order to punish sin: because, moreover, it would be inappropriate, and subversive of all the ends of penal law, to reduce transgressors to slavery. God says "the soul that sinneth it shall die." But he does not say "the soul that sinneth, it shall be no longer accounted a soul, but reputed and adjudged to be a mere thing!" God says that "death hath passed upon all men for that all men have sinned," but he does not say "sentence of chattelhood hath passed upon all men or upon any men, because they have sinned."

It is no proper punishment of transgression to deny the free agency and moral nature of the transgressor! To treat men as being no longer the subjects of conscience—as being released from responsibility to God, and held under absolute and unlimited control of their fellow men! God does not punish lost spirits and fiends of the pit by contradicting and subverting the moral natures he gave them. So long as he punishes them he must, of necessity, maintain and preserve their moral natures, must recognize all the relations they sustain, and all the duties growing out of those relations, and all the rights which the discharge of those duties requires. And this is saying that so long as he punishes them, he must deny and forbid their chattelhood—must treat them as immortal beings, morally responsible—bound to the discharge of duties, and free to obey the dictates of conscience. In doing this himself, he must, of course, forbid others to do the contrary, by holding them as slaves! God authorizes, therefore, no slave holding, even in hell, nor could he do so, without contradicting the fundamental principles of penal law, moral accountability—moral freedom.—God does not allow even the damned, to be chattelized. And if they could chattelize one another, it would bring down upon the chattelizers a still deeper damnation. Nobody supposes that God "allows" of chattel slave holding in heaven. If he "allows" it on earth, he "allows" that here which he forbids every where else—he authorizes in this incipient state of educational training for eternity, a contradiction of the immortal nature he gave us and of the foundation principles of his own government, a phenomenon which is to be witnessed in no other part of the universe—he gives us lessons in the primary school of our existence to be unlearned in our maturity, he "allows" us to do that in this world which could not be done in heaven without turning it into a hell—nay that which he could not "allow" even in hell without overturning all the authority he maintains there—the authority of penal law!

Chattel enslavement, so far from answering any of the proper ends of punishment, could only subvert all those ends. It could not promote the amendment of the transgressor. It could not deter others from transgression. It could not manifest divine displeasure against sin. It could not illustrate or vindicate the

† I use the word "allows" because this is the word used by Prof. Stowe.

parity of the divine law. It would do the very reverse of all this, by denying free agency and moral accountability by exalting the authority of the creature above the authority of God, by denying the essential elements of humanity itself, human relations, and human duties connected with those relations. Being itself a most comprehensive and flagrant form of transgression, it could but blaspheme the Law giver instead of vindicating penal law, to attempt the use of it, as the penalty of violation.

No moral absurdity can be greater or more manifest than that of supposing that God, the creator of man, the author of man's nature, should ever under any conceivable emergency, contradict that same nature, and violate its laws, which are his own laws, by reducing a human being to chattelhood! The impiety of the supposition could not be less marked and manifest than its absurdity.

But if God cannot reduce a human being to chattelhood, because it is morally wrong, and because God can do no iniquity, then God can never "allow" nor authorize any human being to reduce a human being to chattelhood.*—*"That which God himself cannot do because it is essentially wrong, he cannot authorize or allow any human being to do, for that would be authorizing him to commit sin. And if God could not himself reduce a human being to chattelhood without doing wrong, then he could not 'allow' nor authorize any created being to do that same thing, without himself doing wrong. Whatever God does by his authorized and commissioned servants, he does himself. His authority and his hand are manifest in the act."*

Some may think it rash and irreverent to say that God cannot chattelize men, nor authorize their chattelhood, without moral wrong. But the Scriptures abound in similar declarations concerning God, and the highest strains of adoration on the inspired record contain declarations of parallel import, affirming that God can neither do nor allow any wrong act. "The Lord is a God of righteousness true and just is he." His truth, his justice, his righteousness, furnish the very reasons why he is to be adored and confided in, loved and

* If Prof. Stowe says that the slave holding which he supposes God might "allow," does not involve the feature of human chattelhood, then, we answer, it does not involve the essential element of that practice in America which is known under the name of *slave holding*—There is no slave holding in the country but this, and the laws of the land authorize no other. So that his argument touches not the case. It is with things that we have to do, — not mere names.

obeyed. And he challenges all men to judge of him by his acts, and say, whether his ways are not equal. He has planted in them the moral faculty that enables and obliges them to judge of his character. He does not ask men to acknowledge his equity without or against evidence. He invites them to examine and decide for themselves. And good men have not scrupled to address him, in reference to supposed cases, and say: "That be far from thee? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" God is honored and not revered by the false modesty of those who dare not affirm that it cannot be right for God to do or to authorize that which all men's consciences tell them is morally wrong. The divine reputation needs no such fragile supports. God is honored when his intelligent creatures know what is wrong, when they loathe it, when they fly from it, and confidently exclaim—Oh righteous Father! Thou hast neither done nor authorized this abominable thing, that disgraces thy footstool! That pollutes thy sanctuary! Help us to purge it away. Is it not a time for thee to work, for they have made void thy law?

The conclusion of the matter is this. It is inherently and unalterably wrong to hold any human being as a slave. God can no more do or authorize such a thing, than he can do or authorize any other wicked and sinful act.

It is wicked and criminal for any human being to take away human life unless it be with a divine warrant for so doing, and as an act of obedience to the divine will.

Murder is the taking away of human life without any divine warrant, for selfish and sinister objects, in gratification of bad passions, from malice preposse, or from motives of personal gain or advantage.

Slave holding is the holding of a man as a chattel—the contradiction of a man's moral nature, an act *always* and necessarily without a divine sanction—a deed which no man may commit on any plea of good intentions or pretence of divine permission.

In the severance of a man's soul from his body, his earthly probation is brought to an end. In chattelizing a man his moral probation is contradicted, because his moral nature is denied.

The murderer can kill the body and afterwards there is nothing more that he could do. The slave holder, the chattelizer of a man, in the very act of chattelizing, denies, crushes,

murders, subverts, so far as man's act can do it, *not the body*, the mere shell or outside of the man, but *the man himself, the immortal spirit*, the core and pith of all that is human in man.†

Dismissing then, as altogether irrelevant and importunate to any proper disquisition upon the moral character of slave holding, the case of the man who merely severs the soul from the body of a human being, because God "allows" or "commands" him to do so, (in which case there is no "wrong" either "organic" or "personal" to be disposed of, or "tolerated" in the Church or out of it,) we make bold to compare the character of the *chattelizer* or *slave holder* with that of the *downright murderer* who takes away the life of his brother either in a passion, from settled malice, or for other ends. And however extravagant our position may appear to some, we will close the present article with a sentiment we are ready to vindicate and maintain. It is this—

No one would ever hesitate to regard the *chattelizer* or *slave holder* as more guilty than the *common murderer*, if he did not practically forget that the dissolution of the *body* is but a little evil in comparison with the destruction of the *soul*—that the *termination* of the probationary state is a smaller calamity than its *subversion*—that the more separation of the soul from the body; a process through which all men must pass, is a circumstance not to be named in the comparison with a condition that tends powerfully to render the soul an abortion, and immortality a curse!

Worldliness it is—stolid sensualism, idolatry, adoration of the mere visible—a materialism bordering closely on atheism, and settling heavily, like Egyptian mists and darkness palpable, over and into the Churches and ministry of this country that makes them grope with rush lights at noonday and the mazes of Rabbinical learning, unable to discover the inherent and unparalleled iniquity of chattelizing *immortal spirits*—provided always, that the *bodies* they inhabit be not overtaken, ill

† We do not forget that some of these soul chattelizers are said to be aware that their claimed chattels are immortal spirits, the purchase of a Savior's blood, and that they accordingly pretend to be training them for immortality while making use of them as chattels! What a training that must be! Whatever the all Merciful Savior may do for the poor slaves in despite of such training, we cannot doubt that—as a general proposition—the less religious teaching is attempted by these men stealers, the less aggravated will be their own condemnation, and the better will it be for their slaves. It must be by some better gospel than that human chattelhood, that the soul is to be saved.

† Was Edwards "fanatical" when he held similar language?

clothed, or ill fed—provided, also, (as some plausibly add,) that this same chattelized immortality shall be educated for eternal glory by the same baptized atheism that claims it as a chattel!

OF SPIRITUAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, AND PROGRESS, AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS OF POLITY IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD, THEREFORE, BE ABANDONED!

NO. I.

Some men write and talk as though they doubted the existence of any such thing as spiritual or ecclesiastical despotism, or saw no danger to be apprehended from that quarter. Very few seem to understand clearly where it consists. Others, having detected it under all forms of Church polity, conclude that forms are altogether matters of indifference, and that the evil is as likely to appear under one form of church government, as another. And many (as the writer believes) are very zealous against it, in some forms, yet very obsequious to it, or even exercise it, in others.

In the hope of throwing some light on this perplexed subject we shall lay down a number of connected propositions, leading perhaps, to some definite conclusions, sustaining each proposition, where it seems needful, with the necessary facts and arguments.

Proposition I. *The fact, and the Danger.*

The reality and the danger of spiritual despotism among Christians are manifest from existing facts, from the testimony of Church history, and from the prophetic warnings and admonitions of Christ and his apostles concerning it, beforehand.

The despotism of the Romish Hierarchy are too well known to be disputed. All religious persecutions and violations of the rights of conscience, of which religious teachers are or have been the instigators, are specimens and fruits of spiritual despotism, on the part of such teachers, and such manifestations of spiritual despotism have not been confined to the Romish communion. Christ bade his disciples beware of false prophets who would be ravening wolves. Paul forewarned the Thessalonians of the coming of the man of Sin, exalting himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped (1 Thess. ii. 3. &c.) See also 1 Tim. iv. and Rev. xiii. 11. xvii. and xix. These strikingly graphic and terrible descriptions, these solemn warnings, these awful predictions and threatnings should admonish Christians, not only of the reality and the danger of despotic power in the Church,

of the criminality of supporting and submitting to such anti-Christian usurpations.

PROPOSITION II. Definition.

Spiritual despotism may be defined as a violation of the equal brotherhood and equal rights of believers. Or it is a breach of Christ's prohibition of kingly power in his church. It is the exercising of authority among Christians, after the manner of the lords of the Gentiles." [See Luke xxii. 24-27. and Mark x. 42.]

Imagine a church or religious community in which all the members are regarded as equal brethren, and exercise equal rights—a church in and over which there is exercised kingly authority, and you have the idea of a church free from the control of spiritual despotism.

Imagine a Church in which all the members are not regarded as equal brethren, entitled to equal rights, or, a church under the control of those who, standing either in or out of the church, exercise authority over it, superseding or infringing the exercise of the natural and original rights of individuals or of the entire body of believers, and especially doing this without the appointment of the entire body, and at their request; and you have the idea of a church under the control of a spiritual despotism.

In a Church free from spiritual despotism ecclesiastical acts are the acts of the assembled brotherhood in proper person, or of officers appointed by them to do certain things for them, and accountable to them for their manner of doing it. And all acts whether of direct action of the brotherhood or its officers, must be such as do not infringe natural rights.

THE INCIDENTS OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

PROPOSITION III. There may be a despotic position in the members or officers of a church, without the power to exercise it. This is the fault of the individuals thus described. There may be despotic acts in a church contrary to its polity, and established usages.—This is the fault of all who are guilty of such acts and who sustain and countenance them. There may be despotic acts in accordance with the polity and established usages of a church, or such polity and usages may be despotic in their own nature, being inconsistent with the equality of the common brotherhood, and violations of their individual or natural rights. This is the fault of such church polity and usages, and of all who frame, sustain, honor, or submit to them.

Spiritual despotisms though commonly exercised by the few over the many, may be exercised by many over the few. The offence of the same nature, in both cases. Its es-

sence lies in the invasion of original and heaven conferred rights.

PROPOSITION IV. A union of civil with ecclesiastical authority, the vesting of Church power in civil rulers, or the enforcement of ecclesiastical decisions by civil authority, by pains and penalties, fines, and physical compulsion, always involve spiritual despotism—in an aggravated degree. Legitimate spiritual or ecclesiastical influence and action are only admonitory and suasive, the highest penalties being the public censure of offenders by the brotherhood, and, in the last resort, a withdrawal of religious fellowship and exclusion from the privileges of membership in the body. By the laws of Christ, this latter may only be done when the delinquency is of such a character as to destroy or essentially obliterate the requisite creditable evidences of sound Christian character, and living faith in Christ.

PROPOSITION V. Yet a spiritual despotism may exist, and in a very high degree, without any union of Church and State authority, without any physical compulsion, without any temporal penalties, operating most effectively through the influence of *superstitious fear*.—When the people can be made to believe that the question of their eternal salvation is in the hands of their priests, who can grant or withhold the divine favor at their pleasure, no physical racks or tortures are requisite to command their implicit obedience, and reduce them to the most servile and abject condition. The core and pith of a purely spiritual distinction from a civil despotism, lies just here.

PROPOSITION VI. The same end is reached in perhaps a less unmitigated degree, when the people are successfully taught that the proper order and divinely appointed polity of the Christian Church requires the essential subjection of the masses to the authoritative control of the select few, although they may not be taught that the priest can pardon, or withhold the pardon of sins, nor that salvation is suspended on the reception of the sacraments at their hands. For if God has appointed such an authority, then a refusal to submit implicitly to its decisions is held to be an act of rebellion against God—a sentiment that has obtained deep root in many Protestant sects, in respect to their own accustomed church polity, however human in its origin, and unscriptural in its authority.

Illustrations of the fifth proposition may be found in the early history of the rise and progress of the hierarchy, before the union of Church and State under Constantine, and while the most distinguished clergy, so far from wielding the terrors of the inquisition, were subjected to cruel persecutions, them-

selves. They may be found likewise in the abject submission of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, in Canada, and in the United States, to their priesthood, at the present time who wield, in these countries, no secular powers or physical penalties.

Illustration of the sixth proposition may be found among Protestants in Europe and America, whenever we witness a compliance with the decrees and a submission to the decisions of ecclesiastical bodies not recognized in the New Testament, on the ground, not of the fitness of such decrees, nor of the equity of such decisions, but simply on the ground that the existing canons, however unwise must be obeyed, that ecclesiastical decisions, however unjust, must be submitted to, because "Church order" requires it, because our "standards" enjoin it, because ecclesiastical usages and precedents sustain it, because, in a word, it would be "disorderly" and "disorganizing" to follow our consciences and the word of God, instead of the bidding of our church rulers: yes! and in many cases, of rulers who exercise their functions, not only without any divine warrant, but without any commission or authority from the mass of the Christian brotherhood, to act for them!

In both these cases we have, (wherever the Church polity is not matter of civil supervision,) very clear instances of ecclesiastical despotism in the absence of physical power, and without the secular arm.

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE EVIL.

PROPOSITION VII. The love of power on the one hand, and the spirit of worldly listlessness, (willing to transfer responsibilities and avoid self denying duties,) on the other, conjoined with a sinful and foolish idolatry of distinguished men, have unitedly led to the rise and growth of despotic power in the church.

All accounts agree in the fact that a decline of spiritual religion, and the growth of a worldly spirit, in the churches planted by the apostles, were first witnessed, and that these paved the way for the simultaneous rise and growth of superstition and priestly power. Spiritual pride in the ministers and spiritual sloth in the people produced their legitimate fruits, at that early period, as in later times.

PROPOSITION VIII. The beginnings of the anti christian apostacy, involving the elements of spiritual despotism, were witnessed at a very early period, yet, at the time they were unperceived, except by the vigilant and unheeded few, whose warnings produced little effect. And the progress of the mischief was, at some stages, so silent and gradual, that it is difficult to ascertain with precision,

the dates when important innovations were introduced.

Christianity received upon itself, at length, the full impress of the evil influences which it came in to purvey. In a word, it became an human nature would have it. In this perverted condition we find it, at the end of five hundred years, if not earlier. In attempting to trace the perversion backwards from its nature to its ancient state, we meet with no marked stations where it might stop short, and say at this point truth gave way, and error took its start. Nothing decisively arrests our progress, and it becomes inevitable to conclude in the language of scripture itself, that the hidden iniquities "did already work," while yet the apostles were "planting the gospel." We hold it, then, quite impracticable to mark, with any precision, the era of the growth of superstition, and its attendant despotism. — Taylor's *Spiritual Despotism*, pg. 145.

From the same writer, however, and from other authorities, we find evident marks of a formidable despotism in an organized form, standing on the basis of corresponding superstitions, during the second and third centuries. We proceed with the chain of our statements.

PROPOSITION IX. A stringent ecclesiastical despotism had pervaded and subjugated the Christian Churches, not only before the rise of the Papal power, and before the first union, under Constantine, of the church with the Empire, but likewise before the rise of even diocesan Episcopacy, and in the absence of any settled arrangements at all resembling except in a few particulars, the complicated system known as Presbyterianism, in modern times. In other words, such a despotism existed in the churches, before the period of their departure from that local independency which was doubtless the primitive model, except so far as such a departure was involved in the separation of the clergy from the laity, and the control of the latter by the former through their synodical councils, either with or without an unimportant admixture of the lay element.

This statement will startle many, especially those who have been accustomed to conceive of spiritual despotism as exclusively confined to the Papacy, to church and State Unions, to diocesan episcopacies, or who at least have regarded the simple fact of local church independency of all these and of Presbyterian arrangements, as a sufficient guaranty against ecclesiastical domination. Let such be patient, while we present, at some length, the proofs of our statement. If it shall be found correct, the discovery may put us in a way to perceive, more clearly than we have hitherto done, the real root and resting place of the evil so long deplored. A number of facts should be pondered in their connexion with each other, that the chain of evidence may be seen entire.

1. INDEPENDENCY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

The early churches remained independent during the first three hundred years of the Christian era, or nearly up to the accession

of Constantine, AD. 300, and his conversion to Christianity, AD. 311.

When we say that the churches were independent, all that time, we do not mean to say that there were no departures from the spirit and the principles of Congregational Church independency during that period. This is more than can be said of the Congregational churches of our own times. But we do mean to say that their polity and usages in respect to church order were such as would give them in that particular, a standing among such Congregational churches as our own. — They were neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian, in the modern sense of those terms — The officers called Bishops were only pastors of local churches, and there was no such thing as a diocese in distinction from the parish, nor any supervision of these local bishops or pastors, nor of the churches, by any diocesan bishops or Presbyteries composed of pastors and delegates of churches, or organized associations or conferences or any thing of that kind; unless we reckon as Presbyterian those occasional or stated councils or synods of pastors or bishops, which very nearly resemble the clerical or pastoral associations of congregational ministers, (sometimes with a lay element,) in our own country, at the present time. The people likewise held and exercised the right of electing their own pastors.

Abundance of evidence might be brought to establish this point. All writers against diocesan episcopacy fortify themselves by citing the ancient fathers in proof that the first churches were independent, in the sense that has been described. But the most full collection of those ancient testimonies that we have seen, is contained in a very elaborate work of one of the most learned laymen of the church of England, who flourished upwards of two hundred years ago, viz. Peter King, Lord High Chancellor of England. His work is intitled, "An Inquiry into the constitution, discipline, unity, and worship of the primitive church, that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ, faithfully collected out of the fathers and extant writers of those ages." The perusal of this work convinced John Wesley, notwithstanding the prejudices of his high church education, that "originally, every Christian congregation was as a church, independent of all others." Our copy of this work, bears the

*Theological errors and popular superstitions are not here taken into the account. In our own times, a great diversity of rituals, and the most opposite doctrinal sentiments, obtain among churches claiming the same congregational independency. Yet we shall find the theological tenets of the church, during the first three centuries, to be sufficiently orthodox, according to the now prevalent standards.

following imprint, "New York, published by G. Lane and P. P. Sandford, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, at the conference office, 200 Mulberry Street, J. Collins printer, 1841," "and we procured the copy the hands of the publishers at the above mentioned office. We are thus particular that our readers may see to whom we are indebted for the statements that will so extensively be denounced as "disorganizing." Some may wonder that such a work should be written, recommended, published, and circulated by Episcopalians, who notwithstanding all their reverence for the early Fathers decline following their example of church independency. The solution is this. Lord King wrote with a view to temper the asperity of certain ecclesiastical disputants in those times, by instructing their ignorance, and checking the arrogance and bigotry of the High Church party, whose intolerance and absurdities annoyed the best informed of their own sect. Mr. Wesley, with his usual frankness, expressed his own convictions of truth, but thought it allowable from motives of expediency, to vary from the primitive standard, by remaining, as he did, in the church of England. Yet he found it convenient to Lord King's Book, in evidence "that bishops and presbyters are of the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. Thus fortified, he ventured to ordain ministers, without the aid of the Bishops of the Church of England. Within a few years High Churchmen in America have greatly annoyed the Methodist Clergy with a charge that their ordination, derived from Mr. Wesley is irregular and not valid. This has driven them to a re-publication of Lord King's Book, in their own defence! Should divine Providence make use of these clerical and Episcopal bickering, and rivalries to restore a knowledge of primitive Church order, and of the point at which it was subverted, our thanks will be chiefly due Him who thus brings light out of darkness and restores order by the self subversive workings of confusion.

It will be noticed that by lumping together under the common appellation of the "primitive church," the whole body of Christians during the lapse of three hundred years, the course of which great changes were progress; Lord King fails of making a "primitive church" a safe model for our imitation because he does not distinguish between the usages of the apostles and those which lived three hundred years after them! For the purposes now before us, his testimony is all the stronger and clearer, on this

No one will suppose that if the established diocesan Episcopacy, churches in the second and third centuries could have been found independent! The changes known to have been in progress were not at all in that direction. The fact of church independency for the first three hundred years, if it be a fact, is one that furnishes much matter for contemplation, especially, if it be a fact; likewise, that long before the lapse of that period, spiritual despotism had attained a rank growth, and had embodied itself in a definite ecclesiastical form.

In the beginning of his second chapter, page 30, Lord King brings his proofs that the churches, during the first three hundred years were independent. This is continued through the chapter, of which we have room only for some very brief abstracts. To receive its full force the reader should examine carefully the chapter entire.

(1.) "The ancient dioceses," says Lord King, "are never said to contain churches in the plural, but only a church, in the singular. So they say, the church of the Antiochians, the church of Smyrna, the church of Macedonia, the church of Philadelphia, the church of Antioch, and so of any place whatsoever, the church of or in such place," pg. 30.

"As for the word *diocese*, by which the bishop's flock is usually expressed, I do not remember that I ever found it used in this sense by any of the ancients; but there is another word, still retained by us, by which they frequently denominated the bishops' cure, and that is *parish*; so, in the synodical Epistle of Irenaeus to Pope Victor, the bishoprics of Asia are twice called parishes. And in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, the word is so applied in several hundred places. It is usual there to speak of the bishops of the parish of Alexandria, of the parish of Ephesus, of the parish of Corinth, of the parish of Athens, of the parish of Carthage, and so of the bishops of the parishes of several other churches, by that term denoting the very same that we now call a parish, as a competent number of Christians dwelling near together having one bishop, pastor, or minister set over them, with whom they all met at one time, to worship and serve God," pg. 32.

(2.) The writer cites Justin Martyr and Ignatius in proof of this. There is but one altar," says Ignatius, "as there is but one bishop," so writes Cyprian, "we celebrate the sacrament, the whole brotherhood being present." Justin Martyr says: "The bishop's whole flock met together on Sunday, when the bishop gave them the eucharist, and if any were absent he sent it to them by the deacons," pgs. 33, 34.

(3.) "The other sacrament of baptism was generally administered by the bishops alone within their respective dioceses." So saith Tertullian: "Before the bishop we renounce the devil and the world."

(4.) "The church's charity was deposited with the bishop."

(5.) "All the people of a diocese were present at church censures, as Origen describes an offender as 'appearing before the whole church.'" Clement, Romanus, and Cyprian are quoted to the same effect.

(6.) "No offenders were restored again to the church's peace without the knowledge and consent of the whole diocese," so Cyprian writes, that before they were received to communion, they were to plead their cause before all the people," pg. 57.

(7.) "When the bishop of a church was dead, all the people of that church met together, in one place, to choose a new bishop. So Sabinius was elected bishop of Bmeria by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, which was also the custom throughout all Africa, for the bishop to be chosen in the presence of the people. [Cyprian.] And so Fabianus was chosen to be bishop of Rome, by all the brethren who were met together in one place, for that very end." [Cyprian.]

(8.) "At the ordination of the clergy, the whole body of the people were present. So an African synod held anno 238 [mark well the date!] determined that the ordination of ministers ought to be done with the knowledge and in the presence of the people, that the people being present, either the crimes of the wicked may be detected, or the merits of the good declared, and so the or-

dination may be just and lawful, being approved by the suffrage and judgment of all. And bishop Cyprian writes from his exile to all the people of his diocese, that it had been his constant practice, in all ordinations to consult their opinions and by their common counsel to weigh the manners of every one, therein imitating the example of the apostles and apostolic men, who ordained none but with the approbation of the whole church," pg. 33. [Modern associations of ministers "licensed" other men with less regard to the laity than this!]

(9.) "Public letters from one church to another were read before the whole diocese," Witness Tertullian and Cyprian's Letters.

(10.) "Lastly, the whole diocese of the bishop did meet together to manage church affairs. Thus when the schism of Pelagius in the bishopric of Carthage was to be debated, 'it was to be done according to the will of the people and by the consent of the laity.' [Pleboni Epist.] And when there were some hot disputes about the restitution of the lapses, the said Cyprian promised his whole diocese that all those things should be examined before them, and judged by them," pg. 39.

"Nothing was done in the diocese without the consent of the people. So resolved bishop Cyprian. 'From the first time I was made bishop,' said he 'I determined to do nothing without the consent of my people.' And accordingly when he was exiled from his flock, he wrote to the clergy and laity thereof that when it should please God to return him unto them, all affairs, as their mutual honor did require, should be debated in common by them," pg. 49.

There we see evidences, not only that the churches in those times were local churches, in distinction from the modern episcopal diocese, but that the people had a hand, at least nominally, in ecclesiastical transactions, a freedom of speech and of debate in church matters that puts our modern Presbyterianism, (with its church sessions) in the United States of America to the blush, and a freedom that would not be tolerated in many of the so called Congregational Churches of Connecticut and of Massachusetts! When shall we see such bishops as Dr. Hawes, Dr. Taylor, and the clergy of Boston, throwing open their church doors to a full and free discussion, (notwithstanding "hot disputes") of "all affairs" not excepting the question of holding fellowship with men stealers, "as their mutual honor requires"? When shall we see the dignified ecclesiastics who control the American Board, upon the debate concerning their course, to the equal brotherhood of all the members of the churches for whom the Board acts?

Till we see this, how can we conceive that the church independency of our modern Presbyterians, or even Congregationalists, is as thorough and as real as that of the churches during the 300 years discussed by Lord King?

We cannot now follow our author in his long argument to prove the congregational independency of those churches from "the bulk and size of those bishoprics: concerning which we have any notices remaining on ancient records" and showing that "the very largest of them were no greater than our particular congregations are." The Bishop of Smyrna "knew all his flock by their names."

"The ordinary tone of Cyprian's language is indeed too imperious to comport gracefully with this. But Cyprian was inexorable, and perhaps thought of the points which would be most likely to be grateful to the people. Ecclesiastics nowadays who wield large authority, can also use the language of condescension.

In the diocese of Ephesus "there was but one altar" or communion table" and they all "met together." "As for the diocese of Antioch 265 years after Christ, they were all able to "meet together at one place." The same was the fact even in Rome, at several periods, as "when Bishop Anterus died, all the people met together in the Church, to choose a successor." And long afterwards at the election of Cornelius, the same thing occurred. Similar facts are known concerning the church at Alexandria, at different periods from all which Lord King affirms it to be evident "that the greatest bishopricks in the world, even in the third century, were no more than so many single congregations." pg. 43.

"How long it was," says Lord King, "before these dioceses swelled into several Congregations is not my business to determine, since it happened not within my prescribed time," (i. e. the first three centuries,) except in the church of Alexandria, the reason and manner of which shall be shown in a few leaves more." pg. 43.

THE FIRST EPISCOPAL DIOCESES!

This account is so interesting, as containing the particulars of the first erection of an episcopal diocese in christendom with the reasons and the process of its formation that I cannot forbear quoting it entire. Those who would not insensibly slide into episcopacy would do well to ponder the picture. It confirms what we incidentally said in controversy, in this paper some two years ago, before we had seen the book of Lord King, viz., that episcopacy must have had its origin in the overweening desire of a large church, in a populous and widely extended location, to retain its numerical unity. The demand that all the Christians in one city, corporation, or township, must at all events, and on pain of being accounted schismatics, remain in one church, under one pastor, is a virtual demand for Episcopacy whenever Christianity extends itself through the population of a large city or town. Congregational church independency is violated or is in imminent peril, when ever stated weekly worship on the Sabbath, is set up in two or more congregations at the same time, the church still remaining one.—Read the record and see.

"As for the diocese of Alexandria, though the numbers of Christians therein were not so many, but that, in the middle of the fourth century, they could all, or at least most of them, meet together in one place, as I might evince from the writings of Athanasius, were it not beyond my prescribed time, yet in the third century they had divided themselves into several distinct and separate congregations, in the extreme suburbs of the city.—The reason whereof seems to be this: those members of this bishoprick who lived in the remotest parts of it, finding it inconvenient and troublesome every Lords day, Saturday, Wednesday and Friday, (on which days they always assembled) to go to their own usual meeting place, which was very far from their own homes, and with all being willing to divide themselves from their

old bishops, lest they should seem guilty of the detestable sin of schism, which consisted in a censured separation from their bishop and parish church, as shall be hereafter shown, desired their proper bishop to give them leave for convenience sake, to erect, near their own habitations, their chapels of ease, which should be a daughter church to the bishop, under his jurisdiction, and guided by a presbyter of his commission and appointment, whereat they would usually meet, though on some solemn occasions they would still all assemble in one church with their one bishop.

That for this reason these separate congregations were introduced at Alexandria, seems evident enough, because Dionysius Alexandrinus saith that these distinct congregations were the "remotest suburbs" and the Christians hereof were not as yet arrived to those great numbers but that several years after they could all meet together in one and the same place, as might be proved from that forementioned place of Athanasius.

So that distinct congregations were only for the convenience and ease of those who lived at a great distance from the bishop's church, being introduced in the third century, and peculiar to the bishopric of Alexandria, all other bishoprics confining themselves within their primitive bounds of a single congregation, as we have before proved the largest of them did, even Antioch, Rome and Carthage.

"Behold what a great matter a little fire kindleth." The precedent set at Alexandria, in the third century, undoubtedly, gave rise to the entire system of diocesan episcopacy, with its lordly claims! The high notions entertained elsewhere, as well as at Alexandria, of the "sublime dignity" of the bishopric or pastoral office, would naturally incline the bishop to discountenance the organization of new churches independent of his control, and drawing away a portion of his revenues now becoming princely, in the rich cities.

Thus then, we fix the date of the first episcopal diocese to have been in the third century, and ascertain that this one instance furnished the only recorded exception the general fact of Congregational church independence, up to anno 300, or the commencement of the 4th century.

2. THEIR FREEDOM FROM SECULAR CONTROL, AND FROM PAPACY.

Put this fact, thus established by the side of two others. First, that there was no union of church and state, and consequently no secular or physical power in the hands of the clergy or their patrons, during this entire period, nor until after the conversion of the emperor Constantine, anno 311. Second, that the power and influence of the bishop of Rome, (till then merely pastor of the single church or Congregation worshipping together in that city) attained no very decisive preponderancy over the power and influence of all other bishops, until about the year 360,* and that the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs was not fully established until anno 606, ‡ more than three full centuries after the close of the period treated of in this work of Lord King.

Our chain of our argument is thus completed, viz. that there was neither diocesan

* See Goodrich's Church History, pg. 77.

‡ 1b. page 86. The temporal power of the Roman Pontiff was not established until about A. D. 755, vide Purchard Hist. page 37.

episcopacy, papacy, or secular or physical power in the hands of the clergy, during the first three centuries of the Christian era, nor aside from the synodical councils of the pastors was there any thing resembling modern Presbyterianism, unless it be claimed that a representative character and lay element sometimes attributed to these councils (vide Lord King, pg. 133 and 135) gave them a resemblance to Presbyterian courts or consociations of churches.

So that the spiritual despotism of the first three centuries, if there were any, are neither to be charged upon the Papacy, nor upon secular power, nor upon church and state union, nor upon diocesan Episcopacy, nor upon any degree of Presbyterianism that would be distasteful to the bulk of our congregational clergy now. This obvious remark, which we do not recollect to have met with, distinctly in any writer except, perhaps Mr. Taylor, and which will startle, perhaps, some of our readers, is one which no congregational writer, if a clergyman, (as most ecclesiastical writers and historians are,) would be very likely to make! To ourselves we confess it is a comparatively new idea that it was during the continued prevalence of congregational forms of church polity, as the term is now used, that those spiritual despotisms and kindred corruptions afterwards resulting in episcopacy and papacy, had their origin and rank growth, in so much that prelacy and papacy are to be looked upon as effects rather than as causes of spiritual despotisms or as new forms of usurpations previously existing and manifesting not so much a new nature as a new name and shape.

3. SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM IN THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

The fact of a deep rooted and organized spiritual despotism over the equal brotherhood of believers, during a great part of the first three centuries, is the next point demanding our attention. The choice of their pastors by the people, their participation in the discussion and settlement of ecclesiastical affairs and their local church independency, (nominal at least, in opposition to diocesan episcopacy, and the stringent and recognized authority of our Methodist Conferences and Presbyterian Synods and General Assemblies,) would seem to forbid the idea of any very serious clerical encroachments, and it would be a curiously interesting question, if we had time to do it justice, whether or no the ancient churches, during that period, were more or less free than the Congregational Churches of this country now are. Many items perhaps, might be marshalled on both sides of that question.

(Concluded in the next.)

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE SEPTEMBER, 1840.

After an absence of two months, the Editor is at home again, and is ready to receive communications from those who wish the publication continued. He is willing to continue the labor, if they are wanted, but he must have the means, or he cannot go forward. For some time past the receipts have not been sufficient to pay the paper maker and printer.

Corrections—for the October number.

Instead of *Goodwin* (several times repeated among names of authors) read *Godwin*.

Page 304, column 1, 27th line from bottom, instead of *Creditable* read *creditable*.

Page 305 column 1, 12th line from top, instead of "for prelates" read "of prelates."

Same column, 13th line, instead of "reject the papal authority," read "reject" &c.

Same column, 20th line, instead of "tacit assent" read, "its tacit assent."

Same page, 3d column, 27th line from bottom, read "notion or idea."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, December, 1840.

T. Hopkins, Scotsburg,	0.50	D. Foster, Whitesboro,	1.00
H. Dresser, N. York,	1.00	L. S. Wood, N. Y. Mills,	1.00
J. M. Ward, Alban,	1.00	E. Childs, Taberg,	0.50
J. Harrison, Troy,	1.00	T. Bebe, Westmoreland,	1.00
J. H. Paine Half Day		Dea. Hills Vernon	
(Ill)	1.00	Center,	1.00
L. Tappan N. York,	2.00	A. Mills N. Hartford,	1.00
J. Brower, N. Haven		Mrs. L. Smith, Litchfield,	1.00
(Ct)	0.50	J. Ward, Vernon Center,	1.00
S. Wells Peterboro,	0.50	H. Lewis, Canastota,	0.50
A. Mahan, Oberlin	0.50	W. Stickney, do,	0.50
McCarthy, Rome	1.00	E. Seymour, Oazonova,	1.00
P. Field Charlemon,		by G. C. Norton,	0.50
(Mass.)	1.00	W. P. Childs, Vernon	
S. W. Green, Whites		Center,	1.00
(boro.)	1.00	S. Spring, Fraits Hollow,	0.50
Sally White, do,	1.00	J. Sims Oazonova,	1.00
Mrs. S. Sandford, Utica,	1.00	W. J. Chapin, Perry,	1.00
J. Smith, Whitesboro	1.00	A. Percival, Vernon	
C. M. Hawley, Hamilton	0.50	Center,	0.50
B. Woodman, do,	0.50	R. Lewis, Sullivan,	1.00
J. Dewey, W. Leydon,	0.50	Warren & Wait Whites	
L. King, Lowville,	0.50	boro,	1.00
J. Kilburn, Princeton,		Mrs. Frost, do,	1.00
Mass.	2.00	S. & Jocelyn, N. York,	1.00
N. Adrews, Bust,	1.00	Wm. Harned, do,	0.50
D. Goddard, Mannsville,	1.00	P. T. Allen, Vernon	
N. Mann, do,	1.00	Center	0.50
J. P. Mann, Adams,	1.00	Wyllis Goodell, Abing-	
G. D. Mann, do,	1.00	ton, Ct,	0.50
D. Brace, Salina,	1.00	R. D. Sharpe, do	0.50
A. Beach, Oppenheim,	0.50	D. Root, Guilford,	0.50
D. Inglish, Mannheim,	0.50	Conn.	0.50
P. R. Pitts, Honeoye,	1.00	W. H. Lyman, N. Haven	
H. G. Andrus, (dec)		Conn.	0.50
Pittsford, by W.		D. G. Platt, Washington	
D. Andrus,	1.00	Conn.	0.50
F. Gillette, Bloomfield,		J. Skinner, Harwinton,	1.00
Conn.	1.00	Conn.	0.50
H. Snow jr. Troy,	1.00	E. Birchard, Mill Plain,	0.50
G. Smith, Peterboro,	1.00	Conn.	0.50
J. A. Halburd, Champion,	1.00	F. Stone jr. do,	0.50
G. P. Reed, Richmond,	1.00	A. Painter, N. Haven	
S. W. Upson, Water-		Conn.	0.50
bury Conn,	1.00	G. Hine, do,	0.50
P. Allen, Camden,	1.00	W. Smith, do,	0.50
J. Henshaw, W. Brook-		G. Lewis, Oswego,	0.50
field, Mass.	0.50	J. Rich, N. Y. Mills,	0.50
		S. A. Tisdale, do,	0.50

Amount

\$7.75

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. IV—No. 12.
WHOLE NUMBER, 50.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. DECEMBER, 1840.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and send the money without expense to the publisher, shall receive one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Each of any particular number will be sold, separate from the whole, (if desired,) as follows, viz:

Three, per dozen, 60 50 Sixty papers, 62 00
Eight papers for 1 00 One hundred papers, 3 00

SPIRITUAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL DESPOTISM.

A REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, AND PROGRESS, AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS OF POLITICS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD, THEREFORE, BE ABANDONED!

NO. 1.

(Continued from the last.)

The common account, nay, the common expression, nevertheless, is very emphatic in forming the subjugation of those ancient churches, to the control of priestly power, being most of the period under review.—The pictures drawn by Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational writers very nearly agree, in this matter. And the facts recorded and the language used, by the early writers tell their own story, and are quite decisive of the question. We will first hear the testimony of a Congregationalist.

CONGREGATIONAL TESTIMONY.

Mr. Punchard in the introduction to his History of Congregationalism, makes a brief statement of the distinguishing doctrines of the sect, and then adds,

Such are the prominent outlines of the denomination as history we are now to consider. Such, we suppose, was the polity of the churches founded by Christ and his apostles, and for more than two hundred years, substantially retained by all Christendom.—(pg. 11.)

So far then as this period of 200 years is concerned, the testimony of Mr. Punchard responds with the facts of Lord King.—And we gather from Mr. Punchard that he admits the prevalence of Congregational church independency, as contra distinguished from diocesan episcopacy during the first centuries. Mr. Punchard and his Con-

gregational readers should bear in mind, then, that it is from the history of Congregationalism, as the term is now understood, that the writer gleans the particulars contained in this part of his history. Let us see what they were.

"Some idea" (says Mr. Punchard, in a note on page 15) "of the early corruption of the church, and of the cumbersome and unscriptural machinery which was introduced into them, may be found from the account which is given us of the church at Rome, about the middle of the third century." [i. e. about anno 250] Cornelius, bishop of Rome, writing to Fabian, bishop of Antioch, given the following list of his clergy, etc. "There are six and forty priests, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, two and forty scholares [a sort of waiter to the bishop] two and fifty exorcists [persons employed to expel evil spirits] and readers [i. e. of the scriptures, in public worship] with porters." All these were subject to one bishop, and were regarded as necessary to a single church of the highest rank and dignity.—See Cuschi's Eccl. Hist. Lib. VI. chap. 42, or Minor Cent. III. chap. 9."

A graphic picture of priestly pomp, to be sure, but did the writer, or do his congregational readers, bear distinctly in mind, that this is only a picture of the clerical magnificence witnessed at Rome, while it was yet nominally, a Congregational Church? We fear not! From the connexion in which this note stands with a paragraph concerning "the pride and ambition of the Clergy . . . the complicated and corrupt system of Anti-Christ, with its pope and cardinals, its arch bishops, and bishops, its arch presbyters, and presbyters, its arch deacons and deacons," &c., &c., &c., we are led to suspect that not a little confusion of dates and of facts may have taken place in the minds of the readers, if not of the writer, though he does speak of these corruptions as having been gradually introduced. Let it not be forgotten, then, that this congregational minister at Rome, (A. D. 250) never heard of a pope nor of a cardinal, never dreamed of a diocesan bishop or arch bishop, and could not have derived any of his "unscriptural and cumbersome machinery" from the "corrupt system" engendered by these! No! He lived at least half a century before either secular power or diocesan episcopacy was introduced, nearly a century before his successor in office began to lord episcopal power over the neighboring pastors, and full three centuries and a half before the permanent establishment of the papal power!—Let us understand the facts as they are, and not charge on the Papacy nor yet upon diocesan Episcopacy those sins of that Congrega-

tional clergy and priestly assumption from which both Episcopacy and Papacy took their rise! Let us not confuse dates, nor interchange moral causes and effects. Though Episcopacy and Papacy had not been introduced, at the period of Cornelius (about A. D. 250) one other thing, far more potent and significant had been done! There had been the violation of the holy equality and brotherhood of believers, by the separation of the people from their ministers, the erection of a clerical caste, the exercise of the kingly authority that Christ had forbidden, in his church! And it was a Congregational ministry, not a papal, not an episcopal, no! nor yet a Presbyterian, that had done this! Such was the atmosphere in which "the Rev." Mr. Cornelius had been reared! Raise him to life again, install him pastor over a sufficiently wealthy and respectable congregational church in London, in Boston, in New York, or Philadelphia, and he would make a very distinguished and venerated Congregational minister, now. Or, revive old Rome again as it was in A. D. 250, and transfer some of our modern congregational Doctors that might be named, to the same station, and how would you distinguish them from such bishops as Cornelius?

Full justice to this subject cannot be done without tracing minutely the decline of true godliness and the inroads of worldly policy, which gradually introduced priestly domination and clerical power. This we cannot now attempt. Suffice it to say that the decline of primitive Christianity, and the rise of priestism went hand in hand. The partizan spirit which arranged Christians under favorite leaders, Paul, Apollos, Cephas, or later teachers, was only one form of carnality or worldly pride, as Paul rightly affirms. This too was directly calculated to foster pride and arrogance in the ministry, at an early period, just as the same cause, in the more palpable form of organized sectarianism does, now.—Our Congregational historian, Mr. Punchard, has not overlooked this early element of anti-Christian apostasy, and he observes "that afterwards, this partizan spirit was taken advantage of, by ambitious men, to promote their

selfish ends, regardless of the interests or rights of the churches." (pg. 17.) Equally to the point are the observations that follow:

"The very excellencies for which the primitive elders were distinguished were an occasion of corruption to the churches. This may seem a paradoxical assertion. It will nevertheless, be found susceptible of demonstration that the virtues of the Christian pastors in the first and second centuries were the innocent occasion of corruption to the churches. To be a Christian pastor in those perilous times, was to take the front rank of danger, for the officers of the churches were the first to be sought after when persecution arose because of the word. To men who were ready to lay down their lives for the cause of Christ, the churches reasonably supposed they might safely trust their dearest rights. They would naturally choose to be guided by the opinions and governed by the wishes of such men. They would be slow to speak of their ecclesiastical rights. Feeling that all was safe in the hands of their devoted and venerated pastors, they would readily dismiss all anxious care, and it would be but reasonable to suppose that, ere long, it would be forgotten that the churches had any claim to those special rights and immunities which they had so long neglected to exercise."

"The difficulty and danger of meeting together for the transaction of church business, during the seasons of persecution, to which the churches were frequently exposed, for more than two hundred years after Christ, would be an additional reason for leaving the management of their affairs more entirely in the hands of their officers than was originally contemplated."—pgs. 18—19.

The fact, and in part, the philosophy, of the rise of clerical power are here very definitely traced. A persecuted ministry, it seems, and for the very reason that they are persecuted, may come to be idolized, and, in the end, arrogant. Some of us think we have witnessed a similar process, in the case of a distinguished pioneer of reformation, not a clergyman, in our own times. Thus are the choicest things on earth marred by perversion. The first Christians did well to admire their heroic pastors, but they should have imitated what they admired, and so shared the danger and the responsibility along with them. Then their precious rights would not have been lost by their neglect to exercise them. They did well to value the instructions of their pious guides, but that was no reason why they should leave off thinking and acting for themselves. When the brotherhood allow their minister to do all their thinking for them, and discharge all their duties, they are then on the borders of spiritual degeneration, and their pastors or their successors will be likely to become spiritual despots, in the end.

An excessive veneration for their pious teachers, led the Christians of that period, by unperceived, yet rapid stages, to regard the entire corps of church officers, whatever their attainments or characters, with a defer-

ence bordering on servility, and strongly tinged with superstition. Thus, at Smyrna, as our author notices (vide note, page 18,) when Polycarp was about to suffer martyrdom, he so adjusted his raiment as to accommodate the crowds of Christians who were contending who should first touch his flesh." And Martin, bishop of Tours, in the fourth century, received attentions almost amounting to adoration, from the empress herself. (pg. 19.)

"The superiority which the city churches assumed over those of the country was another step in the progress of deterioration." 1b. pg. 20. Another symptom not unknown nor inoperative in our own times.

"Another step in the path of declension was the introduction of Synods, or general councils, with authority to make laws for the government of the churches."—"The first appearance of these assemblies was about A. D. 170 or 173. At first they were composed of the representatives of the independent churches, elected for the express purpose of deliberating in behalf and in the room of these churches. It was not long, however, before they assumed to act in their own name. These bodies needed, of course, a moderator, and, as they generally assembled in the capital of the province, who so suitable for a moderator, as the president of the city church, an officer who now began to be called bishop, to distinguish him from his co-equals, the elders. This honor, at first conferred as an act of courtesy, would be expected as a matter of propriety, and finally claimed as an official right. In this way, the office of Metropolitan or Diocesan bishop was, probably, introduced into the churches." 1b. pg. 21.

If this theory of the rise of diocesan episcopacy be correct, we have a double origin of the practice, for the mode of its introduction at Alexandria, as related by Lord King, rests on no more conjecture or inference, but stands as an authenticated historical fact.—Without doubt the Presidents of the councils, being city pastors, would acquire additional importance from their presiding, and this would facilitate the operations of those of them who wished to follow the example set at Alexandria. But the very positive statements of Lord King, confirmed as they are by the Fathers quoted by him, forbid the supposition that these Presidents of councils, or any other Bishops, had established any diocesan bishopricks, (if we except that at Alexandria,) before the close of the third century.

But the more importance we give to this solution of the rise of the diocesan Episcopacy, as advanced by Mr. Punchard and other congregational writers, the more closely do we identify the rise of *Episcopacy*, with the movements of that sort of *Congregationalism* which has its clerical associations and its consociations of clergy and "representative"

* Gibbon tells us: "It was soon established as a custom and as a law, that the bishops of the independent churches should meet in the capital of the province, at the stated periods of spring and autumn."—Decline and Fall. Vol. 1. chap. 15." This reminds one of the similar custom or law by which the annual associations of the pastors or bishops of the congregational churches are held in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

lity, for the management and supervision of ecclesiastical affairs. Mr. Punchard adds further to this point.

"Another way, in which these synods corrupted the original order of the churches, was by taking to themselves legislative and judicial authority. It was natural that the churches should pay a great deference to their opinions and decisions of the bodies, composed as they usually were, of the bishops of the entire province, and it was not at all strange that their decisions should gradually assume the form of canons, or rules, for the government of the represented churches; for rules, ecclesiastical as well as civil, will generally assume authority as fast as the people will yield it." 1b. pgs. 21, 22.

COMPARISON OF ANCIENT WITH MODERN CONGREGATIONALISM.

We are almost led to enquire whether the writer is recording the events of the second and third centuries, or of the eighteenth and nineteenth! Suppose we put the picture by the side of equally authentic accounts of the clerical councils or synods of our own country, and compare them. The histories, be it remembered, relate to the doings and arrangements of *Congregational ministers and churches* in both cases.

We have before us a book with the following title page. "Congregational Order.—The ancient platforms of the Congregational Churches of New England, with a digest of rules and usages in Connecticut, and an appendix, containing notices of Congregational bodies in other States. Published by order of the *General Association of Connecticut*, Middletown, Edwin Hunt, 1843." The Preface is signed by Leonard Bacon, David D. Field, Timothy P. Gillett. We hope it will not be thought a "slander to the church" to copy a few items from a book thus attested. The very title page shows that "the decisions" of clerical bodies, now, as in the ancient church "gradually assume the form of canons or rules." And if the former "corrupted the original order of the Churches,"—why not the latter?

This book informs us that "Mr. Hooker, who is said to have assisted in gathering and organizing all the churches which were formed in the towns settled within the present limits of the State, (Connecticut) before his death, to have helped ordain their ministers", &c., &c. "was a great friend to the meeting and consociation of ministers and churches." On one occasion he observed—"We must agree on constant meetings of ministers, and settle the consociations of churches, or we are undone." [Trumbull Vol. 1, pg. 149.]

"The Massachusetts synod which met in 1662, fourteen years after acknowledged that some few particulars referring to the continuance and combination of churches needs yet a more explicit stating and, reducing to practice."

In an account of the Saybrook platform, the following statement occurs:

The articles provided for one or more associations in each county consisting of the teaching elders, who should meet at least twice a year, consult the duties of their office, and the common interests of the churches, and perform various other specified and important duties. page 35.

These "teaching elders" were of the same office with those Congregational bishops who, according to Gibbon, as quoted by Punchard, were also directed to meet twice a year, for similar objects. But let us read further.

† "Though I have all faith so that I could remove mountains—and give my body to be burned, and have not charity, I am nothing." To suffer martyrdom has strangely been thought sufficient evidence of Christian character! We have abundance of men, now, who can stand during popular riots and violence, but who fall before flattery, and the offer of preferment. To live for his surer test than to die for him!

"Some prototypes of such meetings of ministers had existed from the beginning, particularly in Connecticut, but being countenanced by no ecclesiastical constitution, attended only by such ministers in one place and another were willing to associate, they could bind none but themselves. The churches might advise with them, if they chose it, or neglect it, at their pleasure." [What a pity!] "There was no regular way of introducing candidates into the ministry, by the general consent either of themselves or the elders. The platform brought these things into more order and system."

This also recommended a General Association, to be composed of one or more delegates from each of the district associations, which should meet once a year. In recommending this, the Platform said nothing about the duties of this body; it was not deemed necessary, for in the general meetings which the ministers in New England had long held at the time of the colony elections at Boston and Hartford, they had been accustomed to go into consultations on the interests of the churches, and of the cause of literature, and to give advice when necessary," &c. &c. Being general, the recommendation gave abundant scope for the range of consultation and discussion which has taken place in that body," &c. &c. pgs. 36, 37.

In a subsequent page (50) we are told that the advice of the General Association [a purely clerical body] was generally adopted by the associations and consociations," the latter body, (as a "court of appeal," see page 37) controlling the churches at pleasure.

Thus much respecting Connecticut. The same book contains the "Cambridge platform" of Massachusetts, somewhat less favorable to the growth of clerical power. Yet even this provides for occasional synods, and speaks of them as being clothed with "power"—"as being an ordinance of God," &c. *Ib.* pg. 140.

"Associations of pastors meeting statedly, for council and mutual improvement, began to exist in Massachusetts at a very early period. But these associations were fewer, and in Connecticut, formally adopted by the churches, as an element in their system of communion. Gradually, however, the practice of examining and approving candidates, was recognized by usage, as belonging to the associations." pg. 326.

Much matter for both memory and reflection are contained in this brief record. We are reminded by it (1) that clerical associations of modern congregational ministers are of American origin, the usages having never obtained in England, and it does not exist there now. (2) The Massachusetts associations were ostensibly commenced as mere societies for mutual improvement of ministers. (3) They were not authorized by the churches to act for them. (4) Yet they "gradually" assumed the most tremendous function of determining who should be ministers and candidates for the pastoral office! (5) And, in a short time, this power was, "by usage" confirmed in the hands of the clergy!!

We must wipe our spectacles, to discover in Punchard's or any other History, a more remarkably rank growth of clerical power during the the second century!

¶1. as Punchard and other congregationalists have thought, the germs of a diocesan episcopacy was wrapped up in the ancient associations or synods of congregational ministers, (analogous to the associations in Connecticut and elsewhere) what hinders that the germs of an arch episcopacy might be involved in this General Association, over the heads of the mere diocesan?

OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The condition of the Churches and the Ministry, under existing arrangements, depends vitally upon that of the theological schools in which the ministry are trained. We cannot wonder that Dr. Emmons was jealous, before hand, of the concentrated power he foresaw they would wield, and the deleterious influences to which they would naturally be exposed.

The Slavery question has developed facts painfully illustrative of the wisdom of those fears. Princeton, Lane, Andover, Hamilton, and New Haven, have acquired an unenviable fame, which they will retain for ages to come. Hopes have been expressed that Seminaries more remote from southern influence would stand more erect, especially the one in which a reputed disciple of Emmons held a high seat. The result we shall see.

Rev. Dr. Pond, Prof. in the Theological Seminary, at Bangor, Maine, has sometimes been represented, by his friends, as being an abolitionist, or strongly inclined to abolitionism, but he has been remarkably silent on the subject until recently. The Missionary discussion has, at length, brought him out. It seems he is now writing a series of numbers on Slavery in the N. E. Puritan, a paper, by the by, distinguished for its bitterness against abolitionists.

His 'No. 2, 1845,' is copied into the Emancipator of Dec 3d, and is certainly a very curious production. He says "the Bible no where approves of slavery"—that it inculcates fundamental principles "directly hostile to all slavery"—that slavery is anti-republican, and the "Bible is a republican book," &c., &c., all which is evidently designed to ward off the imputation of being *pro-slavery*. Other parts of the article, however, seem as evidently designed to define his position as not being very earnestly opposed to slavery! In respect to this "greatest abomination in all the earth," (as Prof. Stowe calls it)—this "malignant element," as Prof. Pond himself calls it, the learned Professor, according to his own testimony, is "neither cold nor hot" and he has persuaded himself that the "inspired writers" manifest his own apathy in respect to it!—This is his language:

"My second remark is, that the inspired writers never appear excited on the subject of slavery. They did not suffer themselves to become engrossed with it, to the neglect of what they seem to have thought more important topics. They sometimes refer to the existing slavery. They speak of it in various ways, and for different purposes; but always with calmness, with sobriety,

with benevolence, with dignity. We hear from their lips no harsh and bitter epithets; no bitter denunciations or uncharitable judgments; and no violent appeal to the passions of those around them. Indeed, we hear comparatively but little on the subject. Their thoughts were occupied with higher themes. It was not of essential importance, in their view, whether men were civilly bound or free, provided they were but *freemen* in Christ Jesus. To publish the glad tidings of salvation, and rescue their fellow-men from sin and its punishment—which they regarded as the most terrible of evils—was manifestly the grand object with those "holy men of God, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Now here it seems to be taken for granted that it is not "essential" to the matter of human salvation that liberty of conscience should be enjoyed, or men divorced from their sins. That salvation has little or nothing to do with human character or human condition—with the question whether or no one half the race are playing the part of tyrants over the other half, divesting them of all their rights, reducing them to a state of chattelhood incompatible with the family relation, blotting out the intellect, forbidding the scriptures, and enforcing habits of promiscuous concubinage that assimilate men to brute beasts, inducing, in fact, the sentiment that they are not to be regarded or treated as a part of the human species!

All this, we say, appears to be taken for granted, and the "inspired writers" are complimented as being remarkable for having actually written with these views. No other construction can we put upon the Professor's language, if we are to suppose the paragraph penned with any reference to the "slavery" existing in this land, or to any that, in character, resembled it. And we would not indulge in the "uncharitable judgment" that the learned gentleman was bringing forward the "inspired" method of trotting ancient slavery, as a model for modern imitation, if he supposed there was any "essential" or radical difference between them. For that would be acting a disingenuous and dishonest part, and for the obvious purpose of shielding from stern reproof the "malignant element that has long been at work" in our nation. Such a part we should be slow to impute to a man of the reputation of Prof. Pond.

But we are not left to conjecture what sort of slavery it was, that, in his view, "the inspired writers" have treated with so much mildness, coolness, and indifference, saying "comparatively but little on the subject, as being engrossed in more important topics."—The paragraph already quoted was preceded by the following:

"My first remark is, that the sacred writers, both of the Old and New Testaments, were familiar with slavery. Slavery had come into existence, and had become interwoven with the whole fabric of society, long before any part of the Bible was written. We have positive proof of its existence in the families of the patriarchs, hundreds

of years before Moses was born. We have proof equally decisive to its existence in Egypt, during the whole sojourn of the Israelites in that land. Recent discoveries have shown, that even negro slavery was in those days common in Egypt, and the Israelites themselves, during the last half of their residence there, were in some sense slaves. They were at least *bondmen*; and their bondage was exceedingly rigorous and oppressive.

I need not now go into a description of the particular forms of slavery, with which Moses and the more ancient Israelites were familiar. Suffice it to say, that the institution was not a new one; that its malignant element has been long at work; and that its peculiar features had been pretty fully developed before their eyes.

The remarks which have been made respecting the writers of the Old Testament may be extended, with still greater propriety, to those of the New. In the days of Paul, the Roman empire was little better than one great mart of slaves; and few men in the empire had better opportunities for observing the working of the system, than the apostles. The character of slavery, at that period, seems to have been various. In some instances, it was barbarous and cruel, to the last degree. In others, it was comparatively mild and equitable. But whether mild or cruel, the apostles understood it. They had traversed the greater part of the vast Roman empire; they had mingled closely with the middling and lower classes of society; and with the operations and results of the existing slavery, they were perfectly familiar.

This account (leaving out the supposed patriarchal slavery in which the slaves could be the heirs of their masters, and entrusted with the task of selecting wives, in distant lands, for their sons) contains a comprehensive statement of the oppressions of ancient times, from the age of Moses to that of Paul. Is it true that "the inspired writers" speak of that oppression, including the "exceedingly rigorous and oppressive" "bondage" of the children of Israel in Egypt, in the manner described by Prof. Pond? Did the "writers of the Old Testament" say "comparatively little on the subject"?

That song of Moses and of Miriam, on the shores of the Red Sea—Listen! What a specimen of unimpassioned recognition of "the malignant element"! How perfectly in harmony with the cool disquisitions of the American Board and of the Rev. Enoch Pond!—Hear it!

"Thy right hand, O Lord is become glorious in power! Thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy!"

"Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously! The horse and his rider hath he cast into the sea!"—Exodus XV. 6—21.

And one of the "New Testament" writers, who describes the final overthrow of the traffickers in "slaves and souls of men" assures us that he heard in heaven, the song of them who had gotten the victory over the beast.—And what was it?

"And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying Great and marvellous are thy works.—Lord, God Almighty, just and true are thy ways, thou king of saints."—Rev. XV. 3. Also see XVIII. 13 and 20. "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets, for God hath avenged you on her." Aso. XVI. 5. "And I heard the angels of

the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus."

The final triumph of the New Testament Church, like that of the Old, will be a triumph over *oppression* and *oppressors*. Can Dr. Pond deny this? Or will he seek to turn off the edge of the question by saying that these were persecutors of the righteous? Be it so. Are there no persecutors but Papists and heathen? Are there none righteous, but white men, who are never "excited on the subject of slavery"? Ask the 200,000 American Christians whose souls are now under the altar—who cannot read a Bible without stripes—nor teach their children to read it, but at the risk of their lives, whether they are suffering persecution or not! Ask the murdered Lovejoy. Ask Amos Dresser. Ask those who have been hunted by colonization mobs in N. York. Ask thousands of northern Christians who cannot travel over their native land, nor among the Christians (so called) of their own sects, with safety—who may neither preach nor pray against "the greatest abomination of all the earth" in their own church at the north—nor keep a district school—nor fill a clerkship in a bank—nor buy nor sell in the public market without insult, unless they will receive the mark of the beast in their foreheads. The Caiaphases and the Nicodemuses, in all ages, can be "dignified" and cool, in their way. "The inspired writers" do not belong to that class.

But says Doctor Pond—"They did not suffer themselves to be engrossed with it, to the neglect of what they seem to have thought more important topics."

Which of them, Doctor? The Psalmists appear to have been somewhat "engrossed with it," in a number of the Psalms. Just turn to the 88th, the 135th, the 136th. See, how "their thoughts were occupied by higher themes" than "its existence (i. e. slavery) in Egypt, during the whole sojourn of the Israelites in that land."

"O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth forever." • • "To him that smote Egypt in their first born, for his mercy endureth forever; and brought out Israel from among them, for his mercy endureth forever. With a strong hand and an out stretched arm, for his mercy endureth forever. And made Israel to pass through the midst of it, for his mercy endureth forever; but overthrew Pharaoh and his hosts in the Red Sea, for his mercy endureth forever."

Here we have a pretty fair specimen of the manner of "the inspired writers" when celebrating an instance of the abolition of Slavery. Who does not recognize the striking resem-

blance between this passage and the paragraphs in which the American Board and especially Dr. Pond, allude to such subjects?—Who can doubt that our modern Rabbis have drawn their superabundant wisdom and godliness from the same "inspired" fountain!—They "never appear excited on the subject of slavery." Not they! Sometimes, to be sure, we have seen some of our modern prophets (not) a little "excited" against the abolitionists for their "poetry of philanthropy" in seeking to "turn the niggers loose upon us," and have heard them invoking "a healthful public indignation" to "put them down," either with or without penal enactment, as being "justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." Some of their grave Theological Quarterlies have given circulation to intimations of this kind. But as to "excitement" about such unimportant matters (though perfectly "familiar" with them) as the existence in America, and in the American churches, of the sin for which God "smote Egypt in their first born," they are certainly to be suspected of no indecorum of the kind! No! "Their thoughts are occupied with higher themes." There are Theological Seminaries to be endowed, professors' chairs to be occupied, southern patronage to be secured, northern prejudice and negro hatred to be humored, and all for "salvation of souls." And therefore millions of souls for whom Christ died may be heathenized, chateled, brutalized, and denied religious rights, and this may be done by ministers and church members without remonstrance or reproof, and passed by, as not of "essential importance!"

Man may be cheated and gulled with such pretensions, if he chooses, but God will never be. The awful and terrible denunciations of his Holy word against them still stand in force, and will stand, when all the scoffs of the baptized and unbaptized infidels of a selfish generation, against his holy denunciations shall have passed away. And God's terrible denunciations against oppression, the most scathing that universal literature can furnish, will remain in the Bible as long as that blessed book remains, whoever may find it convenient to forget or to deny their existence.

A few of these denunciations we will here record, by the side of Prof. Pond's sly caricature of the language of those whose testimony agrees with them; his strange denial that the "inspired writers" ever "appear excited on the subject," that they ever "suffered themselves to be engrossed with it" &c., that we hear from them, "comparatively little on the subject," that "we hear from their lips no harsh and abusive epithets, no bitter denuncia-

or uncharitable judgments, and no violent appeals to the passions of those around him."

KNOWLEDGE OF THE "INSPIRED WRITERS."

He that stealth a man and selleth him, he be found in his hand he shall surely die to death." Ex. XXI, 16.

Prof. Pond cannot deny that this text has come to usages "with which Moses and more ancient Israelites were familiar."—He has himself given to those usages the name of "slavery." Nor does he intimate it was a worse slavery than that which is now a days. When did he ever hear a "bitter denunciation" of slavery from the lips of modern abolitionists?

It was not of essential importance, in their "inspired writers") view whether men were civilly bound or free, provided they were free in Christ Jesus." So says Prof. Pond, and it must be gratifying to the clean people who so liberally sustain and recently hear religious teachers of that kind, to learn, from their own poets, the estimates they make of the value of the liberal, civil, religious, and personal, of the man committed to their charge: As to the "inspired writers" let them speak for themselves:

And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, have heard their cry, by reason of their masters, for I know their sorrows. And I will come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians" &c., Ex. III. 7, 8. And yet the Israelites were not bought and sold as chattels personal, families were not broken up by sale—literature and the right of worship were not denied them.

It was not essential" says Dr. Pond. Let us give mandate and let the plagues of Egypt testify how essential he regarded it. As saith the Lord God of Israel, let my people go." "It was not essential" says Dr. Pond. God slew the first born of Egypt, by night. He overthrew Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea, for refusing to abolish slavery. "But it was not essential!"

He doth execute judgment for the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye therefore the stranger for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" Deut. X. 17. "It was not of essential importance" was it, Dr. Pond, whether they did this or no?

NO BITTER DENUNCIATIONS.

Go unto him that useth his neighbor's

service without wages and giveth him not for his work?" Jer. XXII. 13.

"Go to, now ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you . . . Behold the hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields, crieth, and the cries of them that have reaped, have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." James, V. 5.

The use of unpaid labor is one of the smallest items in American slavery. Those who go no farther in cruelty than this, are claimed as furnishing instances of kind treatment and of innocent slave holding.

"NO HARSH AND ABUSIVE EPIETHETS."

"Trust ye not in oppression and become not vain in robbery."

Will it be denied that the "inspired writers" call oppressors "thieves" and "robbers?"

"When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him." "Rob not the poor because he is poor." "Deliver the poor and needy. Rid them out of the hand of the wicked." "The righteous considereth the cause of the poor, but the wicked regardeth not to know it." "The people of the land have used oppression and exercised robbery, and vexed the poor and needy." Ez. XXII. 20.—"Woe to the bloody city, it is all full of lies and robberies." Nahum III. 1. "My Father's house shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves," Jesus Christ.

Will it be denied that the terms theft and robbery are commonly used by the "inspired writers" in speaking of even ordinary frauds and oppressions? Are not the terms thus used in the above passages? Do not all trust worthy commentators tell us that the 8th Commandment "Thou shalt not steal" prohibits all manner of fraud and injustice to our fellow men? What do those mean, then, who admit the injustice of slavery, and complaining of abolitionists for using "abusive epithets" when they only use the language which the Holy Ghost teacheth? And what does Dr. Pond mean by intimating that the "inspired writers" use remarkably mild language when treating of this sin? In what respect, or in the use of what "epithets" have abolitionists exceeded them?

"NO VIOLENT APPEALS TO THE PASSIONS OF THOSE AROUND THEM."

Certainly not, Dr. Pond. Nor did they use any "harsh and abusive epithets." But then they used the same epithets and made the

same appeals for which abolitionists are now censured, and charged with being harsh and abusive.

"And there was a great cry of the people" (says Nehemiah) and of their wives against their brethren, the Jews." [Neh. V. 1.] What was the matter? They had fallen in debt, and their sons and daughters were brought into bondage. Take notice! They had not been kidnapped, out-right, as the slaves in this country were. It was in the collection of honest debts, for money loaned them, that the Jewish nobles had reduced them to servitude.

And how was Nehemiah affected on this occasion? Did he "never appear excited on the subject of slavery?" Was he as calm and as dignified as the Theological Professor at Bangor, in the State of Maine? How reads the record of this "inspired writer?"

"And I was very angry when I heard their cry, and these words. Then I consulted with myself, and rebuked the nobles and rulers, and said unto them, ye exact usury every one of his brother. And I set a great assembly against them." By this means he extorted a promise from them that they would abolish this slavery. But lest they should put it off, on some plea of gradualism, Nehemiah told them distinctly, both nobles and priesthood, that they should be thrust out of the Lord's house, unless they acted the part of faithful abolitionists.

"Also I shook my lap and said, so shall God shake out every man from his house, and from his labor, that performeth not this promise, even thus shall he be shaken out and emptied. And all the Congregation said Amen, and praised the Lord." He would have no slave holding rulers or priests among the people, and he resorted to popular agitation against them, in order to effect his object.—"Thus, by the help of God, will abolitionists in this country do, as God has commanded them.

"Cry aloud, spare not. Lift up thy voice like a trumpet. Show the people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins."

If Prof. Pond would see the importance that "the inspired writers" attach to this duty of abolishing oppression, and pleading the cause of the oppressed, in the comparison with other religious duties, particularly the "calling of assemblies" offering sacrifices and holding "solemn meetings" let him ponder carefully the first and fifty eighth chapters of Isaiah, where he will find the latter declared to be a weariness to Jehovah, an iniquity too rank to be borne, unless accompanied by the

former! In the same connexion, too, he may determine whether or no "the inspired writers" ever uttered what would now be called "uncharitable judgments" in respect to religionists who refuse to "judge the fatherless and plead for the widow." What would the Bangor Professor have thought, had he heard the "uncharitable" prophet, "in the days of Jotham Abiez, and Elezekiah, Kings of Judah," exclaiming "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom! Give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah! To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices to me saith the Lord? Your hands are full of blood!" And then assuring them that their sins, now red like crimson, should be as wool, or as snow, if they would only "relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, and plead for the widow?" Would he then think of referring modern abolitionists to "the inspired writers" for models of coolness, charity, moderation, and calmness, when treating of the subject of oppression and slavery?

"Indeed" says Prof. Pond, "we hear (from the "inspired writers") comparatively little on the subject!"

What sort of Bibles do they use at the Theological Seminary at Bangor? Let the learned Professor tell, if he can, what sin is reprobated in severer language in the Bible, than the sin of oppression. And his definition of slavery identifies it with the worst forms of oppression. And he is speaking of *slavery itself*, apparently disdaining, as an honest man ought, the jesuitical distinction between slavery and slave holding.

Let him next blot out of his Bible all that "the inspired writers" say on the subject, and then see how much he has diminished the size of the volume.

The twenty third chapter of Matthew will show what our Lord himself thought of sacrilegious oppression, what "epithets" he applied to them, how "charitable" he was towards them, how "essential" he considered the subject, how much he was "engrossed" with it, and whether it was among the most "important topics" in his view. His reproofs of religious teachers who "devoured widows' houses" and who bound heavy burdens on men's shoulders (too calm and dignified to move them with one of their fingers) so enraged the priestly oppressors, that, to silence him, they nailed him to the cross.

And the 25th of Matthew contains his own account of the principle upon which he will

judge all men, at the last day. He declares that the least of his brethren, the poorest, the most injured, the most destitute, the most degraded, the most despised of the race, will be considered his representatives on that day, that he will consider the treatment of *them* as equivalent to the treatment of *himself*, and will fix the condition of each human soul, for eternity, according to their treatment of *him*, in the persons of *these*. "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

Let the dignified Professor at Bangor remember that! Let him ask himself whether belief of an orthodox creed is any thing better than a belief "in the abstract." Let him next lift up his eyes on a southern plantation, and see in each toiling and manacled slave, the appointed representative and the brother of his Savior! Let him do this, and let him open his belief in the record of Matthew, 25th chapter, by the side of his next congratulation of calmness, and dignity, and freedom from "excitement" and sympathy, his superiority to the weakness of becoming "engrossed with it," his philosophical preference of "more important topics" and more "essential" duties, than that of pleading for crushed and perishing humanity, his own mother's children, the brethren of his Judge and Savior, his representatives at the final day!

When he shall himself have arisen to the true Christian dignity of exercising a manly, a disinterested, a magnanimous, and a holy indignation against the lordly oppressors of the poor, such as Christ and his "inspired" apostles and prophets exercised and expressed, when he shall use the Bible language in teaching Bible religion, he will be far from attributing to the "inspired writers" the coldness of stoical indifference to human wrongs. Let him rise to their standard, and he will have no occasion to bring them down to his own, by statements as wide from the fact as adverse to his own creed. Nor will he symbolize in his language with those traducers of that creed who call the divine justice unamiable—who make Christ too gentle to punish or sternly reprove flagrant sin—who would have a christianity of indiscriminating complacency toward good and bad men.

If the sin of oppression may not be denounced, then the denunciation of all sin is wrong. "New England orthodox" is the imposture that its enemies proclaim it to be, and on the

walls of the Theological Seminary at Bangor inscribed, "No devil, no hell, and no angry God."

The abolition question in the church testing of evangelical ministers in the three they professedly touch: and the result rising generation will witness. An orthodox minister that is not a radical abolitionist (Emmoga was) will, ere long, be understood to be a theological sham. If the "orthodox theology" be from God, then the doctrines, the measures, the agitations and the "deviations" of "modern abolitionists" are from God likewise, for they are identical, the one with the other, only as the latter is a special application of the former to the practice of slavery. This, we are prepared to demonstrate and to maintain against Prof. Pond and any other man living, whether he be an orthodox railer at abolitionism, or an abolitionist scoffer at orthodoxy.

From the American Freeman.

DOES THE LIBERTY PARTY TO SUPPRESS
MEMBERS OF PRO-SLAVERY CHURCHES
OFFICE? NO. 2.

Now we lay it down as an axiom, that there are no influences in the country, that do or can uphold slavery so effectually, as the so called evangelical churches. Religion is the strongest sentiment of the human mind, and accordingly we find in all ages of the world, that the religion of any country, always ruled that country, and the churches are the exemplification of our religion. We look to the principles and conduct of the churches, when they wish to know what is right or wrong. If the churches tolerate a system or institution, the community will, of course also the law. If, for instance, the church sanctions the traffic in ardent spirits, that traffic will flourish, in spite of all the efforts of individuals to put it down. So with slavery; if the church fellowships its holders will justify themselves in continuing to impose claims upon their victims. It is hardly possible to overrate this religious influence. Without exaggeration it may be said, that the church manufactures public sentiment: public sentiment manufactures law and the law shields slavery; and then the church does it all. The pro-slavery churches of this nation, then, are the greatest obstacles in the way of emancipation, and the worst foes of the slave. They do more than all other causes put together can do, to prolong the period of his miseries. They do so because ultimately they give rise to all the other causes. Upholding their churches, then, is upholding slavery. The question, therefore, is reduced to this: is it upholding one of these churches to belong to it?

asking this question, answering it? It be remembered that a church is not like a voluntary society. A man may belong to Temperance, Abolition, or Political society without endorsing character: but he cannot to a church. A church is an assembly of Christians of those who do right, of those who keep commandments. All others are zealous-excluded. This was the very object had in view in the formation of the church. It is to distinguish between it and the world. Of course, then, when a church receives a man into its communion, it endorses him; testifies of him, that he is doing right, and that his character is right: not indeed that in either of these respects he is perfect: but that in the main, in all things which he deliberately acknowledges, he does that which is in accordance with the Bible, and differs from the ungodly world.

And the case is just the same, whether we consider this testimony of righteous character coming from the church in favor of the member, or from the member in favor of the church. The man who consents to belong to a church, endorses that, just as that endorses him. He says to the world, that those are his fellowships in church communion; he recognizes as Christians, and as doing right. If the church is composed of slaveholders, he says that he regards them as Christians. And if it is composed of pro-slavery men, he says the same of them. And if properly we called a pro-slavery church, he tells the world that he regards it as a true church, and that all the churches may be like it, and all other people be just like its members. In other words, he tells all men that he may be pro-slavery, and yet do right and go to heaven. Now then, does he not uphold pro-slavery church, and through it, slavery? Nay does he not by bearing this testimony, uphold Slavery, directly, church or no church? If a man should say that any man might be concerned in the commission of the crime of murder, and yet not do wrong, would he not countenance murder? Why not slavery, when he says the same of that? If he countenance it, is he not pro-slavery? And if he is pro-slavery, can he be voted for? Especially when his pro-slavery extends to the sanctioning of the greatest prop of the system, the very bulwarks of the sin of oppression.

But it will be said that this view of the subject cannot be correct, since there are many churches whose members who are doing all in their power to abolitionize organizations with which they are connected, and who remain in them only for that purpose. It will be asked, can we call them pro-slavery? Ought they not

to remain and endeavor to reclaim their brethren? If they do not, can we ever hope that the church will be reformed? Doubtless there is much truth implied in these questions. They make the matter very plain in instances which we may suppose, but do they do so in the instances which actually exist, and to justify which the questions are asked? Take a case. A man who is connected with one of these churches, suddenly wakes up to the fact that he has been upholding the system of abominations; in other words, that he is pro-slavery. He at once repents, and brings forth fruits meet for repentance. But a single glance suffices to show him, that his brethren are in the same condition: that the church is pro-slavery. What shall he do? Shall he forthwith abandon it? No. He is not bound to do so. Nay, more, he has no right to do so. Neither the Bible, nor his covenant, nor fidelity to truth, nor the cause of the slave, will allow him to do so. He has a duty to perform to that church, which he may not neglect, and till that duty is performed, he may not separate from it: if he does, he runs away: he plays the part of a coward. He is bound to stay till he has labored faithfully for the reformation of that church. He may not go till hope goes, and then he is bound to go.

But how long may he remain before he gives up hope? 'Aye, there's the rub!' In order to justify members of pro-slavery churches at the present day, it must be shown that he may remain long years, and that too, when there are not even any signs of reformation. It would be a little singular, if a man might complain of a church as being wedded to slavery, and then remain in it all his life, under the pretence of wishing to reclaim it. A reasonable time he of course may have, but to say that that is forever, is going a little too far. It is precisely the same as saying that the church is not wrong at all. Those, then, who after all that has been said and done by way of effort to reform the churches, still persist in continuing their connection with them, under the plea that they are trying to abolitionize them, are pursuing a course which is equivalent to saying that the churches are not to be left, even if they never repent.

But, after all, many wish to know how long a man may labor before he despairs of ultimate success. Doubtless it depends much upon circumstances, so that a man might stay longer in one church than he could in another: but yet a general answer may easily be given. And we submit that the answer must be, not long. How long might a man remain in a church that should receive a murderer to its

communion, and justify him in the commission of his crime? How many weeks must he labor to show that church that the murderer ought to be cast out, if he saw no indications of success? How long ought he to be in satisfying himself as to the Christian character of that church, and of its members, if they could not be brought to proper action, in a case so plain as taking the life of a fellow being? To ask these questions is to answer them. But it will be said that slavery is not like murder, for all have been taught to consider the one wrong, and the other right, and the law, too, condemns and punishes the one, while it authorizes and protects the other.—Well, suppose murder were in the place of slavery in these particulars, still we ask how long a man must remain in a murder sanctioning church in order to reclaim it. If the law did support the shedding of blood, and if all men had been trained up to think it right and honorable, yet God says, "Thou shalt not kill." Now how long ought a church member to account his brethren Christians, if they would not hear the Lord, rather than the law and the voice of men? Precisely so with slavery. The law may sanction it; those who have gone before us may have thought it right; yet is it a matter in the least degree even of doubtful character? No. Every man knows, every man feels, that slavery is wrong. He could not be a man and not know and feel it. It is a part of his very nature. It is written upon his heart in letters of fire: it is given there with a pen of iron; the imprint is indelible: he cannot erase it. He was born with it; he lives with it; he dies with it; and he stands before the judgment bar of God with it.

We record on our files, though late, the following item in the history of moral and spiritual declension—we copy from the Union Missionary:

RELIGION OF SLAVE-HOLDERS.

At a recent Missionary Convention in Bangor, says the Bangor Whig and Courier, Rev. Dr. Anderson, one of the Secretaries of the A. B. C. F. M. remarked in regard to Polygamy, "That after a full consideration of the subject, the missionaries came to the conclusion, that the sinfulness of polygamy was not so clearly taught in the New Testament as to make it a test for exclusion. It was, however, regarded by the missionaries as a bar to holding church offices." We would refer Dr. A. to Matt. xix. 5-9, "Shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." Dr. Scott remarks. "It is observable, Christ inserts the word 'twain,' which is not in the

original institution, but is added by the LXX, purposely as it seems, to obviate all misconception of his meaning."

With reference to the question of slavery, Dr. Anderson said, "Whether or not slave holding, under the circumstances of the case, was inconsistent with piety, in Indian communities, the Missionaries who were excellent men, were better judges than we could be. (Why?) The rule of the Missionaries, which he thought a wise one, was to admit members on the simple ground of piety." and that "slave holding is not necessarily inconsistent with receiving a man into the church,—that it is not to be regarded as a disciplinable offence."

In answer to inquiries, Dr. Anderson further stated, that the committee would recall a Missionary who should receive into the church persons entertaining Unitarian, Universalist, or Mormon views, even though he should deem them really pious persons.

Specimen of Progress.—"You see from what I have just written, why it is that I cannot go along with abolitionists in their disfellowshipping of all slave holding professors of religion. I believe that there are friends of God who are so benighted as to consent to stand in the relation of slaveholder, and I must give up my Christian union principles, ere I can consent to the exclusion of any acknowledged friends of God from Christian and church fellowship." Gerrit Smith, Dec. 4, 1811. Repeated, May 5, 1844.

"As a proof that the Liberty party is not yet very conversant with this principle of equal regards for the equal rights of all men, I remark,"—"That many of its members do not see it to be a violation of this principle—do not see it to be unjust to the slave, to continue in church fellowship with those who connive at his slavery, or even those who are directly holding him in slavery. As if they, who have church fellowship with my oppressors do not thereby most effectually endorse my oppression, and trample upon my rights." Gerrit Smith May 7, 1846.

We congratulate brother Smith on this very manifest evidence of progress, and record it for the encouragement of those who were so much embarrassed by the position he held, two years ago, as well as for the earnest attention of those who, at that time, so joyfully took shelter under his wing, and triumphantly quoted his authority and influence against the great measure of secession from churches on the ground of their decidedly pro-slavery character. Gerrit Smith is not the only man who has changed his mind within the last two years, on this subject. A great revolution is going on, in the public mind, and we should not wonder if, in ten years from this time, no decent man would be willing to have it said that he belonged to a church whose members vote for slave holders.

REV. HUBBARD WINSLOW VS. THE APOSTLES.

"We ought to obey God rather than men."—Acts.

"Religious principles will sometimes authorize a man, for the sake of his relation to Government, to do what, but for that relation,

he might think it wrong to do." For instance, the man who thinks all war unjustifiable, might think it wrong, apart from his relation to civil government, to do military service or pay a tax; but, in consideration of that relation, he may Christianly judge it his duty to do it. So of many other things."—*Social and Civil Duties*, p. 84.

Read the following remarks of Gen. Fensenden of Maine, at the meeting held in Boston on the 18th July, in commemoration of the death of Torrey:

"It is solemn and mournful to see how deeply our fellow citizens are blinded to their own degradation. Who would have thought it possible that the condemnation and incarceration, and death of Charles T. Torrey would have excited so little sympathy among the religious portion of community—that as a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, he would have received so very little consolation from his brethren? The men of like faith with him have, with a few honorable exceptions, looked on coldly, and refused their fellowship in his sufferings—dying in prison because he was found guilty of carrying out the principles of the gospel they profess! Who can doubt that if the Free States had looked at Slavery as God looks on it, and felt for the slaves as the Savior of sinners, fools, and had been of one heart and one mind on the subject, the great jubilee for all would long since have been proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of our land."

Christian Investigator.

MONDAY DECEMBER, 1846.

TO MY READERS AND PATRONS.

This number brings us to the close of another year. I find on an examination of my accounts, that my receipts and disbursements for the paper, counting nothing for my own time and trouble, come out so near even that it is not worth while to say much about the balance. Postages and travelling expenses, I have not dared to hunt up and bring into the account lest the concern should bring me in debt. The greater half of my readers send me little or nothing. My receipts come chiefly from a few, who pay me much more than the subscription price, to keep the publication alive. I do not feel much like asking them to increase their ratio of donation, and have little hope that those who have paid nothing for the last two years will be persuaded to do so. I devote a pretty large part of my time to this paper and the care of its concerns. A New Year's present of a

hundred or two of dollars from some of you (to say nothing of back dues) would enable me to go forward again. Half a dollar a piece from four hundred of you who have sent nothing for more than a year would make me up a snug little sum. I would pay me a dollar a day for two hundred days that I have been working for you, according to the best of my ability. Would be too much for you to give, or too much for me to receive? What say you?

The four hundred, I fear will not come forward. If two hundred would send me a dollar each, the same amount would be made. Something of the kind must be done if the paper is to be continued.

CORRECTIONS—for the November number. Page 369, 3d column 23d line from top instead of yes, read yet.

Page 370, 1st column, 10th line from top instead of reject, read eject.

Same page, 3d column, 28th line from top at the end of "human being" instead a period and commence a new sentence.

Page 371, 2d column, 18th line from top instead of "immoral beings" read "immortal" &c.

Page 372, 2d column, 20th line from bottom instead of "and the mazes" &c., read "and the mazes."

Page 375, 3d column, bottom line, instead of "with all being willing" read "with being unwilling."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, December, 1846.

H. Quinby Honeoye, 0.50	N. Gorlish, Oberlin, Ohio, 0.50
J. Ellis, E. Henrietta, 0.50	E. Morse, Brownhelm, Ohio, 0.50
Nelson A. Frost, Riga, 0.50	J. Cross, Temperance Hill, Ohio, 1.00
Dr. Huntley, Brockport, 0.50	Prof. Avery, Clinton, 1.00
H. Lathrop, do, 0.50	Mrs. Dwight, do, 1.00
J. Sperry, Henrietta, 0.50	R. B. Parsons, Flushington, N. Y., 1.00
W. B. Brown, do, 1.00	S. G. Gage, Savanna, 1.00
E. Gooding, do, 0.50	H. Truesdell, Cuylerville, 0.50
Mrs. A. Paul, Northampton, Mass., 1.00	R. N. Wright, do, 0.50
H. Hyde, Ossage, 0.50	C. Holmes, Mt. Morris, 0.50
A. B. Ode, Madison, 0.50	E. S. Skinner, Chius, 0.50
W. P. Harris, Brownhelm, Ohio, 1.00	H. Blackmer, Livonia, 2.00
H. Bushnell, W. Bloomfield, do, 1.00	H. W. Ammerman, Port Byron, 1.00
J. F. Shepard, do, 0.50	J. I. Wilson, do, 0.50
S. P. Harvey, do, 0.50	I. Wilson, Hebron, 0.50
J. Cobb, Honeoye, 0.50	J. M. Sterling, Cleveland, Ohio, 1.00
D. K. Hawley, do, 1.00	
E. Verplanck, Rondout, 1.00	
G. J. L. Colby, Newburyport, Mass., 1.00	Amount, 4.25

Printed at the Citizen Office, Perry, N. Y. Where may be had

Cards, Blanks & Handbills together with every description of Book & Job Printing.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. V—No. 1.
WHOLE NUMBER, 57.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JANUARY, 1817.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.
TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

A. WARREN, Printer, Perry, N. Y.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money, without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz: papers, per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
twenty-eight papers for 100 | One hundred papers, \$3 00

OF SPIRITUAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL DESPOTISM.

REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, AND PROGRESS, AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS OF POLITY IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD, THEREFORE, BE ABANDONED.

NO. 2.

PARTIAL PROGRESS OF DESPOTISM IN THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

PRESBYTERIAN TESTIMONY.

Reverting back again to the history of spiritual despotism during the first three centuries, we dismiss the congregational historian, and take up a presbyterian writer, Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton.—In his treatise concerning the office of Ruling Elder he says:

"Shortly after the apostolic age, several ecclesiastical offices, it is confessed on all hands, were either invented, or modified, so as to suit the declining spirituality of the times." pg. 76.

"A worldly and ambitious spirit gained ground, he who bore the title began to advance certain peculiar divine claims, first, those of styled Chairman, President, or Moderator, and finally, those of a new order, or grade of office."

In pursuing this subject, Dr. Miller is led to confess that his former views of the clerical office have undergone a change, that whereas, he formerly thought the term clerical should apply exclusively to teaching elders, now he would apply it also to those commonly called by presbyterians, lay elders, "so far as the distinction of clergy and laity is proper at all." He says, (concerning the distinction between clerical and lay elders,)

"When we speak of the one as clergymen and the others laymen, we are apt to convey an idea altogether erroneous if not seriously mischievous, 'some judicious and pious men' [mark it!] Not 'fanatics and disorganizers'"] have indeed expressed serious doubts whether the terms clergy and laity ought ever to have been introduced into our theological nomenclature." pg. 202, &c.

The writer afterwards explains the sense in which he would use the word *clergy*, if at all, and in this sense, he thinks the use of it might be admissible, viz:

"Whether therefore we refer to the early usage, or to strict philological import, ruling elders are as truly entitled to the name of *clergy*, in the only legitimate sense of that term, that is, they are as truly ecclesiastical officers as those who labor in word and doctrine." page 208.

If it were understood that the term *clergy* included all church officers, and that it meant nothing more than to say that they were officers, the consequential airs and importance of a large class of men would be greatly reduced! But Dr. Miller does not stop here. He feels that still further testimony is needed against clerical encroachment. He adds—

"The author of this Essay has no zeal either for retaining or using the terms *clergy* and *laity*. So far as the former term has been heretofore used, or may now be intended to convey the idea of a 'privileged order' in the Church, a dignified body lifted up, in rank and claim, above the mass of the Church members, in a word, as designating a set of men claiming to be vicars of Christ, keepers of the hominid conscience, and the only channels of grace, he disclaims and abhors it. He is a believer in no such men, or men. But so far as it is intended to designate those who are clothed with ecclesiastical office," &c., &c., &c.—"the writer is of opinion that that or some other equivalent term ought to be used," &c., &c., &c. But he protests against the use of the term *lay elder* as really adapted to make an erroneous impression. Let the class of officers in question be called *Ruling Elders*." pages 208—209.

Let it be remembered that this is the language, not of a "disorganizing fanatic" at Honeoyo, but of the learned Doctor Miller, of the Theological Seminary at Princeton! Nothing can be plainer than that a consideration of the incipient growth of ecclesiastical domination led Dr. Miller instinctively to perceive that he could not do justice to his subject without giving prominence to the separation of the *CLERGY* from the *LAITY*, the erection of a *CLERICAL CASTLE*! Equally plain is it that he saw the delicacy of his position, and that the term was "now" as "heretofore" used in the sense which he had pronounced "mischievous" and conveying ideas which he abhorred! It was not strange that this strong language and clear exposure (some years ago) of the unscriptural elevation of the clergy in the Presbyterian Church, should have given rise to a party in that church, desirous of some abatement of the nuisance. Our readers will recollect the fate of that movement, in the proceedings of the (old school) Gene-

ral Assembly of the presbyterian church. The views of Dr. Miller were substantially embodied in an overture for elevating the *lay elders* to the same dignity with the *clergy*. The proposition was neglected by a large vote, so that the view of clerical elevation above the laity which Dr. Miller "abhorred" was emphatically sustained! And it is understood that leading congregational clergymen, in their intercourse with their Presbyterian brethren, manifested not a little solicitude at the agitation, and satisfaction with the result. The next thing, they knew, would be to put congregational *deacons* on a par with the *clergy*, and how could they endure that? The author of the pamphlet, "Anti-Deacon," would find fresh occasion for his labors in such an emergency! We cannot afford to part with Dr. Miller without a brief extract more.

"The authority which the apostle claims as existing and to be exercised in the church, he represents (2 Cor. X 6) as given for edification, and destruction. Not for the purpose of creating and pampering classes of 'privileged orders' to lord it over God's heritage. Not to build up a system of polity which may minister to the pride of an ambitious priesthood, nor form a body, under the title of *CLERGY* with separate interests from the *LAITY* of the church. All this is as wicked as it is unreasonable."

[It is to be hoped that the effort to get rid of that separation will neither be thought "wicked or unreasonable!"]

We should be gratified, if Dr. Miller could find it convenient, to make the tour of Western New York, and lecture among the churches in this style. If he should conclude to do so, the friends of church Reform might afford him a reasonable support, for we are greatly in need of well informed lecturers who thoroughly understand this subject and will do it justice. But the difficulty we fear would be, that, after one or two such lectures, a hue and cry of "disorganization" would be raised, and the learned Professor at Princeton would be able to gain access to very few presbyterian or even congregational pulpits, Old School or New. One reason why we think so is because the publication of an essay in the Christian Investigator of May, 1843, on the subject of "the Christian Ministry, Pastoral Office, Church Officers," the sharpest points of which were fully fortified by these same paragraphs from the pen of Dr. Miller, created a very unpleasant sensation,

and secured for the Editor the reputation of being a "disorganizer," which has been fastened upon him ever since. Let any one who chooses, make the experiment of repeating Dr. Miller's sentences, word for word, and see what effect will be produced. How the Doctor came to get into so fanatical a turn of mind has been already explained. He was writing a book which led him into a deep study of the incipient growth of spiritual despotism in the ancient Church. No person not a thorough Romanist or Puseyite could ponder the history of that period without experiencing a similar effect.—The testimony of learned Episcopalians we shall soon see. In the mean time, let it be noticed that Dr. Miller, in the extract last quoted, does not speak of "creating or pampering" a *Papacy*, nor a bench of *cardinals*, nor a corps of *arch bishops*, nor a conclave of *diocesans* or *metropolitans*, but simply a body of men "under the title of *CLERGY*, with separate interests from the *LAIITY* of the Church." Here it was, and (in matter of chronological order) *before* either diocesans, metropolitans, arch bishops, cardinals, or popes were over heard or dreamed of, that Doctor Miller detected the core and essence of the mischief! Put a pin there, for future reference and meditation, we in vain come, if we ever do, to our Propositions X and XI. We shall probably use or distinctly embody the discovery of Dr. Miller then.

EPISCOPAL TESTIMONY.

Let us next see what *Episcopal* writers have to say concerning spiritual despotism in the church, if, with their profound veneration for the "Fathers" of that period, they can admit the idea of any such thing as existing in their times. We have seen that *Congregationalists* and *Presbyterians*, who are more free to speak of the early corruptions and despoticisms of the church, have, very remarkably, borne testimony, whether aware of it or not, to the fact that those corruptions and despoticisms arose to a great height *before* the original independency of the churches was supplanted by either *Papacy*, metropolitan or diocesan episcopacy and *before* the control of the churches and Ministry by the secular power, or their corruption by so foul and seductive an alliance.—We are now to see, whether *Episcopal* writers will admit that there were any spiritual corruptions and despoticisms in those early periods of a church, whose "Christian Fathers" (the despots of their

times, if there were such) are of almost equal authority with the apostles, in the ranks of high churchmen! Such Episcopal writers as know better than to attempt imposing upon the public credulity, with the pretension that diocesan Episcopacy existed during the first three centuries, might indeed be tempted to admit the despoticisms even of the "Christian Fathers" themselves, if by that means they might throw off from Episcopacy and on to Congregationalism the odium of originating the despoticisms that are known, (in some form and at some time,) to have crept in. But such writers, we suppose would not seriously attempt to maintain that diocesan Episcopacy, in the fourth and fifth centuries, had done anything effective towards correcting, repressing, or reducing the corruptions that the congregational clergy of the first three centuries had introduced. No ecclesiastical history that we know of would bear them out in that supposition! One citation to this point, may suffice. [We copy from Punchard's History. pg. 24].

Even Milner, who certainly cannot be accused of uncharitableness towards the orthodox and established church, gives a sombre picture of the state of religion, near the close of the third century. "If," says he "Christ's kingdom had been of this world, and if its strength and beauty were to be measured by secular prosperity, we should here fix the era of its greatness. But, on the contrary, the era of its actual declension must be dated in the pacific part of Diocletian's reign. 'During this whole century, the work of God in purity and power, had been tending to decay.'—Ambition and covetousness, near, had in general, gained the ascendancy in the Christian Church." Hist. of Chh. III. Cant. Chap. 17.

Spiritual despotism must have been witnessed, of course! We will now take up, again, Lord King's account of the "Primitive Church." His testimony to its congregational independency, the reader has seen. Let us now hear his testimony concerning the ecclesiastical powers wielded by those same Congregational Clergy. In his chap. III. he treats largely of the *Synods*. He begins with stating as clearly as any of our modern Congregational Platforms do (not excepting the Cambridge one) the essential independency of the local churches and their bishops! This was conceded, in terms, by the Synods, just as it is now conceded by our clerical associations, Consociations of Churches, Presbyteries &c. Thus, the African Synod, availing in one of their Epistles, to the fact that some bishops, would retain their own peculiar views, says, "To these we offer no violence, or prescribe any law, since every bishop has, in the administration of his church, free liberty to follow his own will, being to render an account of his actions to the Lord." pg.

128.* Even the lordly Cyprian is quoted to nearly the same effect on page 129.

On this Lord King remarks that every Church was in this sense independent—that is, that it had the power, without the concurrence and authority of any other church, to exercise discipline, yet in another sense it was dependent, as considered with other churches, and "a particular church was not the whole church of Christ, but only a part or member of the universal one."—pg. 129—This confused sentiment, existing in our modern Congregational writers, (and expressed in nearly the same words with Lord King) very naturally resulted in the Episcopacy and in the Popacy that followed. As far back as the landing at Plymouth, and from as good a man as Mr. Robinson, we find the same careful repudiation of strict independency, and a bearing towards a Congregationalism that should admit of general supervision: The heaven of a diocesan Episcopacy, in some form, is quite evident here. Supervision of a plurality of churches and diocesan authority are one and the same thing, call it by what name you will. The Synods of the second and third century, (like our associations, consociations, and Presbyteries,) wielded this supervisory power.—Speaking of the ancient CHURCHES, Lord King says—

"But that which chiefly deserves our consideration was their intercourse and GOVERNMENT by synodical assemblies, that is, by a convocation of bishops" (i. e. pastors of local churches,) who frequently met together to maintain unity, love and concord, to advise about the common circumstances and conditions to regulate all ecclesiastical, or church affairs within their respective limits, and to manage other such like things."

A better far simile of the "powers" of our modern ecclesiastical bodies, connected with churches claiming the same local congregational independency that the ancient churches did, could not easily be produced. Our enterprising countrymen of the "Daguerotype" art, could not do better, in the clearest sun-light, if they should try! And "that which chiefly concerns our consideration," as Lord King so quaintly and shrewdly observes) is, that by these conventions, or associations of pastors &c., &c., the "GOVERNMENT" of our so called independent churches is effectually administered!—In what manner we shall see, as we proceed.

* Notice here, that, as in modern times, the independency of the local church bishop, is put for the independency of the church itself. We have known zealous clerical advocates of church independency who evidently made this mistake! When "the Church" only means the pastor it is not marvellous that the pastor should decry exterior control, or a court of appeal from his own decisions!

That the ancient Synods, like our modern associations, associations, presbyteries, &c. disclaimed, in the first place, any authoritative or binding power over the local pastors, we have already seen. But nothing is more common than to disclaim and yet exercise power in the same instant, to say nothing of the fact that men in the occupancy of positions that imply power, are led to the exercise of authority without being aware of it themselves.

"Advisory power," as it is sometimes called, becomes unlimited power, whenever it becomes authoritative at all, and no organized body acting in the manner described can help exercising authoritative dominion, however honestly and earnestly it may protest, in the outset, that its power is only advisory! The African Synods, and even Cyprian himself, claimed only "advisory power," but the result was soon seen. The same African Synods, as Lord King relates, enacted a number of rules or canons. A number of these he enumerates, one of which was that "no clergyman should be a curator or trustee of a lost will and testament"—and another that no lapsed clergyman, even on repentance, should be eligible to the ministry, or to the communion only as a layman. Thus, the action of particular churches was decided for them, before hand, just as the pulpit doors of "independent local churches" (!) are closed now, and sometimes without their knowledge of the fact, even afterwards, by an informal and unpublished vote of the presbytery or clerical association. On these canons, Lord King remarks:

"And many other such synodical decrees relating to the discipline and polity of the church are to be met with in Cyprian, which were ever accounted obligatory to all those parishes who lived within those respective provinces, and had their representatives in those respective Synods. For what purpose else did they decree them? It had been fruitless and ridiculous to have made frequent and wearisome journeys, with great cost and pains to have debated and determined those things which they judged expedient for the churches, well being, if at all, it was indifferent whether they were obeyed or not."—pg. 138.

Equally "ridiculous" is the pretence, now, that grave men, regularly organized, and styling themselves "ecclesiastical bodies" and adopting "rules" of church discipline, exercise only "advisory power!" And the penalties inflicted on delinquents who will not submit, are much the same now as in the times treated of by Lord King. On one occasion, he says, a presbyter named Victor, was threatened with "excommunication" because he had broken one of their rules, but they were content to "chide him" with his rashness ["impru-

dence!"] charging him that he should do so no more. In other cases, refractory clergy were "deposed from the ministry" as they now are.

A mass of individuals, promiscuously gathered, without reference to rank or official station, coming together in convention, simply as individuals and not the representatives of others, discussing particular topics and promulgating their opinions, and then dissolving their temporary organization into thin air, are not to be confounded, by reasonable and candid men, with such exclusive and imposing bodies of official dignitaries acting officially, as has been described. And the pretended precedent in Acts XV. (an hundred times analyzed) contains scarcely a single point of resemblance, when examined. [See Note in Christian Investigator for April, 1843.] The apologists of Clerical Synods, &c., must be hard run for a precedent when they grasp at a case in which one assembled brotherhood apply, on a special occasion, for the advice of another assembly or local church, and that advice is given, not by the clergy—not the representatives of a church or churches, but by all the brethren, "assembled with one accord."

We must leave the Synods, to glance, hastily, at the powers exercised by individual pastors, over their flocks. Here it is, that clerical authority is most felt, after all.

Justin Martyr is quoted by Lord King as saying—"Where the bishop [pastor] is, there the people must be"—and "there is a necessity that we do nothing without the bishop." "As Christ did nothing without the Father, so do you do nothing without the bishop and presbyters!"—pg. 32.

Cyprian describes a schismatic as one that condemns the bishop [pastor] leaves the ministers of God and dares to set up another altar. "No man can regularly constitute a new bishop or erect a new altar besides the one bishop and the one altar"—for which reason he calls the altar that is erected by schismatics against the one altar of their lawful bishops a profane altar with which agrees that of Ignatius, that that that is within the altar is pure, but he that does anything without the bishops, priests and deacons, is impure, and as he says, in another place, whosoever is without the altar, wants the bread of God."

† Soon after the persecuted John R. McDowell was causelessly deposed from the ministry by the 3d Presbytery of New York City, a young Congregational minister of New England, who deeply sympathized with McDowell, declined joining with others in a public expression of that sympathy, because said he (in our hearing) "It would cost me my ministerial standing!" He referred to the power of the clergy over him! This young man soon became pastor of a Congregational Church, and is now a Doctor of Divinity!

* The reader will observe here, that all "the three orders" of our modern episcopalians were found in the one local independent church of the ancients.

Just so it is said, now. No matter how corrupted the church and pastor are—he is the schismatic who secedes! No new church can be organized without the presence and aid of pastors of other churches! He is the true man that sticks to the church and minister, through thick and thin. He is the profane man, the infidel, the covenant breaker, who will not, at all hazards, go along with them, right or wrong! Now remember the testimony of Miller, already cited, that "covetousness and ambition had, in general, gained the ascendancy in the Christian church" in the age in which these notions were introduced! Without his testimony, any spiritually minded person might see that such must have been the fact.

"Without the bishop's leave, a presbyter could not baptize; thus saith Tertullian—"The bishop [pastor] hath the right of baptizing, then the presbyter and deacons, but yet, for the honor of the church, not without the authority of the bishop." And to the same effect saith Ignatius. "It is not lawful to any one to baptize except the bishop permit him." pg. 93.

Similar testimonies are adduced in the same connexion, to show that without the leave of these same Congregational pastors or bishops, none of the inferior church officers or members could preach, or administer the sacraments, nor absolve penitents.

Our modern Congregational as well as Presbyterian Clergy have carried this matter much further than the Bishops of the second and third century ever adventured to do! They never permit their "elders" or "deacons" to baptize, to administer the sacraments, or to preach, at all! They must needs have the monopoly of the whole in their own hands!—What would have been thought, even in Constantine's day, of so stringent a clerical despotism as that? On the other hand, what would be thought if our Congregational and Presbyterian clergy should so far incline towards primitive usages, and relax their clerical dignity as to permit their deacons and elders occasionally, to preach, to baptize, and to administer the supper, as in the days of Tertullian and Ignatius? Our array of facts proving the spiritual despotisms of the second and third century will fail, we fear, to impress, suitably, the minds of some, when they see that, in many important particulars, the clerical assumptions of those days fall so far short of those of the most democratic sects in our nineteenth century! All writers except the Romish and the Puseyite, agree, nevertheless, in affirming the lordly arrangement of the ancient clergy, as exhibited in the writings

of Ignatius, Tertullian, and Cyprian!—Especially do they revolt at the saying of Ignatius—"Let nothing be done, in ecclesiastical concerns without the bishop, for whosoever doth any without the knowledge of the bishop,† is a worshipper of the devil." [vide Lord King, page 64.]

Nothing, in short, can be more evident than that the priestly dominion of the clerical caste over the brotherhood was the anti-christ of the ancient church!—Nothing could be done without the congregational pastor or bishop! His consent was needed to make any ordination or church organization valid! Without his leave, the pulpit could not be opened to the preaching of laymen, nor could they, without his bidding, distribute the sacramental elements, or baptize. Whenever congregated as a church, without his leave says Cyprian, they "were not congregated legally according to command and whosoever officiated without the bishop, sacrificed to the devil." [Ib. page 154] "Flee all division" says Ignatius "where the pastor is, there as sheep, follow." [Ib. 154.]

When we read how Cornelius, on his being elected bishop, wrote a letter to Cyprian, to acquaint him with his "*advance to the episcopal throne!*" [Ib. page 101.] our educational training makes us imagine all this of a metropolitan or diocesan bishop, like those of the Episcopalians of our times. But no! It was only a pastor of a single local independent congregation that said this! These "parish popes" first subjugated the Christian brotherhood before the diocesans, in turn, subjected the majority of them as the Roman Pontiff, long afterwards, subdued the whole! But anti-christ began his reign at the commencement of the defection.

MONOPOLY OF PREACHING AND OF THE SACRAMENTS.

For the benefit of any who may marvel, or half discredit the fact, that laymen and church officers inferior to pastors, during the first three centuries were in the habit of preaching, baptizing, and presiding at the administration of the supper, some additional testimonies will now be adduced, including such as clearly indicate another fact, viz: that originally, before the growth of an aspiring clerical

† When this is contrasted of the diocesan bishop, all our Congregational and Presbyterian Clergy hold up their hands in horror at the blasphemy. But let it be but understood, (as was the fact) that Ignatius was only speaking of Congregational Pastors, and it is presently apparent that he claims for them no more than they commonly claim for themselves, now.

aristocracy, all these functions were exercised by believers in common, without asking leave of the pastor or bishop!—Dissenters from Episcopacy are astonished at the arrogance of the prelates who deny to the clergy in general the right of preaching and administering the sacraments without their leave, signified by the laying on of their hands. But they should bear in mind that this lordly claim is just as well founded as the claim of Presbyterian, Congregational and Baptist ministers that none but ministers ordained by ministers can properly preach or baptize.—The latter claim, indeed, runs into the former. Dissenting ministers of these sects, for the most part, can trace back their ordination only to ministers who had no ordination from clerical hands, and consequently had no leave of any clergy either to preach or to baptize!—When any Presbyterian, Congregational, or Baptist ministers deny the right of their "lay" brethren to preach or baptize without leave, license, or ordination, from ministers, they virtually deny their own right to preach or baptize till they are ordained by prelates of the "regular apostolic succession." Bear this in mind, and then ponder a few facts, from Lord King.

"As for the preacher himself, it was usually the bishop" [i. e. pastor] "of the parish. So saith Justin Martyr, 'the bishop preaches, by way of instruction and exhortation, to the imitation of those excellent things which we read.' Or else he deputed a presbyter" [i. e. an elder] "or some other fit person to preach in his room; without his consent it would have been schism and violence in any person whatsoever to have usurped his chair, but with his permission any clergyman or layman might preach in his pulpit. Now that clergymen preacher [continues Lord King] no one will question, though it will be doubted whether laymen did, but that they did so appears from a memorable history concerning Origen, who, going from Alexandria to Palestine, by the desire of the bishops of that country, publicly preached in the church, and expounded the Scriptures, although he was not yet in holy orders. At which action when Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, was offended, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem and Theoctistus of Cesarea, wrote him in defense, as follows:

Whereas you write in your Letter that it was never before seen or done that laymen should preach in the presence of bishops, therein you wander from the truth, for whosoever any are found that are fit to profit the brethren, the holy bishops, of their own accord, ask them to preach to the people. So Eusebius was desired by Neon, bishop of Laranda, and Paulinus by Celsus of Iconium and Theodorus by Atticus of Synnada, our most blessed brethren, and it is credible that this is done in other places, though we know it not. "But yet though laymen preached [continues Lord King] it was not every one that did so, but only those that were fit to profit the brethren and though they were never so fit, yet they did not irregularly, or disorderly run into the sacred office, till they were desired by the bishop of a parish, to do it, but stayed for the approbation of such a one, for without that, their sermons and discourses would have been but so many acts of schism and faction." pages 173 and 4.

"Justin Martyr describes baptism as being performed 'by the president,' and Tertullian by the presbyter or 'superintendent' and 'by the high priest who is bishop,' but with his permission, it was allowed to presbyters and deacons, and, in cases of necessity, even to laymen to baptize." page 193

Another Episcopal writer, Mr. Taylor, may be quoted to the same point.

"The deacons distributed the elements to the people (Justin Martyr, 2) but were not considered competent to preside over the mysteries. They might, however, on occasions of necessity administer baptism, indeed we find this rite to have been performed by persons altogether secular and even by military men* (see, among other evidences, the mosaics collected by Champollion.) They were not so the receivers of oblation &c., but not the trustees of the Church's property. Whatever was substantial as a means of power, had passed from the control of the PEOPLE at an early period." Spiritual Despotism. pg. 326.

THE APOSTOLIC USAGE.—A CONTRACT.

"That Philip, one of the seven (if the same Philip is found [Acts VIII] 'preaching the word' does not make him other than a layman, for it is manifest that believers at large, as well as the deacons, of the first age, used the liberty of preaching and teaching." Ib. page 326.

To the same point we might quote largely, if we had room, from the "History of planting and training of the Christian Church by the apostles. By Dr. Augustus Neander, ordinary professor of Theology in the University of Berlin."—The education and ecclesiastical connexions of this writer, must we think, have been Episcopal, of course, as nothing like Congregational Church Independency or even Presbyterianism flourishes in that quarter. This writer is highly commended by the principal Presbyterian and Congregational Clergymen in this country. Dr. Samuel Miller says of him "The celebrated Augustus Neander, Prof. in the University of Berlin, is generally considered as perhaps more profoundly skilled in Christian antiquities than any other man now living." Dr. Neander abundantly affirms the original equality of all Christians their equal rights to preach, and the entire absence, in the apostolic churches, of any thing like a clerical caste, as distinguished from the laity. The pastors during the first century, he says, were chosen by the people from among themselves, and continued to pursue their secular callings. He traces the history of innovations upon those usages, until "ministers were now urged to abstain from worldly business, and in the third century, they were absolutely prohibited from all such employment."

Thus was the decline of true spirituality marked by the growth of that spurious spiritualism that demands an "order of clergy" too holy to be contaminated with secular affairs! And this is one of the most natural things in the world. A church given up to worldliness them

*This must have been at a very late period, for there were no "military men," among the first Christians, probably not until after the accession and conversion of Constantine, early in 4th century. So that lay baptism is distinctly traced down into the period of diocesan Episcopacy!

elves, unless they give up all notions of religion, never fail to hit upon the shrewd expedient of erecting a priesthood or hierarchy to carry on their religion for them! The Catholic peasant scorns the idea of praying *himself*; he hires his priest to pray for him! The enlightened Protestant layman, however gifted, never adventures to *preach*, because *that* is the clergyman's exclusive vocation. Just as absurd as for a parent to decline teaching his children any thing, because he finds it important to employ a teacher for them! The necessity and the propriety of sustaining preachers, devoting their time to the work (when they can be sustained) does by no means argue their right to the exclusive *monopoly* of teaching. A class of men known and employed as carpenters would look very ridiculous if, in their panic of being supplanted, they should demand an enactment that none but themselves, and those of their appointment, should ever wield a broad axo, or attempt framing a building!

Neander *denies* that "in the Jewish Christian Churches, public speaking was confined to certain authorized persons." Chap. 1. page 30. In the same connexion he says:

"Meanwhile, though the apostles principally attended to the advancement of Christian knowledge, and as teachers possessed a preponderating and distinguished influence, it by no means follows that they monopolized the right of instructing the Church. In proportion as they were influenced by the spirit of the gospel it must have been their aim to lead BELIEVERS by their teaching to that spiritual maturity, which would enable them to contribute, (by virtue of the divine life communicated to all by the Holy Spirit) to their mutual awakening, instruction, and improvement."

Nearly the whole of Neander's Chap. V. on "the Constitution of the Church, and the ecclesiastical usages of the Gentile Christians" might be cited to the same effect. He adverts to "the general priesthood of all Christians" and says:

"As all believers were conscious of an equal relation to Christ their Redeemer, and of a common participation of a communion with God obtained through him, so, on this consciousness, an equal relation of believers to one another was grounded, which utterly precluded any relation like that found in other forms of religion, subsisting between a *TRINITY* of castes and a people to whom they were the mediators and spiritual guides. The apostles themselves, were very far from placing themselves in a relation to believers which bore any resemblance to a mediatory priesthood. In this respect, they always placed themselves upon a footing of equality. If Paul assured the church of his intercessory prayers, for them, he in return requested their prayers for himself. There were, accordingly, no such persons, in the Christian Church, who, like the priests of antiquity, claimed the possession of an esoteric doctrine, while they kept the people in a state of spiritual pupillage and dependence on themselves, as their sole guides and instructors in religious matters." pp. 34.

How truthful and refreshing is this picture! What a contrast to the manners of the parish bishops of the second and third centuries, and of the eighteenth and nineteenth! Our Protestant Reforma-

tions, English dissenters, Plymouth Rock Puritanisms, Whitefieldian, Wesleyan and Edwardian Revivalisms, have restored to us only a meagre fragment of apostolic spirituality and Christian freedom, after all! The blessing *will* come, but not "until the Spirit be poured upon us, from on high!"

Again, in commenting upon 1 Cor. XIV. 23, 31, (which the reader should not fail to peruse in this connexion) Neander says:

"The Christian life was to be permitted freely to develop and express itself in the church. Whoever felt an inward impulse, might venture to speak in Christian assemblies, but sound discretion ought to accompany inspiration, and might be considered as a mark of its being genuine. No one was to wish to be the sole speaker, or to interrupt others in speaking."

"As to the celebrations of the holy supper, it continued to be connected with the common meal, in which all, as members of the same family joined." page 103.

The radical departure of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, and Tertullian, (Congregationalists though they all were) from this simplicity of the apostles, is mournfully apparent! Yet Ignatius had been a hearer of John the Evangelist, and claimed to be his disciple! No wonder the venerable survivor of all his fellow apostles was constrained to testify that "even now," while he was writing, "there were many anti-Christi! What would he have said, had he lived to hear his pupil "ranting" as one observes, "in a style better suited, one would think, to six or seven centuries farther down, in ecclesiastical history!"

"Let it be your endeavor (says Ignatius) to partake all of the Holy Eucharist; for there is but one flesh of your Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup in the unity of the blood, one altar, as also there is one bishop, together with his presbytery and deacons, my fellow servants, so that whatsoever ye do, ye may do it to the will of God. . . . I cried while I was among you, I spake with a loud voice, attend to the Bishop, to the Presbytery and to the Deacons. Now some have supposed that I said this, as foretelling the division that should come among

* R. M. Beverley, - and English dissenter, whose "Hierarchy of a human Priesthood," in Letters to John Angell James our American publishers whose names, along with those of the London publishers had been placed upon the title page, dared not receive upon their shelves! Mr. Beverley should have given his work a less formidable title—he should have mixed it up with five times the same bulk of curious and useless antiquities, secured the recommendations of Dr. Miller, Dr. Cox, Dr. Edwards, Dr. Pears, Dr. Skinner, Dr. Pond, Dr. Woods, Prof. Stuart, Dr. Emerson, Dr. Jenks, and the twenty other Doctors who recommended Dr. Neander's book which contained the same "heresy" and then he might have got his work before the American public, or at least the American clergy. So small and cheap a book as Beverley's might, at into the hands of the laity and do mischief! There was some ground of suspicion, too, that he wrote, not merely as an "antiquarian" for the gratification of learned clergymen, but as a Reformer, earnestly intent on producing popular effect; a circumstance which makes all the difference in the world.

In saying this, we no more endorse the whole of Beverley's book than we do Neander's, both are valuable to men who know how to think for themselves.

you. But he is my witness for whose sake I am in bonds, that I knew nothing from any man, but the Spirit spake, saying on this wise. Do nothing without the Bishop. [Ignatius Ep. Phil.] See that ye follow your Bishop as Jesus Christ the Father, and the Presbytery as the apostles, and reverence the Deacons as the command of God.— Let no man do anything of what belongs to the church separately from the bishop. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the bishop, or by him to whom the bishop has given his consent. It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to baptize, or to celebrate the holy communion, but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing unto God! (ad Smyrn.) Beverly, Introduction pp. X.

The reader, by this time, has the evidence that preaching, baptizing, *by leave of the bishop*, was practised by laymen and subordinate church officers, in the early centuries, and also that this *clerical license itself*, was one of the first usurpations of the priesthood, after the death of the apostles, and emanating from a spirit evidently similar to that of the Papacy itself! And yet, the outward forms of Congregational Church order, without Diocesan Episcopacy, were retained about two centuries longer! The "Presbytery and the Deacons" were only subordinate officers in the local church, like our Presbyterian Elders or Church sessions; or like the Deacons and "standing committee" in some Congregational Churches.

EARLY SUPERSTITIONS.

If any farther evidence is needed that during the first three centuries, and under the ministration of a Congregational Clergy with their Synods or associations, (without any Papacy, diocesan episcopacy, or secular power, or Church and state union) a stringent system of spiritual despotism grew up and became consolidated in appropriate form, the government of the church becoming monarchical, the evidence may be found in the attendant superstitions which never fail to connect themselves with priestly imposture and domination. The work of Lord King incidentally yet copiously furnishes us with sufficient evidences of this. Baptismal regeneration and the saving efficacy of the Eucharist were as clearly taught and as firmly believed, in those Congregational Churches of antiquity as they ever have been, in any period of the Romish Church, since, or by the Puseyites, now.

What a contrast to the spirit and language of the apostles! It can hardly be said that the change was gradual and almost imperceptible in this case. One is shocked with the suddenness of the transition. Dr. Edward Beecher and the American Board are welcome to the testimony of Ignatius that there were *slaveholders* in the churches that could receive this, for Christian teaching! How could it be otherwise? But that Paul, John, and James would have fraternized with them or their teachings, all the time is another question!

"Children received the Eucharist in the primitive church, which is also a thing so well known as that for the proof of it I shall only urge one passage of Cyprian where he tells the story of a sucking girl who so violently refused the taste of the sacramental wine, that the deacon was obliged forcibly to open her lips, and to pour down the consecrated wine,—therefore it naturally follows that children were baptized, for if they received that ordinance which always succeeded baptism, then of necessity, they must have received baptism itself. Origen writes—children are baptized, for the remission of their sins, for the purging away of their natural filth and original impurity, which is inherent in them." pg. 100.

After showing how the ceremony of exorcism always preceded baptism, the author says:

"When exorcism was finished, then came baptism itself, and the person being ready to be baptized, the minister, by prayer, consecrated the water for that use, because it was not any water but only that water as Sedulius, bishop of Turbo writes which is sanctified in the church, by the prayers of the ministers that washeth away sin." It is true indeed, as Tertullian writes, that any waters may be applied to that use, but then God must first be invoked, and then the Holy Ghost, presently comes down from heaven, and moves upon them and sanctifies them. Wherefore, says Cyprian, the water must be cleansed and sanctified by the priest, that by its washing, it may wash away the sins of the man that is baptized." pg. 217.

"For, as Clement of Alexandria says—'The baptized person, by this dedication to the blessed Trinity, is delivered from the corrupt trinity, i.e. the devil, the world, and the flesh, and is now sealed by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' 1b.

Lord King discusses the question whether presbyters as well as bishops had the power of confirmation, and very gravely adduces the following argument to show that they had the power.

"If the presbyters had not this power of confirmation, many souls must have been damned for the unavoidable default of a bishop [i.e. during his long absence] which is too cruel and unjust to imagine!" page 67.

PUSEYISM, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

No intelligent reader can fail to see that this is the precise doctrine of Dr. Pusey and of the Church of Rome, at the present day. Yet this doctrine prevailed among the "Christian Fathers" who flourished long before papacy or even diocesan episcopacy were introduced!—The doctrine was first taught in the church, not by metropolitan and prelates, but by pastors of Congregational Churches, who are still had in honor by the clergy of all sects. But how can they consistently regard these as 'patterns' of primitive piety, and then affect to start back with horror at the recent effort, at Oxford, to restore the same primitive piety to the church? Considering the common practice among dissenters as well as Episcopalians, of lumping in the first two or three centuries along with the apostolic age, and calling the Christianity of the whole period "primitive," what else could we expect but that the Oxford movement should find some in all the sects inclined to look upon it with favor?

PHILOSOPHY OF THESE PHENOMENA.—FURTHER TESTIMONY.

The superadditions just now recorded, form an important link in the chain of spiritual despotism. Historically and philosophically, the entire process may be summed up, thus, (1.) The decline of vital godliness, the worldliness of the brotherhood, the ambition of the pastors. (2.) The idleness of the rituals, the inroads of superstition. (3.) The monopoly of these rituals and of preaching, by the pastors, and those whom they may license. (4.) The more perfect elevation of the pastors over the laity by a separation from them, effected by some organization of the clergy among themselves, either with or without a small and subservient lay representation whom they can control. When these four links are completed, the chain is entire; and the question whether or no the clergy shall establish a diocesan hierarchy or a papacy over themselves, is a matter of comparative unimportance to the laity. All this is evident enough, from the history we are considering.

The view just now taken is not new. An Episcopal writer of high standing, already cited, has very forcibly presented the true theory of the process. Let us hear him. Discussing the history of the first three centuries, he says:

"Those great and consolatory truths on which all stress was laid by Paul, John, Peter, and James,—of rational import, and of elevating influence, though not denied nor forgotten, had sunk into a secondary place in favor of notions which attribute unutterable value, and a mysterious efficacy to the Christian ceremonies. Here, we trace the first footmarks of clerical overreachment. The administration of the sacraments was the inviolable prerogative of priests and these symbols, rather than the great principles they held forth, were rested upon, as vital energy; it was upon touching, or, handing, the material elements, or upon being duly touched and handled by the dispensers of the mysteries, that eternal life depended. Not to be washed in the laver of regeneration, not to eat of the dying flesh, not to drink of the blood, not to be anointed with the oil of remission, was to perish everlastingly. Salvation and perdition turned, not upon the condition of the heart in God's sight, but upon having a share of the consecrated fluid or solid matter, which the priest might bestow, or might refuse!"—Spiritual Despotism, pg. 149—60.

"We should not fail to mention the important influence which the custom of holding provincial and general councils had, in effecting the general position of the clergy and laity. The first and most marked result of that practice of transferring every considerable controversy, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical, from the church where it originated to a convention of bishops, was of course at once cut off the people from all control over such discussions, and virtually to deny them the right of entertaining a free opinion on the subject of debate."

"If there had been no other cause at work to give rise to spiritual despotism, this alone would have been enough; we must assign the commencement of its operation to as early a period as the middle of the second century. There can be no security, no liberty, and scarcely any purity or vitality in a church which says to the laity in the mass—'You have nothing to do with theology but to receive what we teach you; and nothing to do with rules of discipline or laws of administration but to yield them obedience.'"—pp. 154, 155.

"When the bishops returned from these aristocratic conventions to their flocks, bearing with them authoritative determination of religious controversies,

together with general rules of conduct, or canons, and special decisions concerning individuals, what was likely to happen? Let us suppose that the clergy, as well as the people, obsequiously bowed to the wisdom or the will of their superiors. This acquiescence, in most cases, could take place only because clergy as well as laity had already been so disciplined in servile and silent submission that they knew no other law and no other rule of right than the word of their spiritual masters. Despotism must almost have reached its height where the decrees of synods met with no resistance." * * * page 161—2.

"Thus it is always that despotic practices involve the necessity of still more arbitrary proceedings.—It is not in the nature of things that any invasion of the rights of men should stop at a point of comparative moderation; if we wrong men, we must, in self defence, go on to enslave them. The most horrible excess of tyranny are coiled in the egg that is left, without noise or notice, to hatch in the end, by dragon pride." pg. 62.

"The synodical system then, such as prevailed both in the east and in the west, is justly named as a principle cause or means of the Spiritual Despotism which so early grasped the Christian world. 2b.

"In every age, it has been by gathering themselves into clusters, apart from the people, by sitting in conclave, with the doors barred against the laity and by concerting measures, not in the church but in chambers and closets, that ministers of religion have converted the gospel into a system of tyranny and an engine of cruelty. The history of spiritual despotism hinges upon this division of the elements of church power. An impious and fatal divorce of what God had joined—a divorce effected by the clergy, was the principal means of establishing all corruptions and all usurpations." pg. 123.

Now, for the inevitable result of all this:—"With the early defenders of ecclesiastical power, those, we mean, who belong to the primitive era now under review, the unity of the church meant that artificial concert, action of actual persons, which converged upon Carthage, upon Antioch, upon Alexandria, or upon Rome. It was not the consent of all believers, but the sense of Dionysius, of Cyprian or of Cornelius. The communion of saints was not the affectionate correspondences and intercourse of all who held to the Creed, and loved each other as members of Christ, but rather the visible fact of ecclesiastical submission to this or to that metropolitan or patriarch. The form was taken for the substance; and those, in many cases, were treated as aliens or enemies, whose only crime was the calling in question some arbitrary determination of a self-constructed and irresponsible authority."—pg. 168, 169.

These graphic pictures of Taylor, the historian of "Spiritual Despotism," can scarcely fail to impress us with the fact that a body of Congregational pastors, holding a monopoly of preaching and of the rituals, organized by themselves in associations or synods, and superintending the churches, not only embody all the elements of a Spiritual Despotism, but naturally tend to introduce those advanced forms of domination which are witnessed under an Episcopacy or Papacy. And this same conclusion was reached by the late Dr. Emmons, amid the activities of even Massachusetts Congregationalism.

"Associationalism," said Emmons "leads to Congregationalism—Congregationalism leads to Presbyterianism—Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy—Episcopacy leads to Roman Catholicism—and Roman Catholicism is an ultimate fact."

Lord King and Mr. Taylor, in common with other writers on Church History, have given us abundant proofs that,

"What 'resistance' do they meet in our Presbyterian and Congregational communities? The affected mildness just enough to attest that their consciences demur against their decisions, and then they submit to them!" Thus they attest their own want of fidelity to Christ!

in the ancient churches, the synodical system, very nearly identical with associations or consecrations, less to Episcopacy and Papacy. What Eamons saw at work in Massachusetts, the historians of the church have recorded as having been actually realized in the early centuries.

NOMINAL ORTHODOXY, AN INSUFFICIENT SAFEGUARD, WITHOUT MORE.

It will be thought, perhaps, by some, that the Churches of the second and third centuries, though retaining their Congregational form of polity, must have widely departed from the orthodox theology, otherwise, such superstitions and despotisms could not have been introduced. They must have become Socinians, arians, or grossly heretical, in some way. No such thing! These Congregational pastors and their clerical associations, were the very conservators of orthodoxy against heretics! "The sentiments of the primitive Christians" says Goodrich, "for the three first centuries, in reference to the Savior historians tell us was generally uniform." [pg. 71.] The Arian controversy did not arise until the beginning of the fourth century, and in A. D. 325 Arius was deposed and excommunicated. Afterwards, the Arians gained the ascendancy, for a time, but orthodoxy finally prevailed. Pelagius broached his heresy about a century after Arius, A. D. 404 or 5. His heresy, too, was condemned, and even down to Luther's time, the theology of the Romish Church remained commendably orthodox, though sunk into a secondary place, to give room for mysterious sacraments, as we have already seen to have been the case, in the first and second centuries. And hence, the power of Luther lay very much in violating their correct theology against their corrupt practices, a good example for Church Reformers in our times. The third century, it seems, witnessed some similar conflicts.

CHURCH REFORM BY SECESSION FROM CORRUPT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

"In the year A. D. 251 Novatian and his followers separated themselves from the church of Rome, and the local Congregational Church in that City, and joined from the entire catholic community. It is professedly Christians in general, not for a reason of faith, for they agreed in doctrinal belief with the great body of the church, but on the ground that the catholic church (the church in general) was corrupted, and was unworthy of membership, and was no longer a body of innocent persons, and that her congregations were no longer entitled to the name of Christian churches."

These Novatianists became very numerous all over the empire. Punched claims them as the genuine Christians of the times, and strict Congregationalists,

as doubtless they were; but it ought to be understood that they were seceders from orthodox Congregational Churches, as has already been shown, not on theological grounds, but because of their temporizing and worldly policy (see page 46) and the membership and ascendancy of ungodly men in the Church. "The Novatianists were repeatedly condemned by the Synods but still they increased." (pg. 50) "Purity of principle and inflexibility of discipline were their favorite objects." So says Milner, who mourns over their schism (ib.) "Ecclesiastical writers agree in representing Novatian as strictly orthodox in his religious doctrines, and the sect, as remarkably strict in their discipline and pure in their morals" (pg. 40.) Afterwards, when the Congregational associationism of the third century had ripened into the Episcopacy of the fourth and fifth, "when the strong arm of the law was moved by the Church, par excellence; these conscientious dissenters were persecuted unto death, or were obliged to lurk in corners and worship God in private." (pg. 51.) They were not extinguished until towards the close of the fifth century. "Their distinctive and fundamental principles" was that "the church of Christ should consist of none but the truly pious, and if any forfeited this by an open denial of their faith" [to avoid persecution] or, as they termed it, a sin unto death, they should be rejected by the church." (pg. 53.)

An interesting lesson, for reflection, at the present time.

We think we have now proved our 9th Proposition (see last number,) to wit, that under the forms of Congregational church independency, as the term is now understood, without any papacy, without any union of church and state, without any secular power, without any diocesan Episcopacy or modern organized Presbyterianism, the churches of the first three centuries came, nevertheless, under the control of a spiritual despotism.

More than this, we think has been proved, which might be embodied in some additional propositions, indicating the mode and form of this general fact. These, in a future number, we may state, but for the present we leave the reader to make his own reflections, and draw his own conclusions.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

Since writing the foregoing, we have been looking over a modern work which has recently been commended to our attention, by a friend in New England, and find it to contain additional testimony of some value to us, in these times, when so much is said and done to raise the cry of disorganization against us and to pour contempt upon our statements of the most incontestable facts of Church history. This book is entitled, "The Congregational Catechism, containing a survey of the organization, government and discipline of Christian Churches. N. Haven, published by A. H. Maltby, 1844." From

the preface, written by Rev. E. R. Tylor, it appears that the work was prepared by himself, assisted by Rev. Dr. Murdock of N. Haven, "to whom he was indebted for those parts, especially, which relate to the Jewish Synagogue, and the constitution of the Church in the age, immediately succeeding the apostles." A few extracts may be useful, in this place.

Quest. 31. In what relation did those primitive Churches stand to each other?

Ans. They were completely independent bodies. That is, they had power to appoint and to depose their own officers, to administer discipline, and to regulate and determine all their other ecclesiastical concerns, subject to no court of appeal or higher power having authority to reverse their decisions. They were united to one another by the ties of a common faith, common hope, and common aims; but they acknowledged no subjection or subordination of one church to another, nor did they, in the apostolic age, enter into any confederation of churches, thereby creating a central power having dominion over them all. See Murdock's *Monarchy Cent. 3 P. II Ch. II* sect. 11, and *Cent. II P. II, Ch. II* sect. 1-2. — Tylor page 23-1.

Quest. 32. What is the evidence of this independency of the primitive Churches?

Ans. 1. There is no account in the scriptures of the appointment, or notice of the existence of any presbytery or consociation of churches, having power to review and reverse the decisions of particular churches, or override their doings; nor is there any instance in which their acts were reviewed, or set aside, by any such authority. This omission to mention such a tribunal can be accounted for, only on the supposition that no tribunal of the kind existed.

2. The apostles themselves refer to the brotherhood every question not determined by revelation respecting the order and government of the churches. The question about circumcision was decided by joint action of the apostles and Elders and "the whole church" Acts XV. The appointment of elders was made by a vote of the brethren, compare Acts XIV 23 with 2 Cor. VIII 19. The word rendered "ordained" in the former passage, is rendered in the other "chosen" of the churches. The sense in Acts XIV 23 is—"When they had, by election or vote of the brethren provided them elders in every church." page 25.

3. The rejection, deposition, or exclusion from the church, of unworthy teachers, belonged to each particular church. One of the seven churches of Asia is commended for trying false teachers, Rev. II 2 and another is censured for tolerating them, Rev. II 20. The churches are also commanded, John IV, 1, to "try the spirits" that is, the teachers of religion, for the purpose, evidently, of deciding who were worthy of confidence, and forbidding those to teach in their assemblies, who should be found unworthy.

4. Particular churches are expressly recognized as independent communities, admitting and excluding persons as members, Romans XIV 1-1 Cor. V 1, 7, without appeal from their decisions, which manifestly includes all the powers of self government.—ib.

Quest. 33. After what pattern were the first Christian churches modelled and regulated?

Ans. In a great measure, after the pattern of the Jewish Synagogues and not, as some have supposed, after the pattern of the Mosiac institutions for the national worship of the Tabernacle and the temple. &c. &c. page 26. [Vide Lightfoot and Whitely.]

Synagogues were popular assemblies, in which all classes of people met together, fraternally, on the sabbath and on festival days to hear the scriptures read and explained, to offer prayer and praise to God, and to receive religious instructions from any persons competent and willing to give it. See *Prædix Connexions*, Part I, B, VI, Anno 434 and *Vitrage de Synagoga Vetera*.—(Tylor pg. 27.)

The author proceeds at some length, to show that the "elders" in the Synagogue, held no exclusive right or monopoly of religious teaching, and that "all the male persons present, who were competent and of reputable character, might be, and actually were, called out, successively, to perform these services, in accordance with certain rules of decorum and courtesy. (Vitrage, pg. 28-4)—that "the regular

service of the Synagogue, might be, and often was, performed even without the presence of an Elder—and that finally,

"The worship in the primitive churches, though conducted on the same social principles, was probably less confined to a fixed and established rubric for there was not a formal liturgy, and probably no stated lessons of scripture to be read," pg. 32.

"Besides the immediate co-signature of the Apostles, many others of the early Christians took upon them the office of public teachers and propagators of Christianity. And they were encouraged by the apostles in doing so, for in that early age, any private Christian might preach the gospel and administer its ordinances, without any formal license, or consecration to the work.

What would be thought, in Connecticut, where this "Congregational Catechism" is circulating, if an attempt should be made, in that State, to reduce these admitted principles of primitive Congregationalism to practice?

In tracing the early departures of the Churches from primitive usages, our author mentions, as one of the first symptoms, "the supposed divine right of clergymen only, to bear rule in the Churches, and officiate in holy things," and this, simultaneously with the consideration that "all their official acts, and administrations were supposed to be accompanied by a mysterious divine efficacy," page 56.

"Metropolitans originated from the establishment of Provincial Synods or Councils, about the beginning of the third century. Primate and Patriarchs were first established in the fourth century, under the Christian Emperors," pg. 63.

"The independence of single churches was undermined and subverted in the third and fourth centuries, by the introduction of ecclesiastical councils, with legislative and judicial powers," pg. 70.

Precisely the same process by which the independence of the Congregational churches in New England have been undermined, as we shall perhaps, show, before we dismiss the discussion. How gradually and almost imperceptibly these changes were introduced into the ancient churches, Mr. Tyler and Dr. Murdock, in their "Congregational Catechism" have abundantly shown. We hope the Congregationalists of this country will "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest."

From the American Freeman.

UGHT THE LIBERTY PARTY TO SUPPORT MEMBERS OF PRO-SLAVERY CHURCHES FOR OFFICE?—No. 3.

We do not say but that there are many who confound things together, and have honest doubts as to the sinfulness of a great many things that they call Slavery, but we do say, that they do not have, and can not have, any doubt as to that which Slavery really is. They may not know what to think of involuntary servitude, depriving man of his liberty, holding property in man, &c., perhaps, but they do know what to think of making a man *himself* property, of reducing him to a level with the brute, and of treating him, though created in the image of God, like a chattel, or a piece of property. *This*, they do know to be wrong. They do know that it is inconsistent with the law given to all for the regulation of their conduct, "do to others as ye would that others do to you." How long then, must a man remain in a church, in order to abolition

ize it? Besides, Jesus Christ has told us that what we do to the Christian slave, we do to him. "Inasmuch as ye did, or did it not, to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did, or did it not unto me." In other words, the *Savior himself* is a slave, in the person of every Christian bondman in the nation. How long must a man wait, to convince a church of the guilt of enslaving *their own Head*, before he may rationally conclude, aye, before he must conclude that its members are not Christians? And how long has he a right to remain in such a church, when he finds no response to his efforts? Can a case possibly be plainer? And yet this is but the case of every pro-slavery church from Maine to Wisconsin!

But we need not dwell so long on this, for those who are justifying the course of the so-called abolition members of the churches of our day, can not show that they are making these strenuous efforts to reform organizations with which they are connected. Some of them perhaps may be, but most of them as certainly are not. A great many of them did put forth such efforts, but do not now. Having tried once, and failing, they seem to think that they may now sit still, and yet be trying all the time, in virtue of trying that once. And great numbers of them did try, but are hoping, and waiting, and looking to see the desired reformation.—From all which it follows, that those abolitionists who for one reason or another continue members of these churches, are in reality *upholding* them, and if so, the question is whether they themselves are not from their position at least, pro-slavery, and if so, whether the Liberty party can consistently with its principles support them for office. And this last query is the same, as whether we shall have any liberty party at all, for it is not consistent with its principles, than it is not a liberty party. But it will be said that if a man is anti-slavery in his politics, we can ask no more of him; let his course in regard to the church and religion be what it may, he has done all that we can require; and that pro-slavery in the church is altogether another matter.

But pro-slavery is pro-slavery: in politics, it is nothing more, and in the church, it is nothing less. No matter *what* it is, nor *where* it is from, nor in *what* form it appears: it is still pro-slavery. And if pro-slavery is a bad thing, it is *always* a bad thing. If it is ever wrong, it is always wrong. If it ought ever to disqualify for office, why not always? Why is it not just as injurious to the cause of the slave, to vote for a man who is pro-slavery in the church, as to vote for one who is so in the state? But it will be said, that the reason why we may not vote for a man who is pro-slavery in politics, is, that he will not rule well, that the political measures he will support, will be against the slave; but that the same objection does not lie against the man who is merely a member of a pro-slavery church. Perhaps that objection does not, but then may

not others? Others too, that will just as effectually preclude us from giving him our votes. Is not the principle just the same? Then if it is wrong to support the one, why not the other also? It is not true that the consequences to the slave are the only reasons why we do not vote for the pro-slavery political man. We do it simply because he is pro-slavery; because he is unjust, because he is anti-republican, because he tramples under foot the Declaration of Independence, because it is wrong, and because God has said, "He that ruleth over men must be just." And we do not do it too, because this being his character and conduct, voting for him will be supporting him in that character and conduct, and on that very account supporting the slavery he supports. Now is not all this equally true of any pro-slavery man? of him even whose pro-slavery consists in attachment to some particular church? and is not the influence of voting for him precisely the same as for the other? And then, too, is it not a fact, that Liberty men do refuse to vote for those who would in a great many instances do just as abolitionists would in their place, and accomplish a given object just as well?—Why do they do this? It is on the principle we have just been speaking of, that there is something to be attended to beside the consequences? Then they certainly cannot object to the adoption of the same principle in the case under consideration. Or do they thus refuse, because, though the candidate will do just as well as a Liberty man, yet they cannot vote for him without having fellowship with the great party, slave holders and all? Then why should they object to a measure, the object of which is, to have no fellowship with the great slave-holding church? Is this object of less consequence than the other? On the contrary, is it not vastly more important? And if we ought to be afraid of countenancing the political measures of our candidate, when those measures are against the slave, why not also be afraid of countenancing his ecclesiastical measures, when they too, are against the slave, aye, and a thousand fold more so in their ultimate results than the other ones can be?

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, January, 1847.

H. P. V. Hill, Rushville, 0.50	J. O. Hurlbut, do 1.00
M. Mitchell, Shingler Creek, 50	A. Ward, do 1.00
I. K. Barlett, Smithville, 50	J. Wells, do 1.00
R. Dickson, Livonia, 3.00	G. Hopkins, do 1.50
W. Lyman, Canaan, 50	F. M. Hopkins, do 0.50
A. Baecher, Livonia, 1.00	D. Clark, do 1.00
E. C. Winchester, Andover, Mass., 1.00	H. Pitts, Honeoye, 2.00
S. Lyman, Rose, 1.00	G. Stevens, Fulton, 1.00
E. W. Robinson, Berkeley Mass., 1.00	A. F. Hanna, Cadiz, Ohio, 1.00
P. Adams, Franklin, Mass., 1.00	A. Pratt, Westmoreland, 2.00
G. Thayer, Livonia, 1.00	P. Kennedy, Honeoye, 1.00
J. C. Hurlbut, Holland Patent, 1.00	C. M. Neely, Greene, Ohio, 1.00
J. Blackwell, Sandwich, Mass., 1.00	G. C. Stierman, Fulton, 1.50
J. S. Fish, do 0.50	W. Silk, Fulton, 0.50
	G. P. Price, Sandwich, Mass., 1.00
	T. F. Bassett, do 0.50
	330.00

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, Vol. V—No. 2. } HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. FEBRUARY, 1847. } WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
WHOLE NUMBER, 53. }

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.
TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

A. WARREN, Printer, Perry, N. Y.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz: papers, per dozen, \$0 50 Sixty papers, - \$2 00 twenty-eight papers for 100 One hundred papers, \$3 00

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS OF POLITY IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. III.

RECAPITULATION.

In the first of these essays, in the November and December numbers, a series of distinct propositions were laid down, and, as we trust, established, to the satisfaction of the candid and diligent enquirer after truth. The consideration of the 9th proposition was extended through the second essay (in January,) in the course of which it was shown that during the first three centuries of the Christian era, there arose a frightful spiritual despotism over the churches, which, though gradual and almost imperceptible in its early development and progress, attained, nevertheless, during that period, a great height, and wielded a controlling power over the churches which had become, for the most part, corrupt and impure, towards the close of that period, inasmuch that those faithful witnesses of Christ, the Novatianists, were obliged to secede from them, in order to maintain their own Christian integrity and Christian freedom. It was shown that this defection from truth and from primitive Church order and discipline was neither caused nor accompanied by any marked and open departure from the profession and intellectual belief of the cardinal points of a sound orthodox faith. It was also shown that this spiritual despotism was

begotten and wielded without any union of Church and State, without any aid from secular power, long before the rise of the Papacy, and even previous to the establishment of diocesan episcopacy, or the subversion of the nominal independency of the local churches.

In the course of these historical sketches it was shown that these innovations upon primitive church order, and usurpations of church power, on the part of the clergy, (who were only pastors of local and nominally independent churches, at that period) took their rise, in the demand, in the first place, that the members of the churches—the brotherhood at large—who, in apostolic times, were in the habit of preaching freely, and baptizing, as their ability and opportunity might indicate, (and each contributing to the edification of all, in their public assemblies) should, thenceforward, preach and baptize, only on special leave of the pastors; next the assumed prerogative of licensing ministers,* then the convocations of the clergy, or of clergy and lay delegates of the churches, in synods, councils, or associations, and finally the supervision and control of the churches by these bodies, and by the the pastors acting as mo-

* In Lord King's Primitive Church, Chap. 5: we have a minute account of the manner of clerical licenses, or ordinations in the times of Cyprian and of Origen. It appears that the application of the candidate was made—not to the association, council, or synod of congregational pastors, or of pastors and lay delegates, as among the congregationalists of America in our times, but to the "presbytery of the part where he dwelt" that is, to the plurality of elders, or presbyters which were found in each local church. "By them they were examined about their qualifications." If approved, they "were published or propounded to the people of that church where they were to be ordained, so that if worthy of that office, they might have the attestation of the people." "If the people objected nothing against the persons proposed, but approved of their fitness for that office, the next thing that followed was their actual ordination in that particular church where they were so propounded, not that they were only ordained for that particular church, but in it they were ordained ministers of the church universal, being at liberty to serve that church where they received their orders, or if they had a legal call, to spend their labors elsewhere in other churches," &c. pg. 66.

What a remarkable fact have we here! Amid all the priestly pomp and lordly assumption of the age of Cyprian and of Origen, the power, of licensing young ministers, so far from being the exclusive prerogative of the clergy, as among the congregationalists of Massachusetts, in their associations, was all transacted in the local church, by its officers, and not without the approbation of the laity, signified in each particular case. In this very important particular, the laity of Cyprian's time, and of Origen's, stand on a high elevation above the laity of the American congregational churches, at present! And yet our congregational, presbyterian, and even episcopal writers, of this nineteenth century, attest and condemn the clerical usurpations of those times!

archs over their respective churches.

In view of all these facts and considerations, presented in the two preceding numbers, we are now prepared to make, in continuation of the series of propositions, in our first number, the following

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS:

PROPOSITION X. The broad distinction between the CLERGY and the LAITY, by which the former were elevated into a distinct caste, was the germ, the essence, and the definition of spiritual despotism, as manifested in the churches of the second and third centuries.

PROPOSITION XII. The addition of a lay delegation, by the churches, to these councils or synods, instead of securing the rights of the laity, only added the formal assent of the churches to proceedings which would otherwise have been understood to have been unauthorized; and the clergy were still able, effectually to shape and control the whole; so that by this means an additional step was taken towards the rise of the episcopacies that afterwards followed: just as, in our times, the addition of a lay delegation acting jointly with the clergy, (and giving to each pastor as much weight in the body as the entire church besides) defines the step from simple associationism, as in Massachusetts, to consociationism, as in Connecticut, which latter has been well described by Ezra Stiles Ely, as "virtually, a Presbyterian government, under another name."

XIII. The rise of diocesan episcopacy, prelacy, and even papacy, when these events severally took place, in the ancient church, produced so slight a change in the relative position of clergy and laity as to be scarcely perceived; and in fact the previous separation of the clergy from the laity, in the second and third centuries, (while the churches were yet nominally independent, and ministerial equality had not been, in form, subverted by episcopacy) the separation which, with few exceptions, has been continued ever since, in the churches, protestant as well as papal, dissenting as well as episcopal, was, all along, ever has been, and still is the main evil, so far as an organized spiritual despotism is concerned. Where you have the essential separation of the clergy and the laity into two distinct

outlets, the removal of the pastors from the discipline of the equal brotherhood in the local churches, the monopoly of preaching and of the sacraments by the clergy, with the prerogative of licensing, ordaining and deposing of ministers, and especially when you have all this embodied in the separate associations of the clergy, apart, by themselves, in organized and permanent bodies, thus exercising the powers of self creation and self perpetuity, there you have the very pith and essence of an organized spiritual despotism, and so far as the rights of the mass of the brotherhood, the laity, of the churches are concerned it matters comparatively little whether or no the clergy establish separate castes among themselves, by episcopacies, prelacies, or papacies. The holy equality of the common brotherhood once violated by the erection of the clerical caste, all the rest becomes natural and plausible, if not convenient and congruous. And it has accordingly become a question whether the supremacy of the pastor; or 'parish pope' of the local church as thus reached, without any higher court of appeal, is a milder form of ecclesiastical despotism than diocesan episcopacy, or the universal supremacy of a pope over all christendom, to whom may be referred the decision of local disputes and the rectification of alleged abuses, arising out of the local exercise of clerical power. A choice of different forms and degrees of the same evil becomes at best, the alternative of those who would hold the position of *laymen*, in any of the existing sects that admit a *clerical caste*.

THE PRECISE POINTS AT ISSUE.

These propositions, particularly the last of the series will doubtless seem extravagant to many whose attention has not been directed to the subject, or whose limited sphere of observation or prejudices of religious education may have disqualified them from comparing, impartially, the different portions of christendom in respect to this matter of ecclesiastical usurpation and clerical power. A little attention to the nature of the case, to the principles involved, and to the facts of church history ancient and modern, including the present state of christendom, would probably serve to modify, in no small degree, the views commonly entertained among the protestant and non episcopal sects.—We do not mean to say that, under an impartial scrutiny, the difference between prelacy and papacy on the one hand, and

the clergy of modern presbyterianism and American congregationalism on the other would wholly disappear. But we do say, advisedly and deliberately, that the gulf between them is by no means so deep, broad, or impassable as most persons imagine. We do say that the difference is rather in form than in principle, that it is in degree rather than in kind.

THE PAPACY—WHY TO BE DREADED.

It may have to be admitted that episcopacy strengthens, on the whole, the clerical power, that prelacy strengthens both, and that papacy wields as well as perpetuates the whole. It is the clerical power, nevertheless, rather than the diocesan, the prelatical, or the papal, that presses most directly and heavily on the lay brotherhood. If episcopacies, prelacies, and papacies are to be dreaded, by the people, it is chiefly because they more effectually concentrate and fortify the clerical or priestly power. Take away, in succession, first, the papacy, then the prelacy, then the diocesan episcopacy, then the peculiarities of presbyterianism, and what have you left? The clerical caste, still! The same clerical caste that constituted, all along, so far as the lay brotherhood are concerned, the very core of the evil! The same clerical caste that the Congregational association will no sooner relinquish than would the pope and bench of cardinals! Which the Congregational association wields, perhaps somewhat less efficiently, but not less pertinaciously and resolutely, than the hierarchies of the episcopal sects.

Take away from pope, cardinals, prelates, arch-bishops, and diocesans, if such a thing could be, their clerical caste, which elevates them above and separates them from the common brotherhood of Christian believers, and what would there be left so very formidable or objectionable in those hierarchies? If neither pope, cardinal, prelate, arch bishop, or bishop claimed any monopoly of preaching or of the sacraments, if each member of the entire Christian brotherhood, with the hearty assent and good will of these dignitaries might preach, pray, baptize, and commemorate the dying love of the Savior, without priestly license or aid, as in the days of Paul and Apollos, the tent makers; if each local assembly might shape its own creed, choose its own pastors and transact its own business, without let or hindrance from pope, cardinal, prelate, arch bishop, or bishops; if they themselves formed a part of the common

brotherhood of the local churches, subject to the same discipline with other Christians, if they neither claimed nor exercised the lordly prerogative of licensing, ordaining, installing, or deposing Christian ministers, if they were never convoked in august conclaves, apart from the common brotherhood, to consult together and decide grave questions in which the rights and interests of the common brotherhood were involved; in other words, if they would cease being a clergy, separated from, elevated above, and lordling it over laity, if they would give up their clerical caste, what would remain of all their ecclesiastical usurpations and despotisms, then? Why! just nothing at all!

Suppose again, that instead of giving up their clerical caste, they retain it, but give up the peculiar offices, stations, and names of pope, cardinal, prelate, arch bishop still claiming and exercising all their priestly and clerical prerogatives and powers? What do the mass of the common brotherhood gain by the change? Can any one tell? A part of the clergy might indeed be gratified with the restoration of their equality with the rest of the clerical body, and this, by the by, is about as far, in the way of restoring equal rights in the church, as our boasted protestantisms, and dissenterisms, chiefly moulded by clergymen, have ever been carried! Very few, among our Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregational clergy, ever appear to contemplate any thing beyond this! Give them their "ministerial parity," their equality with all other ministers, and the "parity" of the common brotherhood with the ministry must take care of itself as it can. No marvel that the mass of the brotherhood, so little benefitted by our Lutheran and Puritan reformations, after the lapse of centuries, should manifest little concern whether their ministers choose to establish episcopal hierarchies among themselves or no! What is it to them whether the clergy who, in some way, will manage to control the churches, are on an equality with each other, or whether, for their own convenience, they establish various grades among themselves?

WHEREIN IS A PAPACY ANTI-CHRISTIAN?

Take a further view of the matter.—Our protestant fathers have taught us to consider the pope, anti-christ. Such was the language of Luther and the reformers. And it must be admitted that the prophecies concerning "anti Christ" and

"the Man of Sin," contain specifications which would seem to point in that direction, though not, perhaps, exclusively there. It is the papal power, the papal office, the position, the authority, and prerogatives of a pope, not the particular incumbent, nor his manner of exercising ecclesiastical authority, that the protestants consider to be anti-christian.—There was a pope that ascended the papal chair, during the labors of Luther who, aside from his accepting the office, or sustaining it, would probably have been regarded by most protestants, as a pious and exemplary Christian. The present occupant of the papal chair is said to be, in many respects, a good ruler, intent on works of public utility, amelioration, and benefit. The protestant theory, nevertheless, regards his position to be essentially that of an usurper, lording it over God's heritage, and wielding anti-christian authority over his brethren, in violation of Christ's prohibition of kingly power among his disciples.

Now it may be worth while to inquire wherein the sinfulness of wielding papal authority consists? Does it lie in the fact that the pope claims to exercise power over the *whole* Christian world? Suppose he only claimed and exercised the same authority over the Christians of a single nation, as did King Henry VIII of England, after having thrown off the authority of the Roman pontiff; would he be guiltless, then? Or, suppose he only exercised, over the Christians of a single parish, the same powers, would the smallness of the territory, or the fewness of his subjects, take away the anti-christian character of his authority?

We are speaking now, of the theory of the papacy, in the abstract, or aside from any particular *abuses* of that power. All rational men admit that the power is liable to abuse, and has been abused. The main question between the intelligent advocates of the papacy, in our times, and their clerical opponents, of other sects, respects the rightfulness and propriety of wielding such an extended ecclesiastical dominion. It is quite plausible, (with those who admit *any* ecclesiastical bodies beside and above the local churches, and who admit likewise the elevation of the clergy above the laity and their separate organization by themselves,) to say that all these various clerical bodies, in different parts of the world, should be united under a general supervision, conveniently lodged in the hands of an individual.—

The theory of a papacy does not of necessity require that the kind or degree of superiority held, or of power exercised by a pope over his cardinals, prelates, and arch bishops should be essentially different from that of the arch bishop over the bishops, or of those over the rest of the clergy—or even *equal* to that of the clergy over the mass of the common brotherhood, in our modern presbyterian and congregational sects. It might prove an instructive as well as curious inquiry whether or no, in matter of fact, the difference has commonly been very great.—It is understood that the present reigning pope is disposed to reduce the prerogatives of his office to the very lowest point, in the hopes of uniting all the episcopal churches in Christendom under one confederacy. And what could any episcopalian say against a papacy like this? Or what objections, or *principle*, could any one urge, who admits of any ecclesiastical bodies beyond that of the local church? How can we call the papal power anti-christian, and yet admit any of the *other* forms of clerical power?

WHEN DID THE POPE BECOME ANTI-CHRIST?

You say the pope is anti-christ. He wields an anti-christian authority. He separates himself from and elevates himself above the congregation of the faithful, holding authority over them, but not being responsible or subject to them in turn. Very well, I shall not dispute the statement; but I ask when, where, how, and what period in the history of the present reigning pope, did the anti-christian usurpation commence? Was it when he ascended the papal chair? What was he *before*? A cardinal, perhaps, a prelate, an arch bishop. But what was his position, *then*? Was he not as truly separated from and elevated above the professed members of the body of Christ, then, as he is now? Did he not as truly wield authority over them, without himself being subject to *their* discipline, then, as he does now? Certainly he did. His anti-christian elevation above the brotherhood, therefore did not commence when he was elected pope. He held a similar position before. Follow back his history a few years more, and you shall find the present reigning pope a diocesan bishop, wielding authority, not over other bishops, but only over the presbyters, rectors, and curates of a single diocese. But in regard to the great mass of the lay brotherhood, he held the same essential position

as when he was arch bishop. He was *not* allowed to exercise authority over them, but was not subject to *their* disciplinary supervision, in turn. You must go further back, to find the commencement of his unscriptural position. There was a time, when the present pope was only the presbyter, pastor, or curate of a single congregation. What was his position *then*? Did he not exercise authority over the common brotherhood? He did. But was he subject to the watch care of the lay brethren? Certainly not! He belonged, not to the church, (in the sense of being subject to it, like a lay member) but to the clerical caste! If charged with any offence, it was by *clergymen* only, of his own or of a superior rank, that he could be tried. And the same monopoly of preaching and of the rituals that the pope in common with other clergymen holds now, he held likewise when he was only the presbyter or pastor of a single church, and when his position, in respect to the laity the masses, the common brotherhood, on the score of equality and fraternal watch care, was, essentially the same as it is now while he fills the papal chair! How then do you make out the position of the pope to be anti-christian, and the position he held when a presbyter, (under the ordinary usages of modern times) to be Christian, like? Or wherein does the position of an ordinary presbyter or priest, in the Romish church differ so widely from that of the pastors in the protestant and dissenting sects, where they hold the monopoly of preaching and the ordinances, holding authority over the churches but not subject to discipline in them, organized into associations *apart* from the laity, by themselves, as a clerical caste, and holding by the powers of license, ordination, and deposing, the control and perpetuity of their own order?

PAPAL AND PRIESTLY ABSOLUTION.

But the pope, you say, assumes the prerogatives of pardoning men's sins!—Some of the popes have doubtless done this, though it is often denied, disclaimed, and attempted to be explained away.—There certainly *might* be a pope, and a papacy that should not be obnoxious to this charge. The question whether or no the office of pope be anti-christian, is quite distinct from the question whether the pope, or any body else, should undertake to forgive sins. The popes, as a matter of fact, have commonly, if not always, been in the habit of claiming what amounts in reality to the power of ab-

There is no objection

3

8

8

solving men from their sins. The idea is essentially involved in that of regeneration in consequence of receiving baptism or the eucharist, administered by priestly hands. But this prerogative is by no means the peculiar and exclusive badge of the Roman Pontiff. It was quite familiar to the church, for centuries before the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome was ever contemplated. The pope inherited it from the diocesan bishops, nay, rather from the clergy in general, who preceded him. The claim and the practice had their origin among the *congregational pastors* of the second and third centuries! And the Lutheran Reformation was far enough from displacing it. Among the arguments by which the doctors at Wittenburg persuaded the people that they could get along well enough without a pope, one was, that any ordinary priest could grant them absolution as well as the pope! Even Luther was delighted with the thought that in baptism by the common priests or clergy, they received the remission of sins, which the pope could not annul! In other words, the clergy in general, so far as the matter of forgiving sins was concerned, might and did stand in the place of the pope! The success of this argument with the Germans proves that their education had familiarized them with the thought that their priests in general could absolve them from their sins. And we know that the same idea remains in the Romish church to this day: that is, the people attribute to their *priests* the same powers (whatever they may be) in this respect, that they attribute to the *pope*. The Liturgy of the church of England retains the ancient formula of priestly absolution, in these solemn words, (if memory serves us correctly,) "I do now absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And if we mistake not, the Protestant Episcopal church in America, makes use of the same or nearly the same expression. That Calvin and Wesley as well as Luther, taught the doctrine of baptismal remission of sins, and that the idea is retained in the form inserted in the Methodist Episcopal "discipline" we have already noticed in a previous article. President Edwards lost his pulpit at Northampton for denying that the Lord's Supper is a converting ordinance. Samuel Whelpley, not many years ago, retired from the Presbyterian ministry in the city of New-York, on account of the opposition he received, be-

cause he declined baptizing the sick child of a wealthy parishoner who was not a church member, giving him to understand that he held no power of securing the salvation of the child in this manner. The usages which forbid church membership to all who have not been regularly baptized, taken in connexion with the usages which forbid any person to baptize, except those who have been duly inducted by priestly license and ordination into all the peculiar privileges of the clerical caste, must be admitted to squint very significantly towards the idea of a mysterious power residing in the *clergy* (not merely the *pope*) of opening and shutting the Kingdom of Heaven, by their official ministrations, to whomsoever they will. So that the charge against the *papacy*, of assuming to pardon men's sins, if admitted to be valid, would need to be handled pretty cautiously (as in fact it has been) to prevent its grazing too closely the robes of the clerical caste in general.

DIFFERENCE IN PRINCIPLE? WHERE? "DISCRETIONARY" CHURCH POLITY.

It will be found difficult, we apprehend, to furnish any solid objections *on principle*, to the establishment of diocesan episcopacies, prelacies, and even of the *papacy* itself, which do not equally forbid the separation of the body of Christ into the two distinct orders or castes of *clergy* and *laity*, as defined by the current usages of the times.* If the one be unchristian (or anti-christian) so is the other. And all those New Testament precepts and prohibitions about "exercising authority" and lording it over God's heritage, &c. &c. which are so currently quoted among protestants against the *papacy*, and by presbyterians, congregationalists and baptists against a diocesan episcopacy, are equally pertinent and pointed against the ordinary usages of presbyterians, congregationalists (shall we add baptists?) in respect to a *clerical caste*.

It is common among presbyterians and

It may be well to repeat here an explanation which we have once or twice heretofore made. An association of equals, as a temperance society or a local christian assembly, do not erect a distinct caste by the mere election from among themselves of appropriate officers, holding their stations by the will of the brotherhood and still subject to their discipline. The case would be changed if the Presidents of our Temperance Societies, renouncing their membership in those societies, and claiming to be tried only by their "peers" should organize associations of Presidents, claim the exclusive right of lecturing on Temperance, of licensing and ordaining future lecturers who alone should be eligible to the office of Presidents of Societies, and claim likewise the exclusive right of administering the temperance pledge and of granting the seals which custom has made the necessary badges of regular membership! But all this in substance, is the general claim of even our so called congregational clergy!

congregationalists to treat the question of congregationalism or presbyterianism as merely a question of expediency, or of "preference" as though Christians had a right to act according to their "discretion" in the matter. And this mode of treating the subject is sustained and kept in countenance by the affirmation that Christ has not legislated on the subject, but has left his disciples to act their best judgment in the premises. It is implied and sometimes affirmed that it is wise and safe for Christians in different places and under different circumstances, to vary their forms of church polity, so that uniformity in this matter is neither to be expected nor desired. The relative position of ministers and people is of necessity, affected by all those varied forms of church polity, more or less, though as we have seen, the separation of the clergy from the laity, (the most glaring departure from the usages of apostolic times) is common to all.

Now it is easy to see why the CLERGY, in all these sects, from the congregational, upwards, or from the Romish downwards, having, in their various ways, secured not only the preponderating weight but, in some form, a separate organization, and confederated action of a *clerical caste*, can afford to be tolerably indifferent in respect to all the various forms of church government, from the congregational upwards, through presbyterianism and episcopacy, to the papacy, so long as, in all these sects, the distinctive prerogatives of the *clergy* are left essentially unimpaired. It is true that the tendency is upwards. The more ambitious and influential among the congregational clergy, will prefer presbyterianism, as affording, through its gradation of judicatories, a wider scope for their powers. Those among presbyterians who are most fond of pre ferment and whose talents and position afford them the fairest prospect of it, will incline to diocesan episcopacy, in the hope of becoming bishops. The most aspiring and sanguine among these will have no objections to prelacy, and among a large number of prelates there will be some who think it suitable and convenient to have a common umpire in the person of a universal or catholic pope. In all this process *no new principle* is introduced, in addition to the principle acted upon in erecting a clerical caste. And altho' the tendency with the most aspiring is evidently towards a papacy, (as the early history of the church, along with the developments of the

present ago, may assure us) yet the main body of the clergy may well be content to place the whole question of church polity upon the ground of *expediency* instead of *principle*, which they commonly do, and may well do, since no radical distinction in *principle*, can be shown, in all the various modes which agree with each other in admitting a clerical caste. And so long as the people can be persuaded to regard the matter as a question of expediency and not of principle, assuming that Christ never gave his disciples any specific directions in the promises, so long the important instructions contained in the 18th chapter of Matthew, and in I Cor. V., &c., &c., will remain a dead letter, of course.

It is obvious to remark, moreover, that, in the sects which admit of a clerical caste, and of the organization and action of the clergy in separate conclaves, by themselves, it is equally easy and natural for the mass of the laity to become even more indifferent than the clergy themselves in respect to the particular form and shape which these clerical organizations shall assume, whether that of the congregational association or consociation, the methodist conference either with or without bishops, the presbyterian synod, the diocesan episcopate, the prelature, or the papacy, the difference between all which consists in the various methods and forms by the use of which the *organized clergy* see fit to govern themselves and control those under their charge. So long as clerical control is the grand element in all of them, (from the local monopoly of the congregational pastor, through all the oligarchies and aristocracies of variously mingled and combined presbyterianism and episcopacies, up to the universal monarchy of the papacy) *why*, indeed, *should* the mass of the lay brotherhood trouble themselves much about the matter? *They* have no ecclesiastical preforments to expect or to look after, in those rival methods of organization — Nor is it easy to see that the choice of the various modes of being governed by a clerical caste, is worth their contending about, very earnestly. And have they not all been trained in the doctrine that Christ left his disciples no definite directions in respects to church order? That the order of his house may be preserved and fidelity to his authority maintained, equally well, in most if not all of them? That the entire question of church organization and polity is one of mere “dis-

cretionary” arrangements and “preference?” How then can *they* make it a matter of conscience to inquire minutely into the manner in which their clergy choose to become organized among themselves? For this, after all, is the grand question between the sects recognizing and maintaining a clerical caste, from the congregational to the Romish, so far as church polity is concerned.

We hope no one will charge us with uncharitableness or extravagance for maintaining that there is no radical difference in principle, between the various forms of church government which admit a clerical caste, so long as the clergy themselves, particularly the Congregational Presbyterian and Low Church Episcopalian, are, for the most part, so fond of representing the matter in the same light themselves, which they always do, whenever they tell us that Christ has not decided the question, that he has left it for us to decide it by our own “discretion” or “preference” or views of “expediency,” and that Christ’s institutions can be faithfully maintained and honored in all these different ways; nay, that “circumstances” may require one form in one country, and another in another. Perhaps they do not always nor commonly intend to include the papacy in this statement, though we do not recollect to have noticed, very frequently if ever, any express exception made to the papacy, in these statements. It might be quite difficult to obtain currency for the sentiment, in the presence of such an exception, or even to make it intelligible. If a clerical caste, separate from the mass of the brethren, may organize itself in the form of an association, a consociation, why not in a conference, a presbytery, a general assembly, a diocese, a prelature, a papacy? Can any one tell where to stop, if you once begin? Who can put his finger on the point where primitive simplicity ends and clerical assumption begins, if it be not at the point where a clerical caste appears, or where, as in the association of Congregational pastors, holding a monopoly of preaching and of the rituals, it first assumes a combined and organized form?

THE ALTERNATIVE ADRIFT, OR AT ANCHOR!

When once you admit the rightfulness and the propriety of a distinct, an organized clerical caste, apart from the laity, you admit the rightfulness and the propriety of allowing to that distinct and separate body the management of its

own concerns, including the form and manner of its own organization, of course. And whether it chooses to make use of the associations of pastors of local churches, (as in the second or third century in the countries about the Mediterranean, and again in New England in the nineteenth,) or whether it prefers the diocesan episcopacy of the fourth century, or the papacy of the seventh, or the presbyterianism of the sixteenth or seventeenth, the mass of the common brotherhood, called the laity, cannot, without apparent impertinence, [†] intermeddle with the matter at all, so long as they adhere to the notion of a separate and organized clerical body. Their only proper remedy against presbyterianisms, episcopacies, prelatures and papacies, if they find themselves annoyed by them, or by the fear of them, is to dispense with, and cut themselves adrift from an organized clerical caste. So long as they hold a connexion with such organized clerical bodies in whose modes of organization they can have no voice, they must run their chance of being under associations, synods, &c. &c. to the end of the chapter, (the papacy not excepted,) as the clergy see fit. And the hazard, in respect to the form of clerical sway, should not greatly alarm those who can rest content under any form of it, at all. In admitting that Christ has left them at liberty to remain in such a position, and that he has clothed either themselves or their “clergy” with “discretionary” power to model these things at their pleasure, they only claim the liberty of floating, as the Christians of the second and third century did, wherever the winds and waves of worldliness and priestly ambition may chance to drift them. It may be associationism in Massachusetts, consociationism in Connecticut, presbyterianism in New Jersey, episcopacy in Virginia, prelature in England and papacy in Italy or wherever the Roman pontiff can find converts. The associations of Massachusetts may be exchanged for consociations; the consociations of Connecticut for presbyteries, the presbyteries of New York (no great change!) to diocesan epis-

[†]We are sometimes told that it is altogether “impertinent” for the laity to trouble themselves about the associations which clergymen may form. This might be plausible if the clergy held no relations to the churches of which the laity are the members, and if the associations did not act as “ecclesiastical bodies” for the superintendency of church matters. The individuals who happen to be Presidents of Temperance Societies might associate by themselves, but if they did this for the purposes mentioned in a former note, the members of the societies would be apt to think it somewhat arrogant.

episcopacy, prelacy may be engrafted upon American episcopacy, and Romanism upon Anglican prelacy, at the "discretion" of the clergy, as they may deem most 'expedient' and all without any departure from their fundamental principles of "discretionary" church polity as openly taught and avowed! One country they tell us, requires one form of church polity and another another. One age of the world, admits of one form and another of another. The "genius of the people" must be studied, for Christ has laid down no uniform rules! The plain English of all which is that the clergy who use this language are not to be restrained by Christ's teachings in the 18th chapter of Matthew, nor by any other portions of the New Testament, from making church government what they please, so far as the "genius of the people" in "different ages and nations," will permit them. † Such at least, is the commentary which church history, ancient and modern, affords us, upon the doctrine, and if it does not mean this, it is difficult to tell what it does mean. The "genius" of the Italians and of the Spaniards and Portuguese admits Papacy and the "discretionary" exercise of clerical power establishes it there. In Germany there is a struggle between papacy and Episcopacy, in England and America between Episcopacy and almost all other forms. In all countries, the "discretion" of the clergy establishes as high a tone of ecclesiastical organization as the "genius" of the people will bear, and in most cases they attempt more in that direction than they can accomplish. The conclusion of the whole matter is that under the supervision of an organized clerical caste (it makes little difference what the form of organization may be) the Christian brotherhood composing the lay members of the churches are all afloat and

† "I don't think Independency will suit our people, in this region. This may seem strange to come from an abolitionist yet I have no doubt it is true. We are not used to it." So writes a good brother from the West connected with the incipient Presbyterian secession of abolitionists. That Presbyterians "are not used" to primitive Christian institutions must be admitted, but we cannot concede that those institutions are not adapted to all Christians. And we doubt the permanent benefits of the anti-slavery secession that does not cut loose from Presbyterianism. A Presbyterian anti-slavery secession was talked of, three or four years ago, in Western New York, but the leaders thought that independency would not suit the people in that region. It turned out that "the people" would not come into the measure, and so the enterprise was given up. Those who started the measure, and who thought independency would not suit the people, are still clinging to the pro-slavery Presbyterian Church while "the people who are ready to secede, at all, are forming themselves into independent churches. The leaders of the Wesleyan secession thought independency would not suit that people, but they find it hard work to keep them from running into independency, after all."

adrift upon the ocean of "discretionary" clerical adventuro, without chart, rudder or compass, and whether they fall upon this, that, or the other shoal or quicksand of hierarchical domination, is a matter altogether out of their control.—There is no safe anchorage ground for the bark of religious freedom, within the precincts of an organized clerical caste.

THE LESSON OF CHURCH HISTORY.

These reflections are warranted by a review of that portion of early church history to which, in a former number, we have directed our attention. The almost imperceptible rise and growth of ecclesiastical power in the second and third centuries, paving the way for the equally gradual introduction of diocesan episcopacy and papacy in the centuries that followed, can be accounted for in no way but by admitting the essential elements of a settled spiritual despotism to be comprized in any and in every form; even the simplest, of an organized clerical caste, as that term has now been defined, and, in its natural growth and developments, traced. Begin with the first organized association, or synod of Congregational pastors, and go onward through the incipient and matured episcopacies that followed till you come to the papacy itself, or begin first with the full growth papacy, if you please, and trace backward the mighty stream towards its early beginnings, and place your finger if you can, upon the spot where the Rubicon was passed, where the fatal transition was made, from "the holy equality of souls before God" which constituted the life and glory of the primitive church, to the rise of "the Man of Sin," lording it over the subjugated and despoiled heritage of God. Will you find it to be just then, when the Roman Bishop first claimed and wielded the authority of universal pontiff? No, you will not.—Or then, when first under Constantine, the civil and ecclesiastical despots were combined? This you will not affirm!—Or, then, when diocesan episcopacy was first introduced? Certainly not! No reader of church history who ponders the state of things in the second and third centuries will say that! It cannot be denied that all the essential elements and functions of an organized spiritual despotism were wielded by the associations of Congregational pastors of the second and third centuries. And in what did the usurpations of that period consist, if not in the peculiar and distinctive characteristics and prerogatives of a

clerical caste? Fix the period when that innovation upon apostolic order was introduced and you have sufficiently ascertained the date of the rise of the anti-Christian power. Nowhere else can you fix upon the date or the event in which a new and opposite principle was introduced or the essential features of primitive order changed. But in that innovation there was indeed something more than a change in mere circumstances and modes. A new and an adverse principle was introduced, a principle of exclusive privileges, of priestly monopoly, usurpation, and caste, which, from that time to the present, has been assuming new shapes, modifications and names, remaining the same thing still, and evermore producing the same bitter fruits.

THE LESSON OF THE PRESENT AGE.

The same conclusion is reached by a consideration of the present condition of things throughout the nominal Christian world. If any one imagines the papacy to be essential to the rank growth and development of anti-Christian power in the church, let him glance his eye over the map of the world as it is now.

The Greek church has no pope; but has she therefore no manifestations of anti-Christian authority and priestly power? How far short of even Roman magnificence, and pomp and domination does she fall? Or how much more of Christian freedom do her prelates permit than is enjoyed under the Roman pontiff?—It strikes us as a somewhat significant circumstance that our Protestant Doctors who have instructed us so minutely in respect to the anti-Christian usurpations of the *Romish Church*, have been, all along so silent in respect to the *Greek*. Was it because it would have been a hazardous and delicate task to give us a definition of anti-Christian power beyond the precincts of Rome? The Anglican church with her Lords Spiritual—the various episcopacies of continental Europe to say nothing of those in America, what shall be said of them? On which side of the line of demarkation between Christian and anti-Christian organizations do they stand? And what shall be said of the proscriptive and intolerant bearing of the leading Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian

*The American Board, whose publications show that the same degrading superstitions and arrogant priestly usurpations that characterize the *Romish church*, were equally prevalent in the Greek communion, extended the right hand of fellowship to the latter, at the very moment when their leading members and advocates were sounding the trumpet of alarm against the former.

and congregational clergy in America, towards those of their own communion who are engaged in works of philanthropy and reformation? Observe the prerogatives they claim, of suppressing free inquiry, of silencing the voice of remonstrance, of shutting the doors of their churches and their pulpits—of placing under the ban of censure and ex-communication all who do not conform to the dictation of the organized clerical caste.—Consider passing events and the developments of the last ten years. Then say, if you can, how far the priestly assumption and usurpation of the clergy of these sects, fall short of similar exhibitions in the church of England, or even of the church of Rome.

ORGANIZATION OF NEW CHURCHES FAVORABLE TO PURITY.

Under this head, Wm. W. Patton, minister in Connecticut, writes ably, in the *Charter Oak* of May, 14. His object is to show that in organizing new churches there are none of these impediments in the way of their moral purity, which are found in churches that have been established for a long time. And hence he infers that the American Board is "peculiarly guilty in founding churches on wrong principles."

This is a fair argument, in the existing state of things, and has much force; but the perusal of it has suggested to us some ideas which Mr. Patton has not expressed, and, perhaps, would not entertain.

How comes it to pass that churches established for a long time are commonly, if not uniformly in such a position as Mr. Patton describes? Is it a matter of necessity that churches should become less pure, less intelligent, less enterprising, less active, less progressive, less efficient, in the cause of God and of humanity, as they grow older? One would think that since the course of the good man is a progressive one, and his path like the morning light, the path of a true church, a "congregation of faithful men" would be progressive, likewise, "shining more and more unto the perfect day." Every church member ought to be wiser and better, more active and more useful, as he grows older. And every generation profiting by the instruction and experience of the preceding one ought to be wiser and better than any one that has gone before it. Until this progression shall be witnessed, how is the superior purity and power and glory of the latter day Church to be introduced.

Can this phenomenon be fully accounted for, by the general consideration of the downward tendency of our depraved human nature? Are not the provisions and the appliances of gospel redemption an equal match, not to say a superior force, to these? What if it should be found

that the very structure, polity, organization, usages, and order of our modern churches are such as to cripple enterprise, discourage inquiry, and proscribe progress? If so, would it not be well to correct these, and see whether it will always remain true that churches grow less pure in proportion to the lapse of time in which they have enjoyed the means of spiritual improvement?

However the existing fact is to be accounted for or remedied, there is yet another idea that forces itself upon our attention. If it be so notoriously the fact, as Mr. Patton apparently conceives it to be, that old churches are almost uniformly and incurably impure, while the very fact of organizing new churches is favorable to a higher purity, why should Christians look with so much dread and horror upon the expedient of leaving old and impure churches, for the sake of establishing newer and purer ones? The Puritans, the Non-Conformists, the Protestant Reformers generally, the Methodists ultimately, acted on this plan. And much as we may deplore the sectarian divisions which their mode of trying the experiment involved, it must be confessed that the early state of those communities compared either with their old churches, or with their own subsequent course, corroborates the view of Mr. Patton. Hence, too, some of our more recently formed American sects, though starting with a less rigid code of ethics and theology than the Puritans (Universalist and Unitarian for example) have, in their youthful vigor, occupied higher moral ground, on the slave question, than the imbecile disciples, or rather sycophants of a bloated, Epicurean, fat hearted, gouty and decrepid Puritanism tottering on the verge of dissolution, have adventured to attempt.

So that Mr. Patton's idea is closely allied to other ideas that would be thought still more revolutionary and startling.—After all, we deem it important to caution our readers, especially our associates in the enterprise of Church Reform from placing too much, or indeed any positive reliance upon the purifying influences of a re-organizing process. Necessary as such organizations may be, they do not confer spiritual life. Such occasions do indeed afford fair opportunities to lop off and discard other excrescences and abuses as well as the particular one that occasioned secession. But these opportunities are not always wisely improved.—In correcting one class of errors, another often creeps in. Little is gained by exchanging one sort of worldliness or impurity for another. Then shall we not be ashamed when we have respect unto all God's commandments. In gathering new churches, the materials, the membership, is the first pure requisite—"Holiness to the Lord" must be inscribed upon and within them. Then, the building must be shaped according to the divine model, regardless of the traditions of men, in accordance with Christian liberty, and so as to encourage instead of prohibiting

progress. Otherwise the more "organization of new churches" will accomplish little or nothing "favorable to purity."

Our Readers may be assured that if they do not find, in our paper, or elsewhere, any great amount of intelligence in respect to the progress of the principles we advocate, it is not because such progress is not making. The most deep and permanent revolutions in public sentiment do not always, nor often, in their early stages, make much noise or show. Especially is this true of revolutions in favor of a purer faith, and a more spiritual and practical religion. "The Kingdom of Heaven cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, lo! here, or lo! there!" It would be comparatively easy, to raise a storm of excitement, to build up according to a prescribed pattern, a new and pretentious sect, and in doing this, to chronicle, from month to month, the visible progress that had been made. Quite a different work is that of exposing and undermining time honored superstitions and heinous abuses—of recalling attention to the long forgotten simplicity of New Testament institutions—of persuading the people to search the scriptures and think and act for themselves, like accountable creatures, bound to the tribunal of the Searcher of hearts. But let no one imagine that because the progress of it is quiet and unperceived, it is therefore the less steady and sure, that it is less effectually charged with power to work great and beneficial results. If we had room for the record we might, already, exhibit evidences of a change in public sentiment, altogether marked and decisive. "Revolutions never go backward." Not all the civil and ecclesiastical authorities on earth, with all the resources and allies within their reach, can turn the tide, or set back the intelligent and reflecting portion of the religious public, where they were five years ago. In many respects, the change is a more salutary and promising one than it would probably have been had it been more showy and rapid. Those who have entered the field of Church reformation have done so, not because they were pioneered by popular leaders and great men, or encompassed by a multitude of adventurers, but because they have examined and decided the matters involved, for themselves. And it is better that those who might have been

enrolled in the ranks, under other circumstances, have been left behind, to wait till they have counted the cost; and understand their position,

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE FEBRUARY, 1847.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Our friends who favor us with letters are respectfully assured that we read their communications with interest and benefit, although we have not time, always, to answer them, nor room to give them a place in our columns. It is useful for us to know what is going on, and what is thought and said, in different parts of the country.—Once in a while we make room in our paper for some select extracts, for the benefit of our readers; but our little sheet could contain only a small part of them, even if we had little or nothing to present ourselves. Notwithstanding we write and publish so many "long articles," our correspondents are frequently suggesting new topics of discussion which they wish us to investigate. Sometimes questions are asked us, or information is requested, which would take much time, labor, and space, to dispose of, in any suitable manner. To some extent, we have answered such inquiries, from distant parts of our own country, and England and Ireland, inasmuch that, for some months past, the labor of our private correspondence has nearly equalled that of writing for our own paper. In addition to this, we have written some long articles for the Albany Patriot, and other papers, during the year past, besides preaching almost every sabbath, either at home or abroad, lecturing, attending conventions, &c.—We mention this, that our distant correspondents may understand, why it is, that, in many instances, their letters are unanswered or the answer long delayed.—We cannot do half of what we see that needs to be done in our line of labor, and that must go undone. With a feeble constitution and infirm health we dare not attempt doing more, and our friends must take the will for the deed.

We are charged with hostility to the church and ministry. The following from an aged and experienced minister, well known in the middle and western states, will show his opinion.

For the Christian Investigator.

My Dear Brother Goodell: Let not your modesty deny me a little room on

your precious sheet, (I wish it could be larger,) to say a word to one portion of your readers.

Christian Friends: I respectfully, and very earnestly solicit your attention to the following statement by the Editor of the Investigator Dec. 1846; viz, "The greater half of my readers send me little or nothing. My receipts come chiefly from a few who pay me much more than the subscription price to keep the publication alive, I have little hope that those who have paid nothing for the last two years will be persuaded to do so." That some of these readers may have small pecuniary means, I do not question, but that most of them could pay punctually the 50 cents annually and without the least embarrassment, I have no doubt.—Why then withhold this due? Pray look at this matter as it is. 1. The Investigator conveys to you many thoughts, and the presentation and illustration of principles seldom found in other publications—just the instruction you need, and what does not come to you at all through any other channel: 2. To supply you thus, costs the Editor much time, labor and expense, and prevents him from seeking an income from other sources. 3. It is a moral wrong to withhold from him his due. 4. Punctuality on your part in this matter, would make the instructions of the paper more valuable and precious to yourself, and enable the Editor to enlarge the sphere of his usefulness to the gain of all his readers.

5. The Christian Investigator, is doing a great work for the present, and especially for the coming age. It occupies a place which no other paper in the country does: Its dwelling place is in the rich but neglected mines of **FINEST PRINCIPLES**, and is constantly throwing up among men the best and the needed materials to be wrought into use by the moralist, the Philosopher, the Statesman, the Politician, the Theologian, the Preacher, the Christian, the Reformer. I regard this Investigator among the indispensables of the age, its teachings as among the generations of the wholesome, though, to not a few, the unpalatable agitations of the day: the strong tonic for the weather-beaten reformer; the patient tireless pioneer, willing to bide the verdict of a coming age. It cannot be spored. Nor should its grey hairs be multiplied by the postponement of its dues, till it has become, pennyless, breadless by neglect. Pray, do now throw a smile around its

editorial chair, and make it a fact that the candle used on it, is paid for, by the readers of this invaluable periodical.

JOHN KEEP.

PAINVILLE, Lake Co., Ohio, Jan. 3rd, 1847.

From the Albany Patriot.

[BY REQUEST.]

DIED,

At Cohoes, Nov. 19, of fever, Mrs. Sarah Twitchell. She moved with her husband to Cohoes, about a year since, having for many years previously resided at New York Mills.

Mrs. T. was a most exemplary Christian—a thorough reformer; being possessed of good discriminating powers, and having a conscience alive in reference to the direction in which her influence should be given. She some two or three years since, withdrew with her husband, from the M. E. Church, on account of its pro-slavery character, and manifestly radical departure in other respects; from the simplicity and purity of the Christian model.

She took her position boldly, yet meekly, and feared not the cost. Her equanimity of spirit, blended with a sound judgment and deeply rooted affection, made her one of the best wives and mothers, while her inflexible integrity, and loyal adhesion to the cause of Christ, made her one of the most efficient of Christian reformers.

In bearing this testimony to the worth of our departed sister, the writer speaks what he knows, having enjoyed for several years, the intimate acquaintance and unwavering friendship, of both herself and her bereaved husband. "She rests from her labors, and her works follow her."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, February, 1847.

B. Heartwell, Oak Corners,	1.00	G. Henderson, Walcott,	1.00
J. Kilburn, Shrewsbury, Mass.	1.00	L. D. Pomeroy, Ogdensburg	2.00
T. Stringham, Canandaigua,	0.50	W. Twitchell, Cohoes,	1.00
E. W. Friable Phelps, Berlin,	1.00	E. Strong, for G. Mills, and others, Hudson Ohio,	1.00
J. S. Pattinill, N. Y.	1.00	S. M. Pond, Backport Maine,	2.00
R. Hanna, Morcer, Pa.	0.50	G. F. Horton, Terrytown Penn.	1.00
J. Sykes, do.	0.50	L. L. Nourse, Huma, Mich.	1.00
J. T. Andrew, Cornwallbridge, Con.	0.50	J. E. Babes, Jackson, Mich.	1.00
A. Colman, Warren, Con.	0.50	G. Goodyear, Truro, Mass.	1.00
D. Marsh, Cayuga,	1.00	N. Miller, Skaneateles	2.00
A. G. Noble, Delhi, Iowa,	0.50	H. P. Crozier, Dryden,	0.50
E. Strong, Hudson, Ohio,	1.00	A. L. Bushnell, do	0.50
J. W. Fox, Walworth,	0.50	D. Gillett, Roxbury, Con.	0.50
S. C. Cuyler, Pultneyville	0.50	T. S. Canfield, do.	0.50
J. Sherman, Ontario,	0.50	C. B. Allen, Odo.	2.00
B. Church, Tallmadge, Mich.	1.00	J. Keep, Painesville, Ohio,	1.00
J. Woodruff Windsor,	1.00	E. Doty, Pine,	0.50
S. Brigham, Vienna,	0.50	Hugh T. Brooks, Wyoming	1.00
H. Gilbert, Allen's Hill,	1.00		
J. C. Harrington, Sherburne	2.00		
			\$35.00

Further acknowledgments next Month.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V—No. 3.
Whole Number, 59.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MARCH, 1847.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR. TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

A. WARREN, Printer, Perry, N. Y.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
Twenty-five papers for 10¢ | Sixty papers for 20¢
Twenty-eight papers for 10¢ | One hundred papers for 30¢.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—AISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDY.—THE FORMS OF POLITY IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. IV.

With an eye to the general propositions already laid down in the commencement of our discussion, and to the illustrations of them derived from the history of the early growth and appropriate forms and instruments of spiritual despotism in the ancient church; keeping in mind, also, the further illustrations derived in our last number, from a consideration of the nature of the case, and the inherent relations and tendencies of things; let us proceed now to inquire what further illustrations of our doctrine may be derived from a review of the

SUCCESSIVE STRUGGLES FOR CHRISTIAN FREEDOM.

Our Protestant world has heard much of these struggles; and of the Christian heroism displayed in them. It may be worth while to institute at last, the inquiry: against what, and against whom, have Christian heroism and religious liberty been called to contend? Has it been against the Papacy, or against Church and State unions exclusively, that the holy warfare has been waged? Or has it been chiefly & almost unceasingly against Clerical caste, no matter what its accidental cognomen or form? On what principles, by what measures, and with what views and usages have the spiritual despots that infest Christendom been suc-

cessfully crippled, held at bay, repulsed, or displaced? Persecutions from avowed infidels and heathens, we leave out of the account, though heathen persecutions are mostly at the instigation of heathen priests, and from these the priesthoods of the Clergy, under a corrupted Christianity are derived.

We are treating now of the spiritual despotisms and consequent persecutions and struggles in which Christian professors have been marshalled against professors of the same faith.

THE NOVATIANISTS.—FURTHER PARTICULARS.

The followers of Novatian, who separated from the Church of Rome, and from the entire Catholic community, A. D. 251, "not for a reason of faith," but because of prevailing corruptions, have already been mentioned. Modern Roman Catholic writers call them Puritans, and tax Novatian with being the parent of innumerable congregations of Puritans all over the Empire." [Vide Robinson's Researches, quoted in Punchard's history of Congregationalism, page 39.] The very date of their secession proves that, in their early conflicts, they were arrayed against the associations of Congregational pastors, (or synods of ancient bishops,) in which form was embodied the clerical caste of those times, before diocesan Episcopacy appeared. "The Novatianists were repeatedly condemned by the Synods, (or associations,) and yet they increased."

This is the first general associated struggle for Christian liberty in the church against ecclesiastical domination, on record, though "Tertullian had quitted the church near fifty years before, for the same reason, and Priscus who was an old man in the time of Novatian, had, with several more, repeatedly remonstrated against the innovations taking place; and, as they could get no redress, had separated and formed separate congregations." [Ib.]

From whom could they get no redress? From the pastors or local bishops, who controlled the churches at that period, by their clerical associations. Why could they get no redress? Because the clergy in their associations controlled every

thing. By whom were they persecuted, and against whom did they contend? The clerical associations, of course. Diocesan Episcopacies, Popes, unions of Church and State, were all unknown at that time.

THE DONATISTS.—A. D. 311.

"These, Milner calls the second class of dissenters. Like the Novatianists, they agreed with the Catholic party in their doctrinal belief, but dissented on the ground of Church order. The Donatists believed that the Church had so corrupted itself that she was no longer the spouse of Christ; that IMMORALITY had tainted her Catholicity and sunk them in mere worldly corruption. They therefore entirely separated from them, and would neither commune with the Catholics, nor receive them into their churches until they had been re-baptized. [Punchard's History, p. 41.]

It is of some importance that the reader bear in mind that these "Catholics" were not "Papists." Papacy had not yet arisen. The churches had now begun to exchange Congregationalism for Episcopacy at this period. The Donatists suffered bloody persecutions, afterward, under professedly Christian Roman Emperors. The celebrated St. Augustine is represented by Gibbon, as taking a conspicuous part in these persecutions.

The Donatists thought the Church ought to be separated from the world, a religious society voluntarily congregated together for religious purposes, and for no other. With this view they admitted none without a personal profession of faith and holiness." See Robinson.

"Donatus was a man of learning, eloquence, very exemplary in his morals, and was well acquainted with several circumstances, and was very ready to oppose the growing corruption of the Catholic church." [Jones' Ch. Hist. vol. 2, p. 388-390. Punchard p. 66.] "When the Donatists who were afterwards called Independents and Congregationalists first appeared in England, the Church and State party denounced them as 'Donatists!'" [Ib. p. 69.]

There can be no doubt that the Donatists were Independents; that they seceded from corrupt churches, and that their contest was with a clerical caste.

THE PAULICIANS.

"The Paulicians were dissenters from the raptions of the Greek and Roman church. They had their origin A. D. 660, from the labors of a humble man named Constantine." "He believed that all religious teachers were equals in rank, and that they should be distinguished from Laymen by no rights, prerogatives, or insignia." The authority of COUNCILS to govern the church he did not recognize, neither indeed were any such institutions known among his followers. In a word, he utterly rejected the whole hierarchical system of church government then in vogue."—Punchard, p. 79, 81.

The Paulicians suffered bloody persecutions for centuries, yet they were, from

* The word Catholic, means universal or general, in distinction from partial, sectional, or sectarian. To belong to the Catholic church was to belong to the great body of Christians, rather than to the little bands of seceders. And this language was in use before Papacy, or even Episcopacy was heard of and while the churches remained independent or congregational, in form.

that very cause, scattered all over the nominal Christian world and some of them took refuge among the Saracens. Their missionaries found their way into every part of Europe, nor were they extinct in the eleventh century, when they took, in France, the name of *Albigenses*; and the Waldenses in Italy appear to have been only another branch of the same great Paulician family. They were also known by the name of *Separates*; and during the darkest part of the dark ages, they suffered martyrdom at the rack and the stake. "The light of the inquisitorial fires (says Pynchard, page 94,) enables us to trace this interesting sect of dissenters down to the dawn of the Lutheran Reformation."

THE ALBIGENES AND WALDENSES.

The name of *Albigenses* is derived from the fact that a council which condemned them sat at *Albi*, or *Albigoa*, a town of Aquitain. "Gibbon speaks of them as identical with the Paulicians."—Mosheim considers them a branch of the Paulician family. The name of *Albigenses* became common to all heretics, at one period.

Mosheim derives the name of *Waldenses* from Peter Waldo, or Waldus, or Valdo, in the 12th century; yet he admits that "long before that time there had been resident in the valley of Piedmont, persons who rejected the prevailing opinions of the Romish Church, and who agreed in many things with the Waldensians." [Cont. XI, par. 2, Chap. 5, Pynchard's Hist., p96.] The Waldenses are sometimes called the *Vaudois*.

"Milnor seems to have regarded the *Albigenses* as a branch of the *Waldenses*," and "the proper founder of them, Claudius of Turin, the Christian hero of the ninth century." [Pynchard's Hist. page 36.]

"Besa, Milton, Moreland, Allix, and Andrew Fuller maintain that the Waldenses were of primitive if not apostolic origin."—[ib. pg. 97.]

"Mr. Gilby maintains that the Italian Waldenses, the *Albigenses*, the *Subaldins* of Dauphine and Provence, and the *Pyrenian Waldenses* were all independent of each other, and remain or branches of the primitive churches in those parts."

Mr. Pynchard thinks it probable that the Alpine recesses were, from age to age, the resort of the persecuted dissenters of different names, and of somewhat varied usages, but agreeing in some of the leading points of their faith, particularly in their opposition to the prevailing corruptions of the catholic or general church. And this theory, he thinks, will account for the conflicting statements we have, of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*

by various writers, of different sentiments who may have described different neighborhoods or congregations of them.—Thus, Waddington thinks, they maintained and imitated the divine institution of three orders in the Priesthood," though it may be presumed that these "three orders" were maintained, if at all, within the bounds of one local independent church, as in the second and third centuries, without diocesan episcopacy. Dr. Miller says they were "anti episcopal and substantially Presbyterian in their church government" alluding perhaps to the supererogation he attributed their plurality of orders. He probably would not attempt to prove that their churches were, under provincial presbyteries, synods, and a General Assembly.

Of one branch of them, the *Paterines*, it is known that they believed "that a Christian church ought to contain only good people, that a church had no power to frame any constitutions, that the sacraments, orders and ceremonies of the church of Rome were futile, expensive, oppressive and wicked." [Pynchard, pg. 102.]

If we are to judge of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses* by the testimony of their persecutors, it will not be very difficult to classify them.

Reinerius Saccho, an inquisitor and bitter persecutor of them, though formerly one of their number, accuses them of "a contempt for ecclesiastical power." "They hold that none of the ordinances of the church which have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed, as being of no value. This fasts, feasts, orders, blessings, offices of the church, and the like they utterly reject. They say the bishops, clergy and other religious orders, are no better than the Scribes and Pharisees, and other persecutors of the apostles."

Another inquisitor tells us, "they maintained that our obedience is due to God alone, and not to prelates, which they found on Acts IV. 9. That none in the church ought to greater than their brethren; according to Math. XX. 25. That no man ought to kneel to the priest, because the angel said to John, (Rev. XIX. 10.) So that thou do it not. That tithes ought not to be given to the priests, because there was no use of them in the primitive church. They reject all titles of prelates, as Pope, Bishop, &c. They condemn all ecclesiastical offices, and the privileges and immunities of the clergy, and all persons and things belonging to it. Such as Councils and Synods, parochial rights, &c. They hold the sacrament of different orders of the clergy to be of no use; EVERY GOOD LAYMAN BEING A PRIEST; AND THE APOSTLES THEMSELVES BEING ALL LAYMAN." "They condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs, which they do not read of, in the gospel."—[Pynchard pg. 103.]

Flagitious heretics these! They rejected the *clerical caste*! They would have nothing to do with associations or Synods! They were persecuted by the Pope, it is said. Yes. But why? Because they were rebels against the *clerical caste*. And who was the Pope, but the creature, the tool, the representative, the embodiment, the personification, of the *clerical caste*! But the persecution

was under a union of the church with the state! Aye, truly. And what of that! This simply, the state lent its power to enforce the claims of the *clerical caste*!

All your hierarchies, papacies, church and state unions, established religions, test acts, bulls of excommunication, laws of conformity, disabilities, distrains, enforcement of tithes—what are they, but the engines and servants of an organized *clerical caste*? Wherever you have this, you have the germ of all the rest. To say that organized clerical bodies, apart from the brotherhood, are less formidable without episcopacies, papacies, and church and state unions, is only saying that, in the absence of these they have less ability to enforce their clerical claims. The claims are nevertheless, substantially the same, after all, whether with or without the facilities for enforcing them.

Episcopacies, papacies, and presbyterianisms, are not the only forms of clerical organization that admit of a union with the state, as our own American history testifies. How gracefully and efficiently, the association of congregational ministers can call in the aid of the civil authority, we shall see, in due time.

We have now before us, distinctly, the important lesson that the struggles of Christian liberty, in the times and in the persons of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, were against a clerical caste, and that the freedom then claimed was freedom from the claims of a clerical caste.—Their grand heresy, that subjected them to persecution, was, undoubtedly, the rejection of those claims. And the persecution was simply an effort for enforcing them.

The creed of the Waldenses, in the twelfth century was, substantially, that of the protestants of the sixteenth. They received the Scriptures as "an infallible guide, and rejected whatever usages were not found in them." They maintained that churches should be composed only of true Christians; "that Christ has given on his church no authority to make laws for the government of his people, but simply requires them to administer such as he has given in his word." "Their churches were composed of persons previously confessing and declaring their faith, and change of life." Their church officers were bishops or elders, and deacons, elected by the brotherhood at large.

The dawn of the Protestant Reform

mon was joyfully greeted by the Albigen-
ses, who, surviving the persecutions of
successive ages, were still found in the
fastnesses of the Alps. Their revived
faith and piety drew forth fresh edicts
against them, and after the middle of
the seventeenth century, the poet Milton
celebrated 'the late massacre in Piedmont'
in the following sonnet.

Avenge, O Lord, thy Slaughtered Saints, whose
bones
are scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,
Forget not! in thy books record their groans,
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese, that roll'd
Down with infant down the rocks. Their means
No valiant valour to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyr'd blood and ashes sow
Over all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred fold, who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.

REVIEW OF THE PRECEDING.

Reader! You have now before you, a
brief, but truthful sketch of the preserva-
tion of pure Christianity and the strug-
gles of Christian freedom, from the period
of the general corruption of the churches,
and the ascendancy of the clerical caste,
in the middle of the third century, (before
the rise of the papacy,) thenceforward
through the dark ages, and so on,
to the opening of the Lutheran period, in
the sixteenth century, a sweep of almost
thirteen hundred years. You see, at a
glance, how one race of witnesses for the
truth was raised up, after another, bear-
ing the same testimony, protesting against
the same corruptions, and enduring the
same persecution from the same class of
men. You see how these different sects,
if they may be called such—were con-
nected together, not only by unity of faith,
purpose, and of suffering, but by his-
torical and chronological continuity, by
geographical proximity, by matter of fact
propagation and transmission from gener-
ation to generation, from age to age, like
a vast chain, that runs from
Valentinian to Luther! Robinson tells us
that the Novatians "continued, under
various names, down to the times of the
Lutheran Reformation"—others speak of
them as having been extinguished before
close the fifth century. But if it
be so, the Donatists, bearing a similar
monopoly, arose in the beginning of the
fourth century, and are traced nearly to
close of the sixth century. [Other

there. Was this the famed prophetic period of
1260 days, or years, of Daniel and
of which so much has been said? If 1260
days, it brings us down to A. D. 1111, the year
in which Rome discovered its abominable
Add 30 years more, and it brings you near
to the Parisians.

sects, as the Luciferians, the Aerions (not
Arians) &c., whom we have not particu-
larly considered, intervened.] And then,
in the seventh century, came the Pauli-
cians, who, with only a change of the
name, ran into the Albigenes and Wal-
denses of the eleventh and twelfth centu-
ries, these continuing to the sixteenth
and afterwards. Thus was one timber
in the bridge, so to speak, lapsed by ano-
ther, pinned on to it, or jointed into it,
till the whole arch was spanned, over
which Christian liberty and gospel sim-
plicity, or at least the knowledge of them,
have travelled down to our times. That
so remarkable a period should have been
the subject of prophetic chronology, need
not seem strange.

Now, we take it for granted that the
Great Head of the church, has employed
the appropriate instrumentalities and meas-
ures for preserving religious liberty and
true Christianity in the world. We hold
it undeniable that the methods which have
in matter of fact, succeeded, are the right
methods. We conceive that if the No-
vatianists, the Donatists, the Paulicians,
the Albigenes, the Waldenses, (we might
add, the Protestant reformers,) had not
in the main adopted correct principles of
action, employed scriptural measures,
manifested a right spirit, and exemplified
a living faith, they could not have secured
the approbation and the assistance of
God, and consequently could not have
succeeded, as they did, in their grand
work, of preserving, against the opposi-
tion of earth and hell, the knowledge of
pure Christianity and of Christian liberty,
in the world. God does not select vision-
ary enthusiasts, or malignant fanatics, or
ambitious aspirants, or narrow minded
bigots, or ignorant ranters, or deluded
rhapsodists, for enterprises of such a
character, taking care to keep up a con-
tinued succession of them, for the course
of almost thirteen hundred years, and
then honoring them with such glorious
success. No! If this council or this
work had been of men, it would have
come to naught, long ago but since it was
of God, the main body of the clergy of the
nominal church, who, for thirteen hun-
dred years, contended against it, were
found fighting against God—and the con-
troversy has not yet ceased.

Let us gather up, then, and group to-
gether, for our distinct contemplation
and future reference and use, some of the
main characteristics of this standing con-
test, in Christendom, together with the

main principles, measures, weapons,
and usages by which, on the part of the
friends of Christian purity and freedom,
the warfare has been carried on. How
reads the record we have already traced?

We answer—(1.) The grand and uni-
versal fact of separation, secession, pro-
testantism, come-out-ism, is the most pro-
minent and unmistakable fact of the case.
Undoubtedly there were intelligent men,
"good sort of people" (to use a signifi-
cant phrase of Hannah More) who saw
and lamented the growing corruptions of
the church, and looked with more or less
favor upon earnest efforts for reformation.
But they could not make up their minds
to separate themselves from the great
body of the catholic, that is to say, the
universal church. Their notions of the
sanctity of church relations forbade them
to sever the tie. They 'thought they could
do more good,' by remaining in the church
and laboring for its purification.† If they
cut themselves off, they thought they could
have no influence with those from whom
they seceded. God's solemn admonition,
recorded in connexion with the prediction
of the great anti christian apostacy—
"Come out of her, my people, that ye be
not partakers of her sins and that ye re-
ceive not of her plagues"—they did not
regard. And so they floated down the
current that they could not muster faith
and courage enough to stem. The his-
tory of the Protestant reformation records
the names of many such men, and here
and there we catch glimpses of such, in
almost every previous age of the church.
But these were not God's chosen instru-
ments for transmitting the knowledge of
Christian purity and freedom to these
later ages of the world. The undeniable
facts of church history, though penned
by those who looked with little or no favor
upon the seceders have settled forever
that question. No intelligent protestants
of our times, number them among the
noble army of Christian confessors, he-
roes, and martyrs, by whom truth and
liberty have been preserved. That hon-
or can never be theirs. To what extent
they partook of the sins and received the
plagues of the mystic Babylon, the search-
er of hearts only knows. Some of them,
we may hope, were finally saved, yet so-
on by fire. That their path was a wrong
and a perilous one, all who admit that
there has been a great and general apos-
tasy of the church, must believe, or else

†Take the case of Briçonnet Bishop of Meaux
as recorded by D'Aubigne, pages 412 to 415.

cling to the Roman Catholic church.—The leading clergy of the present day, like their predecessors for sixteen centuries past, may rail at "come-out-ism" as much as they please, and infidels of all grades, from Gibbon downwards, may join with them. It was God that bid his people "come out" from corrupt churches, it is God who ordained and instituted "come out-ism," as the grand instrument of preserving a true church, in the earth—it is God, who, in his holy Providence has wielded "come out-ism" from the days of Novatian to the present hour, and honored it, as his own appointed means of preserving his people and of crippling anti-christ. Let men who profess to fear God beware how they deride God's commands, repudiate his methods, trample upon his institutions, and scoff at those who would honor them. With the Bible in our hands, we might as well deny that there are any Christian institutions, or deny that the church is one of them, as to deny the duty of coming out of an unfaithful and corrupt church. Not to come out of a corrupt church is to remain out of the true church, of course. To shrink back at the reproach of "come-out-ism" when the church hardens herself against Christ and the least of his brethren, is to be ashamed of Christ and his cross.—Let those who think they can put down come-out-ism by railing at it, consider the history of the last sixteen hundred years. There is but one way to avoid come-out-ism, and that is by a speedy reformation of the church. If those who are staying in corrupt churches to reform them will show us their successful progress (a phenomenon not once witnessed, that we know of, during the last sixteen hundred years) they may spare their attacks upon come outers. We do not say that all who come out of corrupt churches are true Christian Reformers but we do say that no true reformer will stay in them any longer than is necessary (a very brief process) to ascertain whether they are under the dominion of their lusts. If they are, they are to be treated like all other men dead in trespasses and sins, and a Christian might as well take all men into the church, together, to reform them, as to take in that most hopeless portion of them who call themselves Christians, and who have a place in a nominal church. But we must proceed.

2. The secessions which we have been considering, were not made on the ground that the Churches thus abandoned, were considered corrupt in doctrine, deficient or erroneous in Christian Theology.—The Arians did indeed contend against

the received doctrines of the Church. But those we have not taken into the account. We do not number them among the witnesses by whom God preserved a knowledge of true religion and christian liberty in the earth. At one period, the Arians were at the summit of ecclesiastical power in the corrupt and persecuting church. And whatever may have become of them, after they fell into the minority, and were proscribed and suppressed, we trace no line or succession of them down to the Protestant Reformation, and melting away into it—receiving joyfully the revival of their own faith.—The golden chain of Christian influences, on the other hand, the true Apostolic succession of despised and humbled propagators of the truth and depositories of christian freedom, were essentially orthodox in their faith. They believed in the fall of man, his ruined and lost condition by nature, and the necessity of regenerating grace. They held to the doctrines of the Trinity, the deity and incarnation of Christ, his atonement, the retributions of eternity, the final separation of the righteous and the wicked. And these same doctrines were *professedly* received by the main body of the Catholic Church, including the pastors, bishops, prelates, and popes, except the brief space of the ascendancy of the Arians. Even through the dark ages, and down to the period of Luther, nay, to the present hour, the Roman Catholic Church professes the orthodox doctrine on these points. By his appeals to their own correct creed, Luther reasoned against their corrupt practices, with great power. And we find that the Novatianists and their successors did not secede "for a reason of faith." Let those think of this, who in our day, maintain that we must never secede from the churches, whatever their practices may be, so long as they are "sound in the faith," or who seem to think that a correct creed will of course preserve from apostasy, the church that retains it.

3. The grounds of secession were, *first*, and in general, the "worldly corruption" of the church—the general decline of godliness and practical piety, conformity to the world, ambition, destitution of spiritual life—*second*, and more specially, abounding "immoralities" in the church—*third*, the violation of the equality of a common brotherhood, the organization and the usurpations of a lordly clerical caste, whether congregational, as in the time of Novatian; episcopal, as in the

period of the Donatists; or papal, as in the times of the Paulicians and their successors of varied names in the Alpine retreats.

These three evils, against which they protested, (the trinity in unity of anti-christ) they never failed to encounter, from age to age.

As it made little difference with the seceders whether the corrupt and immoral churches they abandoned, professed or rejected the orthodox faith, whether they were Augustinians or Pelagians, Trinitarians or Arians, so it appears to have concerned them as little whether these corrupt churches were superintended by congregational associations, diocesan bishops, prelates or popes, or whether the holy equality of the christian brotherhood was violated by the one form of clerical domination or the other.

4. One cardinal principle of the seceders was, that true christians, godly persons, and such only, should have a place in the Christian churches. "Purity of principle and inflexibility of discipline, were their favorite objects." Thus testifies Milner of the Novatianists, whose "schism" he nevertheless deplors and condemns.

5. Another principle at the foundation of these truly conservatory movements, by which christian liberty and purity were preserved, was the equality of the common brotherhood—the essential equality of the clergy with the laity, or rather, the absurdity of the prevalent distinction between them. They held that "every good layman was a priest," and that even "the apostles themselves were all laymen." Thus they laid the axe at the root of a clerical caste. It was not the papacy—it was not the prelacy—it was not episcopacy—it was simple clericalism, in all its appropriate forms, (associationism, episcopacy, prelacy, and papacy,) that their principles brought them into conflict with, and against the usurpations which, they were called to contend.

Other things might be mentioned, but these may suffice. Secession from corrupt churches, not for a difference of faith, but for purity of practice, reorganization of independent churches, fidelity of church discipline the reception of all Christians, the exclusion of all worldlings, the common brotherhood of all believers, their equality of ranks and of rights, hostility to a clerical caste, and the endurance of a perpetual persecution from it—these, along with the holy faith and godly conversation that impelled, guided, and sus-

ined them,—wore the distinctive badges, watch-words, the ensigns, by which ed's appointed and chosen sentinels were known to each other and to all men, ring their *twelve hundred and sixty* years' vigil from Novatian to Luther, and during the dark period of the church.—That there were deviations or discrepancies during that long lapse of ages, we do not affirm. But that these were their distinguishing features, in the main, no one can deny. When any man sneers at these insignia, when he denounces these principles, when he derides or contemns these measures, let him see well to it that he does not arraign infinite wisdom, that he does not despise the divine operations,—that he does not spit his venom upon the broad seal and signet of Him whose eyes are a flame of fire, and who walks amid the golden candlesticks, with the stars in his right hand.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

Let us see whether the same general features did not characterize the Protestant Reformation that were so prominent in all the similar movements that preceded it.

COME-OUT-ISM—SECESSION.—It will hardly be doubted that this feature of the Protestant Reformation was a prominent one. It is always maintained by Protestants that it was right to come out of the Romish Church. Even those who make little account of the previous secessions—those who place little or no value upon them, and who suppose that the *true* Church was mainly to be found *within* the Romish church, up to the sixteenth century contrary of it, as having come out then.—The command “come out of her, my people,” they suppose, applied emphatically, if not exclusively, to that period.—And yet, it is quite remarkable that not a few, at the present day, who admit, and even maintain all this, are ready, nevertheless, to commend Luther for *not* obeying this divine command—for *not* “coming out” at all (according to their version of the story,) until he was thrust out by the pope. Thus, they betray the fact, after all, that the measure of Protestant secession is not to their liking, and that, if they had lived in the stormy times of the Protestant Reformation they would have remained in the Romish church, and let it run down the stream if permitted to do so, as multitudes did, who professed friendship for the reformers and zeal for reformation, so long as the sacrifice

required of them was not too great for them to endure. It cannot be uncharitable to say this of those who say the same of themselves, declaring it to be their fixed and settled principle *not* to come out of any church so long as permitted to remain in it; affirming, as many do now, that no one ought to leave any church, however corrupt, until excommunicated by it. The amount of this is, that so long as Satan will *allow* the saints to remain in his Babylon, they are to remain in it, the divine command to the contrary notwithstanding; and so run the risk of “partaking of her sins, and receiving of her plagues!”

As to the course of Luther, we do not admit the fact to have been as alleged. Be this as it may, the other prominent reformers, with few, if any exceptions, and the great mass of the protestant community, did “come out” of the Romish church, without waiting for excommunication by the Pope. Could they have been prevailed upon to remain in the church, the history of the Protestant reformation would have remained unwritten to the present hour.

And let those who contend against “come out-ism” now, on the ground, *not* that the course and position of the churches in general do not furnish a proper occasion, but on the ground, simply, that they have not, with the Bible in their hands, a sufficient degree of “light” to warrant the measure,—consider that the Romish church and priesthood, in Luther's day, *without* the Bible in their own language, were in a depth of darkness which it would be thought slanderous to attribute to our Protestant Churches now.

THE CAUSE OR OCCASION OF SECESSION.

This was “not for a reason of faith,” as already noticed, since the cardinal points of the orthodox faith, as taught by the reformers, stand recorded in the Romish creed, not excepting the article of justification by faith, on which Luther so much insisted, as furnishing an antidote to their superstitions. When any of his adversaries ventured, ignorantly, to call in question that doctrine, he confounded them by citing the standard authorities of their own church, and thus put them to silence.

Nor was it, in the first place, or chief-

Even before Rome could find time to publish her formidable Bull, he himself hurled against her a declaration of war.—D'Aubigne, p164. “My resolution is taken. I despise alike the rage and favor of Rome. Away with reconciliation. I desire never more to have any communication with her.—16. p162.”

ly, as some would have it, on account of their superstitious observances, and use of images. The first and main controversy was on account of the *gross immoralities* practiced and allowed in the church. Here lay the dispute of Luther with John Tetzel. And the unexpected discovery that the highest authorities in the Romish church tolerated or licenced these immoralities, and could not be persuaded to alter their course, convinced Luther and the reformers that this was an anti-christian church. The Protestant party has always appealed to the common conscience and common sense of mankind, on that very point affirming that here lay the pith and core of the contest. For a specimen, let any one examine the notes and practical observations of Thomas Scott, upon Rev. VIII, 4. “Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues.” This the commentator applies to the Romish church, and justifies the application by a reference to her “injustice, oppression, fraud, avarice”—“sale of indulgences, and traffic in ‘souls of men’ comparing it to ‘the accursed slave trade.’” He also says—

“This *summon* [i. e. to “Come out” &c.] concerns all persons, in every age; they who believe in Christ, and worship God in the Spirit, should separate from so corrupt a church, and from all others that copy her example of idolatry, persecution, cruelty, and tyranny, and avoid being partakers in her sins, even if they have renounced her communion, or else they may be expected to be involved in her plagues.”

“The vengeance of heaven is coming upon Rome not for gestures, garbs, and ceremonies, though multiplied, ridiculous, and of bad consequence in themselves, but for idolatry, ambition, oppression, cruelty to the people of God, imposture, avarice, licentiousness and spiritual tyranny. These are the sins that have reached to the heavens, the iniquities that God remembers, and the evils for which we must stand aloof from her communion, and that of all others that resemble her, or we shall be involved in their destruction.”

Little would it redound to the credit of Protestantism to reverse this statement and say that the separation was on the ground of “gestures, garbs, and ceremonies” rather than account of gross immoralities of practice. But how, on the score of “injustice oppression, fraud, and avarice, do the Protestant sects of America (the greater part of them) compare with the Romish church in Germany, in Luther's time? Read the facts as established “by the testimony of a thousand witnesses,” consider the manner in which the churches of these sects, at the north and south, cling together and sustain each other, and render the verdict as an impartial posterity will render it.

PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION.—“Luther then begins the assault. He shakes to its foundation that papal monarchy which had for centuries past banded together the nations of the West, under the sceptre of the Romish bishop. That there is no

uch thing as a PRIESTLY CASTE, is the truth, hidden from the church, even from the first ages, which he powerfully sets forth at the outset."—D'Aubigne, pg. 151.

"That which chiefly irritated these friars and priests was the evangelic doctrine that in the Christian church there can properly be no priestly caste raised above other believers."—Ib. pg. 253.

This confirms what we said concerning the persecution of the Albigenses and Waldenses. It was not the pope solely nor chiefly, with whom they were called to contend; it was the *priesthood*, of whom the pope was only the representative and head. At several periods in the progress of the Protestant Reformation, the pope would have gladly put off the monks and friars, and let Luther alone, if they would have permitted him to do so.

"There is but one religious order," said Albert, "and it is as comprehensive as Christianity itself."—Ib. pg. 331.

The purity and power of the Reformation, every where, was in proportion to the fidelity with which this principle was followed.

"The idea of one universal priesthood, known in such living power to the first Christians had been revived by Luther, in the sixteenth century. But this idea seems then to have dwelt only in the Lutheran Church, and was really acted out only among the congregations of the Reformed Churches. The Lutheran congregations (agreeing, in this point with the Anglican Church), took, it seems, a middle course, between the Romish and the Reformed Churches. Among the Lutherans, every thing proceeded for the Pastor or Priest, and nothing was valid in the church, but what was regularly conveyed through its rulers. But the Reformed churches, while they maintained the divine appointment of the ministry—by some acts denied—approached nearer to the primitive condition of the apostolical communities."—Ib. pg. 394.

The subsequent history and the present state of the Lutheran Church furnish an instructive comment upon the above paragraph. William Farel and Leclerc, the wool carder, by preaching without the customary ordination, carried out the Protestant principle that there is no priestly caste.

The principles of the Reformation, and not a few of its direct assaults, were against a hierarchy, a clerical caste, as well as against the papacy itself. The opposition it encountered was less from the Pope than from the clerical body.—The result of the whole, for the most part, was a compromise, in which the higher forms of clerical organization were abandoned, and the lower retained.* The Lutherans rejected the Papacy, the Calvinists rejected Episcopacy, but establish-

* It is evident, in many cases, that the lower orders of clergy would countenance the reformation so far as it displaced the orders above them, but no farther. The prelates could dispense with a pope, the bishop with higher prelates, and the clergy with bishops. But few ministers were willing to relinquish the peculiar privileges and honors of the priesthood, which distinguish them from the laity.

ed Presbyterianism in its stead. Thus the reformation was left incomplete, and after the restoration of quiet, the work settled back rather than made progress. Hence the struggles that have since been witnessed, whenever, among the masses, the sense of individual religious responsibility, in any manner, becomes revived.

And thus, we see, the same methods and principles which God employed, to keep the knowledge of Christian liberty and purity in the world, for thirteen centuries previous to the Protestant reformation, he employed, likewise, in and during it, for the revival, extension, and further transmission of the same precious blessings.—These measures were secession—the restored doctrine of the holy brotherhood of the saints—"the holy and primitive equality of souls before God"—the repudiation of the claims of a priestly caste.

That the corruptions of a Romish Church which demanded a reformation by secession, were connected with and fostered by the ascendancy and domination of a clerical caste, (not simply a papacy or a prelacy,) is evident from the testimony of D'Aubigne, who draws a picture that might, with almost equal propriety and fitness be applied either to the congregational pastors of the third century at the time of the secession of Novatian, to the Romish clergy of the sixteenth century in the time of Luther, or to a large proportion of the Protestant clergy of the nineteenth century both in Europe and America. Speaking of the church he says:—

"At the beginning it was a *society of brethren*, and now an absolute monarchy is reared in the midst of them. All Christians were priests of the living God, (1 Pet. ii. 9,) with humble pastors for their guidance. But a lofty head is uplifted from the midst of these pastors; a mysterious voice utters words full of pride, an iron hand compels all men, small and great, rich and poor, freemen and slaves, to take the mark of its power. The holy and primitive equality of souls before God is lost sight of. Christians are divided into *two strangely unequal camps*.—On the one side a separate class of priests daring to usurp the name of the Church, and claiming to be possessed of *peculiar privileges in the sight of the Lord*. On the other, *timid flocks*, reduced to a blind and passive submission; a people gagged and silenced and delivered over to a proud caste. Every tribe, language, and nation of Christendom submitted to the domin-

ion of this spiritual king who had received power to overcome.*"

Let this description be carefully pondered. The "two strangely unequal camps" of clergy and laity—not the "three orders of clergy," nor yet the prelacy nor papacy, comprized the pith of the evil,—the clergy, "claimed to be possessed of peculiar privileges, in the sight of the Lord."—"On the other" side "timid flocks." Of whom is the historian speaking? One is almost tempted to conjecture that he must have had his eye upon the Congregational and Presbyterian churches in America, that he must have been furnished with some account of the doings of presbyteries and associations of ministers deliberating "in conclaves apart by themselves," and deciding whether or no their flocks should listen to the advocates of the poor. If D'Aubigne wishes to see the original of his picture, let him accompany us a few weeks on a reformatory tour through Connecticut or Massachusetts. We will show him "timid flocks" desiring to hear, but afraid of the "mysterious voice"—we will show him deacons, muttering in privacy their deep dissatisfaction, but dumb in the presence of their pastors; we will show him professed reformers in these churches who dare not pray for the slave in public, nor assemble by themselves together for the purpose, lest they should offend the powers that be. We will show him tall men who, in attending a reformatory convention, will "fetch a compass" to avoid going by the doors of their "absolute monarchs"—and others, who, having attended and taken a part in reformatory meetings, will quail before the "lofty head" on their return, and do penance by publishing spiteful and slanderous aspersions upon the proceedings in which they themselves bore a part.

CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON SLAVERY.

It is the wish of many that there should be an opportunity for some appropriate manifestation of the increasing sensibility among the churches on the subject of slavery. To this end, it is proposed that there be a public conference of ministers and church members, to commence at the Tremont Temple in Boston, on Thursday, the 21st of Jun., and continue so long as may seem desirable. To the

* It was not without a reason that in the edition of D'Aubigne's work republished by the American Tract Society, the greater part of this paragraph was suppressed.

meeting all are invited, (without distinction of denomination, and without reference to any former or present views or positions on the various questions connected with slavery;) whose hearts mourn for the existence of such an evil, and who desire and expect, that the gospel in its progress, is to abolish it. It will assemble in the hope, that through God's blessing upon the prayers and conferences of his people, a way may be opened by which all good men may unite in *doing something* in the line of purely religious effort to bear directly towards the abolition of slavery—something which, if properly begun, unitedly supported, and persevered in, cannot but end in the peaceful extinction of that great sin.

A general attendance is requested, with the hope that every one will come under the influence of a Christian spirit, to inquire after the will of God, and do it.—*Emancipator*.

Boston, January 4, 1847.

A rare "Christian conference" this must have been, if the plan of the invitation shall have been carried out. It was to have been composed of "all whose hearts mourn for the existence of such an evil, and who desire and expect, that the gospel, in its progress, is to abolish it—without reference to any former or present views or positions on the various questions connected with slavery." Let us imagine such a convention. Here comes a disciple of Wesley or of Edwards who believes American slavery to be "the sum of all villanies"—"the highest kind of theft." By his side sits Bishop Hedding who "hates slavery as he hates hell" but believes the warrant for holding slave to be "the golden rule." And next to him sits Prof. Stuart who believes in the golden rule "decides against" slavery, but that the relation "may still exist *salva fide et salva ecclesia*" (without violating the Christian faith or the church.) Another member of the conference has withdrawn religious fellowship from slaveholders and from those who elevate them to places of power; and next to him, on either hand, sit Joseph Sturge who attempted to 'put down' the abolitionists 'by popular indignation,' and Edward Woods Jr. who held them 'justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures.' Here, too, are Samuel H. Cox and Joel Hawes, whose hearts mourn for the existence of an evil and who propose to remove it by hugging it to the bosom of the

church, and by capping the Venetian of ecclesiastical agitation on the subject—Doctor Taylor of New Haven sits next, with his pet 'lesser devil of the two' between his knees grinning hideously his satisfaction with his 'present position.'—The venerable Dr. Jacob Lee, the father-in-law of the martyr Torrey, has a place, we will suppose in the 'Christian conference' along with the officials of the Park Street Church, who spurned the 'herald corpse' from their house of worship!

Verily, it would be an edifying sight to contemplate, the religious fellowship and co-operation of such a group, assembled together as a 'Christian conference on slavery,' and asking 'God's blessings upon the prayers and conferences of his people!' The questions once asked—'what fellowship hath light with darkness?' &c., are in a fair way of being directly answered, if such a conference assembles, and comes to a harmonious result.

And what confidence could the community be supposed to have, in the doings of such an assembly? And what influence could it exert? Who would fail to see that the whole was a solemn farce?

Then think how Tracy, Woods, Stuart, Hedding, &c., &c., would look, embracing the 'opportunity for some appropriate manifestation' of their 'increasing sensibility on the subject of Slavery.'

"The increasing sensibility of the churches" with their bolted pulpits and negro pews, and pro-slavery missions and pro-slavery votes! What are we to understand by the apparent implication that these churches in general (as such) have ever manifested any proper kind of sensibility on the subject of slavery? As to any increase of the kind of sensibility that they have, in fact, manifested, on the subject of slavery, an increase of their opposition and spirit of persecution (if it were possible) would be the only result. They are not less, now 'the bulwarks of American slavery' than when Birney wrote his noble testimony concerning them.

'In the hope that a way may be opened in which all good men may unite' &c. The way is opened, already, and always has been open, ever since God said 'Break every yoke'—Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, show my people their transgression and the house of Jacob their sins.' God's way of salvation from sin—from all sin—from (slave-

holding, negro hating, and pro-slavery voting not excepted) is already 'opened' and revealed. It needs no 'Christian conference' to devise any new way, nor to mock God by asking him to 'open' any new way. 'Other foundation can no man lay than is laid.' God will never open any other. Do the orthodox ministers of Massachusetts, Joshua Leavitt included need to be told that? And having lost all knowledge of God's way of salvation from sin, must they needs have a 'Christian conference' of ministers and church members' 'without distinction of denomination' (Theodore Parker, Dr. Woods, universalists, catholic priests and all) colonizationists, abolitionists of all sorts &c., &c., to devise, or to ask of God a revelation of some new way of salvation?

Who does not know that God's way is repentance, and fruits meet for repentance? And who does not know that the churches and leading ministers of Massachusetts, with few exceptions, refuse to humble themselves and repent of this sin, and refuse to bring forth the appropriate fruits of such repentance? And who does not know that the attempt to devise, or to ask of God, any other way of salvation, is to give up the orthodox theology that these churches and ministers profess, or to ask God to give it up, for their convenience and accommodation? Whenever God does this, for the accommodation of the churches and ministers of Massachusetts he will doubtless include all other transgressors of his law, in the same provision, and the preachers of the orthodox faith must prepare themselves to promulgate the new evangel they seem so intent to introduce.

"Purely religious effort" should be shaped by pure religious principles.—And is it expected that "a public conference of ministers and church members" of all religious creeds, and of all conceivable "views" and "positions" respecting "questions connected with slavery" will be likely to harmonize in these principles? The "orthodox" in Massachusetts must be getting quite as "liberal" as any one could desire.

But "purely religious effort" must, perhaps, be construed into a veto against the introduction of any *political* topics into the discussion of so very religious a body. Pro-slavery voting and pro-slavery legislation, therefore, must not come under review, in this 'Christian conference' assembled 'without reference to any

former or present views or positions on the various questions connected with slavery."

The contemplated measures, which, "if properly begun, unitedly supported, and persevered in, cannot but end in the peaceful extinction of that great sin"—being "purely religious," must have nothing to do with political action. A fine opportunity will thus be presented for your exclusive "moral suasion" abolitionists to come in, and co-operate, where their own fundamental principle is so fully recognized. This is just what the non-government abolitionists have been telling us. Abolitionism must be "purely moral and religious." Mr. Garrison, if a "Church member," with Theodore Parker and his flock, (if they could only be brought to appreciate "the increasing sensibility of the churches on the subject of slavery," as they sometimes do the "sensibilities" of Whig "church members") might bear a conspicuous part in the movement. The N. Y. Observer has already made its advances towards a fraternal recognition of them. Gov. Briggs, who is a "church member," and whose "sensibility" on the subject is generally recognized, might come into the "Christian Conference" without fear of being reminded by Br. Leavitt, of his "past or present views or position" respecting volunteers for pro-slavery wars. In "a purely religious effort," such mere political peccadillos are not to come into the question, especially when the invitation is "without reference to any former or present views or positions on the various questions connected with slavery."

Who knows whether these very liberal and "comprehensive" "views and positions," in respect to ecclesiastical action, on the "various questions connected with slavery," may not shadow forth and portend equally liberal and "comprehensive" movements in respect to political action. The hint of a more comprehensive anti-slavery "league" "without reference to any former or present views or positions" &c., &c., has already been given, and present movements in certain quarters indicate attempts at new combinations for political effort that shall be less rigid and exclusive. Let no one expect that the tone of our political ethics will long remain more uncompromising than our ecclesiastical. The thing cannot be.

A "Christian conference" under this invitation could not be expected to touch the missionary question, or the negro peo-

ple question, any more than did the previous church conference in Boston, invited under similar auspices. And without any discussion of such practical questions which meet us every day, and which cannot be blinked, how can any progress be made?

Our old friend Leavitt must excuse us, if we express, not only our regret but our surprise at the position he holds in these matters. How, without a renunciation of his orthodox creed, can he expect to bring up the professedly orthodox ministers and churches of Massachusetts to the anti-slavery enterprise, by any other process than by deep and thorough humiliation and repentance for their sin? Are they not verily guilty concerning our enslaved brother? Can God hear their prayers and grant them his guidance (even allowing them to be "his people") until they repent and confess their sins? Has he ever done, or will he ever do, any such thing? Can they continue to harden themselves against him, and prosper?—Why, then, instead of calling upon them to repent, does he bolster them up in their proud and impenitent denial of their sinful prejudice, apathy, and hatred of the truth, by complimenting them with their "sensibility"—their "increasing sensibility on the subject of slavery," at the very moment when their treatment of the murdered Torrey, their continued fellowship with his murderers, their support of pro-slavery missions and pro-slavery rulers marks them as increasing in obduracy, and filling up with great rapidity, the measure of their guilt? Could he do or say any thing better adapted to bolster them up in their impenitency and seal their destruction? If even a leader in the anti-slavery ranks thus compliments them, what arrow of conviction from the quiver of truth, shall be able to reach, and subdue, and deliver them?

We may the more freely intimate to Bro. Leavitt our convictions that he is not on the right track, since his own confessions, if we are rightly informed, very clearly reveal the fact that he himself feels no very great confidence in the wisdom of the course he has pursued. At the Christian Anti-Slavery Convention in Beverly, last May, he was understood to say, in substance, as follows:

"Having labored fifteen years to enlighten my brethren in respect to their duties to the slave, and not succeeding, I am satisfied my light must have been darkness. If any object would justify the

commissioning of an angel from the court of heaven with a special message to earth, it would be to enlighten us, (i. e., the New England churches and ministry,) in respect to our duties to the slave."

If brother Leavitt has labored fifteen years to enlighten his brethren in respect to their duty to the slave without preaching to them the gospel duty of repentance for their sins against the slave, the indeed brightness been darkness. But if he has labored thus long to bring them to repentance without success, is not time for him to ask what further testimony he can bear against such inveterate transgressors without "coming out from among them." Let him beware of abandoning God's method because it does not "succeed" in their case. It did not "succeed" in bringing the Jewish church, nor the seven churches of Asia, nor the church of Rome, to repentance, but it remains God's method still. As for "commissioning an angel from heaven" to reveal any thing new, for the benefit of the New England churches and ministry, he will do nothing of the kind.

(Concluded in the next.)

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, March, 12, 1847.

G. W. Perkins, Meriden, Conn.	\$1.00	Mrs. Lombard, Elbridge.	
H. Van Driessen, Cazenovia,	50	J. K. Richards, do.	
P. Rice, do.	50	S. S. Bradford, Little York.	
Z. Brockel, Salisbury,	1.00	H. Avery, Ledyard.	
J. G. Birney, Saginaw, Mich.	3.00	A. Tillotson, King's Ferry.	
H. Buel, Rochester,	1.00	A. Gray, Ovi,	
S. Hale, Union Corners,	2.00	E. Mandaville, do.	
L. Turner, Shannon,	50	D. W. Kinney, do.	
L. Chamberlain, Solon, Ohio,	50	H. C. Taylor, Oberlin.	
I. Casey, Fowlersville,	1.00	A. DeWolfe, Bath.	
B. L. Stedman, Livonia,	1.00	R. L. Platt, do.	
A. L. Post, Montrose, Penn.	95	R. Skinner, Prattsburg.	
O. Lovejoy, Princeton, Ill.	90	J. Pixley, E. Bloomfield.	
J. Copeland, Sherburne,	1.00	S. Morse, Orangeville.	
G. Winn, Reading, Mass. for self and 7 others.	5.00	J. A. Northrup, Lowell.	
J. R. Hopkins, Auburn.	50	W. W. Bancroft, Granville, Ohio.	
A. Green, Port Byron.	1.00	G. Griffith, do.	
G. Candee, S. Butler,	1.00	W. Jeliff, Newark, N. J.	
Dr. Campbell, do.	50	J. Dowstoe, Lakeville.	
W. Lovejoy, Rose,	1.00	A. D. Miner, Lima.	
J. Hink, Cato,	50	J. M. Baker, W. Bloomfield.	
M. F. Hanson, Boston,	50	H. E. Peck, Rochester.	
W. F. Sheldon, W. Bloomfield,	2.00	G. A. Wheaton, Syracuse.	
G. A. Wendell, do.	50	R. Furman, do.	
Amos Dresser, Oberlin, Ohio.	1.00	J. P. Bishop, Boston.	
J. J. Tucker, Buell.	1.00	O. F. Curiss, Milwaukee.	
H. Baury, do.	50	D. Thurston, Winthrop, Me.	
J. Mercey, do.	50	R. Burt, Freetown, Mass.	
J. Coddie, Prairieville, Wis.	0.40	S. Kingsbury, N. East, Pa.	
C. Morris, Jordan,	50	J. Jersup, Harbor Creek, Pa.	
W. Eager, DeWitt,	1.00	Deduct Commissions	

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V.—NO. 4 }
WHOLE NUMBER, 60. }

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. APRIL, 1847.

{ WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER. }

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.
TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.
PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

A. WARREN, Printer, Perry, N. Y.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
Papers, per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 100 | One hundred papers, \$3 00.

(Concluded from the last.)

CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON SLAVERY.

They have Moses and the prophets, Jesus Christ and his apostles, and if they will not believe then, neither would they believe, though one rose from the dead.—What could "an angel from the court of heaven" do for them but point them to the scriptures—to the first and fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah—to the twenty-third and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, to the fifth chapter of James, and other similar messages of the Holy Ghost?—Though "an angel from heaven should" bring any other gospel, he would only be accursed by the Great Head of the church. Just as certainly as he lives and reigns, just as certainly must the churches and ministry of Massachusetts humble themselves and repent, speedily, or be blotted out of the book of life. It is neither presumption nor arrogance to repeat, in this application, Christ's own words in parallel cases. To say that we cannot know enough of human character to do this, is to say that the plain declarations of the Bible cannot be applied to the present generation of men, nor to any particular classes of sinners whom we would warn to escape the wrath to come. If this be harsh and denunciatory, the fault lies in the stern puritan theology that the Massachusetts churches and ministry profess. We have, as believers in that theology, no alternative left us but to make this application of it, or renounce it as incompetent to guide us, in this enterprise, and we must then join in the supplication for

a new and better revelation from the court of heaven!

Till then we shall insist that the churches and ministry of New England, when they sin against God, are to be approached and treated as all other men, under similar circumstances are to be approached and treated. He who does not know how to call them to repentance might as well conclude he does not know how to call any body to repentance. If those churches and ministers are to be saved at all, they are to be saved just as all other people are. There is only one name given under heaven, among men, whereby we must be saved. And that Savior has only one method of Salvation. He makes the same terms to all, not excepting the ministers of Boston and the Professors at Andover. If they cannot consent to be saved in this way, then they must be lost, as thousands of proud and dignified ecclesiastics have been before them. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whose confesseth and forsaketh them shall find mercy." In saying all this, we only say that the Bible is true—that the commonly received "orthodox" exposition of its doctrines is the correct one—that slaveholding is sinful—and that the principal ministers and churches of New England hold fellowship with and sustain slaveholding. If either of these positions are unsound, let it be shown, and we will confess our mistake. But if this cannot be done, we claim that our conclusions should be received by all "orthodox" Christians.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. V.

In tracing, from the times of Novatian, in the third century, the "SUCCESSIVE STRUGGLES OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM" since the period, we brought down the history, in our last number, to the times of the Protestant Reformation. We found that, at every step, the struggle was against a worldly church and a clerical caste; and that church discipline,

purity of church membership, and the equal brotherhood and unity of all Christians, were the watchwords of the persecuted reformers. In England, it was soon found that the reformation was incomplete, and the struggle assumed new exemplifications.

THE ENGLISH DISSENTERS—THE NONCONFORMISTS—THE PURITANS.

Here, again, we have another repetition of the same history. There were, indeed, dissenters who did not separate.—They remained in the Church of England to reform it. With how much success, the present state of that church may certify us. It may be said that for a time, their labors promoted a purer religion, to a limited extent, within the establishment. Very true. But the fact of a revived piety within the establishment, so long as the leading influence and authority remained corrupt, only brought the true worshippers under the control and domination of the formalists. The piety of the dissenters who did not secede, came to be placed to the credit of the corrupt establishment itself, thus increasing their pernicious influence and power over good men. Had the same labors been expended out of the establishment, or if the converts to evangelical religion within the establishment had been led to secede, they would have been removed from the domination and worldliness that, soon afterward, by their remaining in the establishment, rolled over them, and carried them or their successors, down the stream of corruption. And by strengthening the hands of the seceders, in joining them, they might have doubled their means of propagating the true religion. We are warranted to infer this, not only from a common sense view of the nature of the case, but from the well known results of the experiment. Whoever would find, at the present day, any perceptible remains of the labors of the English dissenters, must look among the successors of those who seceded, not among the successors of those who remained in the Mother Church, under the delusive idea of doing more good there.

The reformers, dissatisfied with the church of England, took the name of Puritans, from their demanding a pure

church—a "congregation of faithful men," in distinction from mere men of the world. A wide field of remark opens before us. We should need to compress Neal's history of the Puritans into one of our brief numbers, in order to do justice to the subject. We can only glance at a few prominent features of the movement.

The church of England, originating in an exchange of the Roman Pontiff for Henry VIII. and his successors, had taken the name of "Protestant" and "Reformed," but the reformation had been but a partial and imperfect one. The leaven of impurity which had so strongly marked the English reformation, had well nigh leavened the whole lump, when the Puritans appeared.* The ancient superstitions had revived, and a lordly clergy, wielding the civil power or wielded by it, were the conservators of all this impurity, blocking up, as such a clergy always do, the wheels of salutary reform. Whoever studies the history of Puritanism, will find it to have been, so far as it was a work of Christian reformation, a contest, not with the papacy, nor prelacy merely, but with the clerical body or the controlling majority of it, and with the gross corruption, impiety, and irreligion, within the church, which the clergy permitted to lie unrebuked there, and which they would permit no unanointed and unauthorized reformers to disturb. In this respect, the controversy presented a striking resemblance to the controversy between American reformers and the American clergy, in our own times. If the Puritans came into harsh collision with the Bishops and Prelates it was because these Bishops and Prelates were the representatives of the clerical body, the great majority of whom were opposed to reform. If the Puritans found themselves pitted against the allied power of Church and State, it was for the same reason. The power of the State was on the side of the corrupt church and clergy, and the church and state union, by claiming and treating the entire population, including the most profigate in high life, as church members, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven, had violated the first principles of church organization, as understood by the Puritans, who held the essence of the institution to lie in the separation of the righteous from the wicked, and the enrolment and action

* Popery had, indeed, been temporarily restored for a season, and the final settlement of the Church of England upon its present basis, under Queen Elizabeth, was avowedly a compromise between Romanism and the Protestantism that had prevailed, under Edward VI.

of the regenerated, in assemblies and churches composed only of themselves.—If they contended against superstitious observances, against man-invented ceremonies, forms, modes, gestures, and garbs, it was because they found a reliance upon these, to have superseded in the popular mind, the necessity of personal holiness and practical godliness, and because, moreover, they found these to be the insignia, the implements, the weapons, the enchanted and enchanting symbols of a clerical caste, claiming the monopoly and use of them for their own ends, of holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and lording it over the brotherhood of the faithful. Any other solution of the Puritan severity against these, (apparently innocent and indifferent as many of them were, in themselves,) would be attributing to them a frivolity equal to that of those to whom, in these particulars, they were opposed.

That portion of the Puritan separatists who were called Independent, from their restoration of church independency, were evidently the most consistent and thorough and came nearest to the primitive model. They carried out into practice the principles which their countryman, John Wickliffe and his successors, the Lollards, before the Protestant Reformation, had partially discovered and promulgated, but which their position in the bosom of a corrupt church, and under the control of a clerical caste, had not permitted them fully to develop and exemplify.

John Milton, the poet, characterizes Wickliffe as "the modern discoverer of the principles of congregational dissent." He was nearly two centuries before Luther, and commenced his career by publishing a work in which, says Punchard, "he boldly inveighs against the worldliness, the rapacity, the sensuality, the simony, an utter degeneracy of the clergy, and denounces them as blind guides, who, instead of leading the people by precept and example, into the ways of truth and holiness, had plunged with them into the abyss of sin and crime." "His search into the scripture and into ecclesiastical history," says Hume, "opened the eyes of the Reformers, to see more and more, the anti-scriptural character of the entire hierarchal system of these days." No marvel that the Pope hurled his anathemas against the bold reprover of the Clergy.

"All human traditions," says Wickliffe, "which are not taught in the gospel, are superfluous and

wicked. 'Tis not lawful for a Christian, after a full publication of the law of Christ, to devise himself any other laws for the government of the Church.* If the ceremonies of the old law were to cease under the law of grace, because of their burdensomeness and number, how much more should such traditions of men as are devised without any scripture foundation, cease in the time of the law of grace." (Punchard, p. 1810. Palmer's Protest. Dissenter's Catechism, App. No. 3, 20th Edition.) "The Church," he defines to be "The congregation of just men, for whom Christ shed his blood"—"The assembly of predestinated persons."

He maintained that Christ is the only head of the Church, and that no true man will dare put two heads lest the church should be monstrous—that "we must practice and teach only the laws of Christ." He wrote against the three orders of clergy, maintained that bishops and priests were all one, that presbyters and deacons were the only officers of the church, and that ministers should be supported only by the free will offerings of the people. He regarded "all endowments (permanent funds) of the church as a manifest departure from the original spirit of the Christian system." Episcopal writers of Church history look with suspicion on Wickliffe, and congratulate themselves that the Church of England was not reformed upon his model, lest "the clergy might have been consigned to a degrading dependence on their flocks." The Wickliffites, or Lollards, as they were afterwards called, suffered many persecutions, in the next century.—"A convocation of the Clergy" matured measures for this purpose. Sir John Oldcastle, (Lord Cobham,) was among the victims of their vengeance, and he was "suspended alive in chains, and burned to death, with the praises of God in his mouth, and the spirit of Christ in his heart." A. D. 1417, a century before the era of Luther. These persecutions were continued down to the period of Henry VIII.

If these experiments for reforming a corrupt church by remaining in it were of no other value, as a means of attaining that object, they served to teach the Puritan Independents, who came afterwards, the more rational and scriptural policy of reformation and re-organization by coming out and being separate. This they were careful to do, notwithstanding the majority of their fellow laborers in the cause of reform, including nearly all the great names that have come down to us as the champions of Puritanism, frowned on their course, and continued in the

* A full sweep, this principle makes, of Associations and Conventions, and flatly contradicts the common plea of discretionary power, under the pretence that the "law of Christ" left the ecclesiastical organization incomplete.

communion of the Church of England, to the day of their deaths! Among these was the famous Richard Baxter, who had been charged with having written "whole cartloads of seditious books" against the establishment. The result of his "remaining in the church to purify it" was, that he became contaminated with her persecuting spirit himself, and he even went so far as to upbraid Oliver Cromwell for having granted toleration to the Puritan Independents. No class of opposers, in times of reformation, when secession is needful, are more formidable and virulent than those who have held prominent places among the reformers, but who, nevertheless, stop short of the act of secession. In their view, the reformation is disgraced and retarded by these extravagant and imprudent measures, and hence their anathemas against secession or come-out-ism are redoubled, to prevent their identification with it. Yet it has been well remarked that if the Church of England were half as corrupt as the writings of Baxter had proved her to be, the principle of separation held in common by all Protestants, should have led him to secede. The names of the leading men among the Puritan Independents in their earliest period, have scarcely come down to their successors. To say nothing of Robert Brown, (after whom they were at one time called Brownists,) whose good name has been tarnished by his apostasy from his principles, reception back into the Church of England, and subsequent immorality, their other prominent men were of less note in their day, and are less celebrated now, than the learned Puritans who avoided the scandal of come-out-ism by remaining in the church! We have the names of Elias Thacker, and John Copping, who were hanged! There was also one Henry Barrow, a lawyer, his brother-in-law, John Greenwood, a minister, and John Penry, another minister, who all suffered martyrdom for their separation, and their principles of church independency, while the great men, as they are esteemed, of the Puritan faith, who were prudent enough to stay in the persecuting mother church, for the sake of reforming it, were so fortunate, it must be confessed, as to save their own lives. The majority of the Puritans followed their example, and were ultimately absorbed and lost in the mother church. Out of one hundred Puritan ministers, summoned, at one time

before the Star Chamber, '01 signed the promise of conformity. This appears to have been in order to retain their stations, as the remaining 30 were silenced. But "many devout persons hesitated to separate, totally, so long as the doctrinal articles of the church were sound and scriptural." [Vide Punchard, p. 202.] All the benefits, however that their posterity have derived from the Puritans, have come down to them through the despised and hated portion of them who seceded.

It was for such obscure men as Thacker and Copping, and Barrow, and Greenwood and Penry, to transmit to after ages and to this western Continent, nearly all that we now know of civil and religious freedom, of the foundation principles of civil government, and of church order and discipline. It was by the immediate successors of these men, that the flocks they gathered were organized into the independent churches from which are derived all the Congregational and Baptist churches of Britain and America. One of these congregations fled to Holland, to escape persecution, and afterwards emigrated to America in the Mayflower and landing at Plymouth Rock, laid the foundation of our republican institutions.—Whatever approximation towards these same principles may be claimed to have been made by Presbyterians, in England, Scotland, or America, must be credited likewise to the principle of secession.—Had they not separated themselves from the mother church, her present position would have been theirs. "Come out-ism," whoever may chose to deride it, may claim all of Puritanism that did not go back, with Robert Brown, to the bosom of the established church, and must be credited with all the progress that human society has made, in consequence of the Puritan movement. If all the Puritans had remained in the mother church to purify it, very little, if anything, of the entire effort would have been saved to their posterity.

INDEPENDENCY, &c.

The seceding Puritan Independents elected their own pastors and deacons from among themselves. In all controversies the dernier resort was to the local church. There was no tribunal among them beyond this. One of their articles was, "that ministers and elders, and every one of the church, be subject to ecclesiastical discipline, as others—private members of the church, be." No consociations of churches nor associations of ministers

were ever known among them, previous to their emigration to America, nor in this country, till 28 years afterwards. In G. Britain they are unknown still.

The early English Independents were not sectarian. They received to church membership, all whom they regarded as regenerated persons, and those only.—There were baptists, and pado-baptists in the same churches, and no division took place between them until the year 1608, above half a century after the first organization of independent churches in that country. John Bunyan, who was an independent, and has been called a baptist, advocated the unity of all Christians, baptists and pado-baptists, in the same church. They held and practiced the right of lay ordination, and for refusing to submit to the claims of the clergy to the exclusive right of ordination, they were imprisoned and hung. The practice of ordination by ministers does not appear to have been introduced until the times of Robinson, who, as Mr. Buck informs us in his Theological Dictionary, "remodeled the society in such a manner as to render it less odious to his adversaries," &c. This concession was evidently designed to propitiate the clerical body through whose influence, such terrible persecutions had been inflicted upon them.

CLERICAL ORDINATIONS.

With how much aversion the early Independents regarded the claim of clerical ordination, we may learn from the fact of their enduring the bloodiest persecutions, rather than to submit to it, as well as from their writings, which have come down to us. They contended not only with the established church but with the Presbyterians on this subject. Witness the following extract from a work written by Barrow, while in prison, and not long before he suffered martyrdom:

"These reformers, [the Presbyterians,] however, for fashion's sake, they give the people a little liberty, to sweeten their mouths, and make them believe that they should choose their own ministers, yet even in this pretended choice, do they cozen and beguile them also, leaving them nothing but the smoky, windy title of election, only enjoining them to choose some University clerk, one of these College birds of their own brood, or else comes a synod upon the neck of them; and annihilates the election, whatsoever it be! They have also a trick to stop it, before it comes so far, namely, in the ordination, which must, forsooth, needs be done by other priests; for the church that chooseth him, hath no power to ordain him! And this makes the mother Church of Geneva, and the Dutch churches; I dare not say the secret classes in England—to make ministers for us in England." [Punchard's Hist., page 256.]

What Mr. Barrow would have thought of our present New England congregationalism, and what our present congregational doctors, would have thought of him, it is not difficult to conjecture.

That there could have been no organized associations of ministers or consecrations of churches among the Puritan Independents in England, is evident to any reader of their history, upon the very face of it.

Compare now. The Puritans, including the presbyterians, complained of the church of England "of the promiscuous communion of the ungodly, and godly, at the Lord's table." (See Pynchard's Hist., pg. 236.)

Barrow and Greenwood were accused by the Bishops with teaching that "the worship of the English Church is idolatry, that we admit into our church persons unsanctified, that our preachers have no lawful [scriptural] calling, that our government [discipline] is ungodly, that the people of every parish ought to choose their bishop, that every elder, though he be no pastor or doctor, is a bishop, that the child of ungodly parents ought not to be baptized, &c." [Ib. pg. 253.]

Mr. Robinson, the pastor of the Plymouth Rock church, wrote a book in which he said they, (the separatists) could "draw no longer under the same [i. e. the Bishops] in spiritual communion with all the profane of the land, but would break those bonds of iniquity, as easily as Sampson did the cords wherewith Delilah had tied him, and give good reason also, from the word of God, for so doing." [Ib. page 328.]

Were the members of the English Church worse than our American slave holders and those who promote them in the church and the State?

The Puritan Independents, evidently held a church to be anti-Christian that knowingly held ungodly men in its fellowship and communion. The above citations are full and direct to the point. They also held it unlawful to recognize, in any way, the Christian character of such churches.

While the 'conforming Puritans' expended their strength and wore out their lives in idle attempts to reform the Church of England by their petitions, which, says the historian, they 'might as well have addressed to the four winds of heaven,' and while the more moderate and timid of the petitioners still kept within the verge of the church, and made a compromise with their consciences, so far as to escape the edge of the law; others, however, and not a few, were driven into open separation. Multitudes, in different parts of the kingdom, were gradually brought into the sentiment of the separatists, and resolved to have no further fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. They consequently withdrew themselves entirely from the parish churches, and assembled in private houses, in the woods, &c. &c. [Ib. pg. 292-3.]

In a work of Mr. Robison, he proceeds to justify separation from public communion as would be a virtual recognition of them as true churches. He says: 'As we are, then to join ourselves with them wherein God hath joined us, so are we, wherein He severeth us, to sequester and sever ourselves.'—'If the parish assemblies, gathered by compulsion, of all the worshippers promiscuously, &c., be of God, then is our fellowship only of persons sanctified, &c., &c., not of God, nor from heaven.' If, on the contrary, ours be of God, and of Christ, then is theirs of Anti-Christ. Either the one or the other are plantings which God hath not planted, and shall be rooted up. A church truly constituted, must be of such persons as by and in whom God will and may be thus worshipped and glorified, and are, by Him, both in their persons and fellowship, separated and sanctified thereto.' [Ib. pg. 335-6.]

In opposition to this Puritan doctrine, the Clergy of the established church were wont, it seems to quote the parable of the tares and the wheat, just as the Romanists, before them, had done, and just as the Presbyterian and Congregational oppo-

nents of "come out ism" in America, now do. Mr. Robinson therefore takes up and refutes the sophistry, by showing that "the field is the world" and not the church, wherein "both the wheat and the tares were to grow together until the harvest," that Christ "doth not speak at all of excommunication, which serves for the bettering of the tares, but of their final rooting up to perdition." [Ib. page 250.] He adds—

"Our Savior Christ doth plainly teach that this field was sown with good seed alone, and that after, whilst men slept, the enemy, the devil, came and sowed tares among the wheat." Contrasting this with the English Church, Mr. Robinson says:—'Unto this church, thus capped and clouted together of persons of all sorts and spirits without difference, no man equally and prudently weighing things, can deny but that the pompous and impious hierarchical government, together with its accessories, doth right well accord.' [Ib. page 351.]

In his answer to Joseph Hall, Mr. Robinson says:—'We are built to proclaim to all the world, SEPARATION FROM WHATSOEVER RISETH UP REBELLIOUS AGAINST THE SCRIPTURE OF HIS [i. e. Christ's] KINGDOM.' [page 368.]

A good motto for those who separate from pro slavery churches in America.—The following, from the same answer, is equally in place now, on this side the Atlantic, and applied to churches claiming to be the successors of the puritans.

'The crime here objected, is separation, a thing very odious in the eyes of all them from whom it is made, and evermore casting upon them, the imputation of evil, whereof all men are impatient. And hence it comes to pass that the Church of England can better brook the vilest persons continuing communion with it, than any whosoever separating from it, though upon never so just and well grounded reasons. And yet, separation from the world and so from the men of the world, and so from the Prince of this world that reigneth in them, and so for whatsoever is contrary to God, is the first step to communion with God and angels, and good men, as the first step to a ladder is, to leave the earth.' [Ib. page 373.]

What say our eulogists of the Puritan fathers who nevertheless sneer at "come out ism" to this doctrine? Will they undertake to show that an occasion of separation is not now furnished, quite as urgent as in the case of the Puritans?

LAY PREACHING. Mr. Robinson says:—'For the exercise of prophesying, wherein men, though not in office, have liberty to move and propound their questions and doubts for satisfaction, as also having received a gift to administer the same unto edification and comfort, as when Paul and Barnabas, coming into synagogues of the Jews, where they were no officers, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, after the lecture of the law, if they had any word of exhortation to the people, say on, which order the Jews also observe in their synagogues to this day; so, with us, the officers, after their ordinary teaching, signify and exhort unto the use of the like liberty in that and the other particulars formerly named; and so, as there is occasion, open and explain things obscure and doubtful; reprove things unsound and impertinent, and to order, moderate, and determine the whole exercise, by the word of God.' [Ib. page 339.]

In the year 1618 Mr. Robinson published a work entitled "The People's Plea for the exercise of prophecy, against Mr. John Yates, his monopoly." Mr. Pynchard says:—

"The object of this little work was to defend the practice of the separatists, in allowing the brethren of the church to express their views in public, after

the preacher had finished his discourse." This practice was retained many years by the Leyden and Plymouth Churches, and probably laid the foundation for the religious conference meetings, now so common among congregationalists. [page 343.]

And hereby hangs a tale. Not a little clerical management has been in requisition, for the last two centuries, the descendants of the Puritans, first to crowd the sabbath day prophesying of the brethren (in public, and in the day time,) into a more retired evening conference, and finally to displace, to a great extent the conference itself, by a clerical lecture.

And this remark naturally introduces an inquiry concerning

THE DECLINE AND CORRUPTION OF THE PURITAN CHURCHES.

That there has been a great and lamentable declension, no one denies.—Nothing is more common than to hear from 'presbyterian and congregational ministers' and writers, a general and sweeping admission of the fact; in vague terms. Even Cotton Mather, by no means a thorough Puritan himself, predicted that the time would come when the preservation of evangelic religion in New England would require the "gathering of churches out of churches." It is commonly understood that the "great awakening" in the times of Edwards, Whitefield, Brainard, and Tennant, found a majority, not only of the churches and brotherhood, but also of the ministry, in an unconverted state. The doctrine of regeneration had indeed, come to be discarded, even in theory, by a large portion of the most learned in the ministry. And this state of things is said to have resulted in the Unitarian defection from the Puritan theology,† and the consequent "gathering of churches out of churches" in fulfillment of Mather's prediction, as Lyman Beecher (who was active in that enterprise of "come out ism") believed. It costs nothing to look back half a century and record on the page of our ecclesiastical history, the general corruption and worldliness of the churches, and the radical defection of the ministry from sound doctrine. Well would it be for us, if we could be equally impartial and courageous in scrutinizing the religious features of our own times.

But what were the causes and symptoms, of this marked decline? One of the first seems to have been a weariness

† Lay ordination, lay preaching, lay exhortation, &c., though partly revived, during the "great awakening" had been put down by the clergy as disorderly, and nothing of the kind had disturbed the Boston churches for half a century previous to the Unitarian Schism.

impatience under the reproach and persecution which had been so long suffered. Hence the modifications already made. Even the good Mr. Robinson was to have felt the influence of this change. The society must be "remodelled in such a manner as to render it less obnoxious to his adversaries." And this involved an incipient recognition of a clerical caste. They became, says Buck, more attentive, in keeping on foot a regular ministry, in their communities."—They exhibited more "moderation in their sentiments." They did not pour forth "harsh and uncharitable invectives" (as their predecessors had done) against the churches that were governed by rules wholly different from theirs, nor pronounce them, on that account, unworthy the Christian name." "In 1691 they entered into an association with the Presbyterians residing in and about London."—Buck's Theological Dictionary, article, "Independents." From that time, indeed, the usages of presbyterians, and particularly in respect to clerical ordination, gained ground, among them. The name of Independent has been exchanged for Congregationalist, and the change of name was significant of a change in policy, and a compromise of principle.—The congregational clergy of New England, at an early day, were careful to mediate the name of Independents. It may be said that these particulars cannot be set down as the causes of spiritual declension in the puritan churches.—We may call them the causes, or effects, the concomitants, of that declension, as we choose. That the decline has, at every step, kept pace with these manifestations, cannot be denied, and that the clerical power and prerogative have been at the highest pinnacle, among congregationalists, when the state of religion has been lowest. Witness the period, and the state of things broken in upon, by the revivals under Whitefield, Tennant, Edwards, and the persecutions then denounced, of which we shall say more, due time. The truth is, the spirit of the world entered the puritan churches, and all these results followed. The persecuting spirit manifested against the Quakers and against Roger Williams in Massachusetts was indicative of the low state of religion among the reigning congregational clergy of that period, and equally so of their departure from principles of puritanism and independency. And yet the common statement

is not strictly true, that the same puritans who fled from persecution to this country, were the persecutors, on those occasions. Nearly thirty years had elapsed and the generation active in the planting of the Plymouth colony, had almost entirely passed off the stage. And besides: the settlement of Plymouth had been followed by the settlement of Boston and Salem, with fresh emigrants from England. Very few of these, it is believed, were Puritans, or came to this country on that account. The settlement of Boston, in particular, was chiefly by commercial adventurers, who had never separated from the church of England, and who brought their church clergy along with them. After arriving in this country, they adopted the church order of their Plymouth neighbors, as a matter of "discretionary" policy! The confiding colonists at Plymouth too readily swallowed the bait, and afterwards found occasion to lament their credulity. The seeds of a clerical caste, as we have said, the Plymouth puritans had indeed brought with them from England. By their union with their Boston and Salem neighbors, they were soon brought under the yoke. The policy of recognizing as a true church the corrupt church of England, (from whom on account of the corruptions they had seceded, and from whose persecutions they had fled,) was soon urged upon them by their new associates, and they found themselves outnumbered and overborne. Roger Williams was among the few who loudly protested against this. He retained his fidelity to the Puritan principle of a pure church membership, and accordingly declined recognizing as a true church of Christ, a church that knowingly held communion with ungodly men. In strict consistency with this doctrine he maintained the broad line of distinction between the church and the state, denied the right of civil government to interfere with mere matters of conscience, and opposed himself, resolutely, to the persecuting and hierarchical scheme of the men then in power. For this he was banished from the colony, and laid the foundation of the new colony of R. Island and Providence Plantations. A faithful minority, at Salem, stood by him, and remonstrated earnestly, against his banishment. A large portion of the Salem church, to which he had preached, joined in this remonstrance, and he had the sympathies of the Plymouth church, with whom he had formerly labored. These

were the remnants of genuine Puritanism, in a declining age. So that, strictly and properly speaking, neither puritanism nor independency were the persecutors on that occasion. The puritans were the persecuted party, themselves. They were persecuted for adhering to the well known principles of puritanism and independency. They were persecuted for refusing fraternity with a corrupt and persecuting church. They were persecuted for not recognizing the supremacy of a lordly clerical caste, wielding the power of the State. As in other persecutions, the ring-leader only was selected for summary vengeance, in order to overawe and manage the masses, and this result was secured.

People may say, if they please, that the Puritans of New England hung the Quakers, and banished Roger Williams. I prefer saying that the apostates from puritanism in New England persecuted the Quakers and the remaining Puritans, Roger Williams among the rest, and signally, because he was and would be, a radical Puritan.

We need not contend about names, but should avoid being misled, and of misleading others, by the misuse of them. If puritanism hung the Quakers and banished Roger Williams, it was a puritanism the reverse of that for which Penry, and Barrow, and Copping, and Thacker, and Greenwood suffered martyrdom. It was a puritanism that had gone back into a friendly recognition of the corrupt church from which primitive puritanism had seceded,—no longer "pouring forth bitter and uncharitable invectives" (so called) against it." It was a puritanism that had abjured "come-out-ism" and erected a clerical caste. Of the doings of such a puritanism, we shall have occasion to say more, as we proceed.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES CONCERNING ROGER WILLIAMS.

* It may be proper to add some particulars, and fortify our statements concerning Roger Williams and his persecutors. A writer who signs R. C. in the Boston Recorder of Dec. 31, 1846, imputes it as a fault of Roger Williams that he made a "public declaration of his non communion with the congregation at Boston, because they would not profess their sorrow and repentance for having communed with the church of England while living there." Quite a radical come-out-ism, it must be confessed, but not more so than the Plymouth Puritans themselves, and their predecessors, who emigrated, first to Holland, and then to America, to get rid of that communion. Another writer, in the Boston Recorder of Jan. 28 1847, defends Roger Williams from his assailant, yet does not deny the fact of his non communion, as above stated, which is undoubtedly authentic.—But he says: "The Salem people invited him to minister with them, and with great difficulty he obtained his dis-

mission from Plymouth. There is no reason at all to believe our Pilgrim Fathers would have banished him. They had no bloody intent of that sort. Robinson indicated a spirit of toleration and religious freedom, and his church was not connected in any of the persecutions against the Baptists and Quakers.

"H. C." says "he wrote a treatise and sent it to the magistrates, in which he disputed the validity of the King's Charter." He contended that King James had no right to give Indian lands to Planters, but that they ought to purchase them of the Indians, and John Cotton agreed that they ought not to take the Indian lands without paying for them. But the magistrates were afraid of the King, and would not allow such things to be said. This peculiarity in Williams is such a peculiarity as all the Pilgrim Fathers taught and practised; not an inch of land was taken by them without fair purchase from the Indians.

It is pretty manifest that if Winthrop had been governor, and there had been no rivalry between Boston and Salem, Williams would not have been banished. Governor Winthrop was his fast friend, as were also the Pilgrim Fathers in the Plymouth Colony, and they became mutual helpers of each other continually in after times.

"H. C." should not have called up the story about his refusing to ask a blessing with his family. It was merely an inference which his enemies drew and promulgated. He said unregenerate men ought not to be called on to pray; and complained that he was slandered in respect to his domestic devotions. Hooker told him that if he so felt, he must not complain of the slander; for if they must not be called upon to pray, they must not be prayed with, and he could not properly ask a blessing when his unregenerate family were at the table.—*Mag. 6, ch. 2, sec. 6.*

He was in great and general admiration as a preacher, and did not differ at all in any matter of faith, great or small, from the ministers of that day. Bentley says "the whole town of Salem was in an uproar" when the news of the proceedings of the magistrates was received, "for he was esteemed as an honest, disinterested man, and of popular talents in the pulpit."

It will be sufficiently evident, by this time, that Roger Williams was a rigid Puritan, and that he was persecuted by apostates from puritanism, who had come into fraternity with a corrupt church, and could not abide his puritan come-out-ism. Those who understand the philosophy of the case, will not marvel to find Roger Williams and the Plymouth Puritans in favor of free toleration by the State, but rigid in the test they maintained in the church. This was because they understood the true nature and just distinction between the two institutions—the one designed for the protection of all men's rights, the other for the mutual and voluntary co-operation of spiritual worshippers, intelligently recognizing each other as such.

Roger Williams also understood the Christian duty of admonishing wicked rulers and this was another cause of his banishment.

"H. C." mentions the story of the Salem people petitioning for some land in Marblehead; the court denied their petition; Williams and the Salem church wrote letters to the churches to admonish the magistrates, the magistrates being charged with heinous offences. They were not of a temper to bear such reproof;

and though they threatened Williams, they granted the petition for the lands the very next year.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP WITHOUT WATER BAPTISM.

A hue and cry, in certain quarters, has been raised against us, because we have incidentally expressed the opinion that persons who, in all other respects, exhibit evidence of Christian Character, but whose views of water baptism correspond with those of the Society of Friends, ought not, on that account, to be debarred the privileges of membership in Christian Churches, if they desire it.—If we are in an error in this matter we wish to be set right. But we greatly mistake if those who to whom we allude understand their own position, or that of the sects to which they belong. What if it should turn out, on examination, that the theory we hold has been endorsed by some of the principal evangelical denominations in the land especially by their leading men? We would not quote them as authority for our belief, but we think it not improper to show, (if such be the fact) that those who have been forward to fasten upon us the odium of novel and almost unheard of sentiments, in this respect, have committed a great mistake. Our creed on the subject, may be expressed in the following syllogism.

1. All those who give creditable evidence of Christian character, are entitled to the privileges of church membership.

2. Many persons do give credible evidence of Christian character, who hold the views of the Friends in respect to water baptism, and who decline being thus baptised.

3. Such persons, therefore, are entitled to Church membership.

If the first two propositions be correct, the third follows, of course. No one will dispute that.

But the first two are held and avowed by the principal ministers in the country, of all the Protestant sects, excepting High Churchmen and close communion Baptists.

The first proposition is held and acted upon, by the American Board, and by all the Congregational, Presbyterian, Lutheran, German, and Dutch Reformed Churches that sustain its present course. The broad doctrine is laid down in the Brooklyn Report of the Board, Sept. 1845, that Christian Churches are bound to receive all who give evidence of Chris-

tian Character. The speakers who sustained the Report, at the time, took the same ground. Dr. Hawes declared had held the doctrine for 25 years, the editors and writers who sustain the Board, adopt, explicitly, or by obvious implication, the same principle. They say it would be wrong to reject Christians on account of any errors in theory or practice, which do not destroy the evidence of their Christian character. They say the leaders of the Methodist Episcopal and Methodist Protestant Churches, whenever they would defend their religious fraternity and fellowship with slaveholders. They protest that they are in favor of slave-holding. But they consider many slaveholders to be Christians, and therefore they cannot adopt the rule of excluding persons on account of slave holding.

Thus they teach the doctrine that all who give creditable evidence of being Christians should be admitted to church membership. And this doctrine, constant abolitionists who oppose their course do not, very often, dispute. They commonly if not universally, concede that the principle is correct, but then they deny that incorrigible slaveholders, in a day like this, can give any satisfactory creditable evidence of being Christians. Here, the whole controversy turns. But both parties (High Churchmen and Baptists, perhaps, excepted) agree that the churches ought to receive all who give evidence of being Christians.

Thus, then, we ascertain the very general assent of the great body of professing evangelical Christians, (with the exceptions mentioned) to the first item of our creed. We admit that this assent is of quite recent date, that the occasion which drew it forth is quite a remarkable one, and that it squares somewhat awkwardly with the sectarian position and customs of those, (to a great extent) to whom it is given. The assent is altogether explicit and unmistakable, notwithstanding.

We come now to the second item.—Do not many persons give creditable evidence of Christian character, who do not hold to the ordinance of water baptism? Is not this admitted to be true, in respect to large numbers of the Society of Friends?

Orthodox Friends, hold, in substance, the general outline of the Christian principles, as held by other evangelical sects.

believe in the full of man, the duty of incarnation of Christ, the atonement by his death, regeneration, repentance, justification by faith, and the retributions of eternity, as fully as do their brethren of other sects. Large numbers of them seem to have been born again, and to much the same account of their religious experience that other Christians. Except in the matter of water baptism and the celebration of the supper, one would perceive any remarkable distinction between them and the members of other sects. Does this defect, making it to be an error—as we believe to be, destroy the evidence of their being Christians? If so, the evangelical controversy with Dr. Pusey and the Romishists will have to look for a new foundation and new advocates.

But such has not been the common understanding of Evangelical Christendom. Much as the clergy have disliked Quakers for their apparent rejection of a clerical caste,* it has not been common with them to deny to the sect, as wholly, the Christian name, much less to deny the Christian character to all the members of that body, not one of whom has been baptized with water or is willing to do so. Go through the land, make inquiry, and you will not find one minister or layman in twenty who will adventure assuming any such ground. In populous places in which all sects are found, we will almost uniformly find a number of the sect of Friends, who, by common consent, among the pious, of all denominations, are not only considered Christians, but pre-eminently godly persons.—Men of experimental piety, we might well to say, have ever read the writings of Fox and Barclay, without receiving the impression of their being Christians, never much they might dissent from some of their views. While in many a Quaker's library of choice religious books, you may find the writings of Henry, Watts, Baxter, Wesley, and Doddridge, in many a pious clergyman's library, if you find the writings of pious Friends, resorted to, not for information only, but for edification and comfort. And then a Samuel H. Cox (who is indebted to his Quaker education for some of his best traits) may write a treatise

to show that "Quakerism is not Christianity." And in this he may succeed, to a charm, as any man might who should attempt to prove that Presbyterianism or that Methodism is not Christianity. But Dr. Cox would hardly adventure to say that no Quakers are Christians. Take out of him what he has learned from the sect in which he was educated, and he would probably have never been made a D. D. It is not in the department of morality alone, as on the war and peace questions, that Quaker writers have done a service to the Christian world. To them chiefly, without a question, (certainly not to Luther, Calvin, Zuingli, or Wesley) is the Protestant church of the 19th century indebted for the idea that neither water baptism nor the eucharist can convey regenerating or sanctifying grace.—Whether Jonathan Edwards or Samuel Whelpley would have made any advances in this particular, beyond the Protestant Reformers, had it not been for George Fox, is more than any man living can tell. Certain it is, their denial of baptismal and eucharistical regeneration was a sudden and startling innovation in their own sects, much more so than would now be the reception of members into churches without water baptism. Be it so that the Quakers ran from one extreme to the other, as we think they did, it remains a fact that their testimony on this point, has done much towards changing the sentiments of the Protestant sects, where that testimony has been heard. Penetrate into any portion of continental Europe where the Quakers and their writings have not gone, and find, if you can, the first person in that community that doubts the regenerating efficacy of water baptism, at the hand of the priest.

But to return. Our American Tract Society are glad to circulate the writings of a Quaker, (Joseph John Gurney) on the subject of experimental religion, and even upon the due observance of the Sabbath. Albert Barnes considers William Penn to have been almost the only instance the world has furnished, of a truly Christian Statesman. Dr. Potts, in his controversy with Dr. Wainwright, is glad to recognize the Quaker Church and Ministry as Christian, drawing his specimens of primitive purity from some of their most obnoxious usages. When Joseph John Gurney comes to this Country Presbyterian and Congregational ministers and D. D's. invite and even press him into their pulpits, as a trust worthy

and venerated Christian teacher. Perhaps no Christian minister now living is more beloved or more extensively respected, and confided in, by Christians of all the evangelical sects, than he.—When the Evangelical Alliance that so strangely admitted slave holders, (because they hoped they were Christians) adopted a rule excluding Quakers, they took great pains to tell them and the world, that it was not on the ground of any distrust of their Christian character. The singularly absurd position in which these two acts, taken together, has placed the Alliance, only shows, the more clearly, the fact that the public sentiment of evangelical Christendom recognizes the Quakers as Christians.

Putting together, then, the two first propositions of our own creed in this matter, we find ourselves in the bosom of a religious community that is forward to profess its belief in both of them. On all hands, (with the exceptions mentioned) we hear it said that the Churches must receive all who give evidence of being Christians, however widely they may differ from them in other respects. On all hands, too, and with still fewer exceptions (for neither Baptists nor Episcopalians deny that Quakers may be Christians) do we hear it admitted that there are many striking exemplifications of true godliness, among those who reject the ordinances of water baptism, and the supper.

And yet, in the bosom of the same religious community, a man finds himself a speckled bird, to be pecked at, by every theological chattering, because he simply puts those two propositions together, and thinks of reducing them to practice!—And so terrible, to some men, is the odium to be thus encountered, that, with all their intellectual convictions in favor of the two propositions, taken separately, they dare not put them together, by an affirmation of the third!

"All Christians have a right to be in the church." So runs the confession.—"And many are Christians who decline water baptism." Yet those who will not be baptized, must not come into the churches.† Such work does prejudice and the fear of man make of our rational natures!

But does not the New Testament

*Some who hesitate to say that persons may not come into the church without water baptism, insist nevertheless, that they shall submit to baptism afterwards as a condition of remaining in the church!

We say "apparent" for we are not certain whether the superior inspiration attributed to their elders does not, in some sense, imply a substantial superiority of the common brotherhood, after

plainly teach water Baptism? Yes!—So we think, but some Christians think otherwise. May we impose our belief upon them as a condition of receiving them to our fellowship? Why have they not an equal right to impose the same upon us? And what becomes of the equal brotherhood of Christians, then?

"The New Testament plainly teaches water baptism, and the celebration of the supper." Very true. And it teaches with equal clearness, in our view, and with double emphasis, the much more important truths of predestination, election, reprobation, and the certain perseverance of all true Christians. So I judge. Shall I therefore exclude from church membership all who disagree with me in these matters? Or may they exclude me? Certainly not, unless it be believed that an error on these points destroys the evidence that a man is a Christian.

"But how can I consent to receive unbaptized persons into the Church?"

Ask Andrew Fuller? Ask Robert Hall? Ask every Baptist or pedo-baptist writer that has ever undertaken to persuade Baptists to relinquish their close communion. All Baptists conscientiously hold, as they have a right to hold, until they can be convinced to the contrary, that immersion is the only scriptural baptism. Some of the most sincere, godly, and well informed Christians believe this. Convince them, (or rather, concede to them) that unbaptized persons have no right in the Church, and you settle the question, for them, that they are not to receive any into their Churches who have not been immersed.

And, on the same principle, you must exclude all Christians from your church, who do not agree with you in respect to every thing. And this is the same thing as saying that there must be no such thing as a Christian church in the world. For no two persons of common sense and manly independence of character, ever yet did believe alike, in every thing.—You shall seldom find two Christians who do not disagree in something more important than baptism. The controversies on this subject are doubtless to be reckoned among the least important of any, except when the question is, whether Christians shall be divided asunder by it. Since the similar controversy about circumcision, in Paul's day, there has been no case parallel to it.

High time were it, to have done blinding the Baptists for not receiving those whom they consider unbaptized persons into the church, until we, ourselves, are ready to set them the example. In the view of every Baptist, a person who has only been sprinkled, either in infancy, or in adult years, is as completely an unbaptized person as is a Quaker. The Baptists may be mistaken in this view, but they honestly hold it, and all the learning in all the pedo-baptist sects has been found unable to convince them. Nay! The most awkward part of the business is, that some of the most learned pedo-baptist ministers have, at the least, hinted their suspicions, that, every possibly, the Baptists may be right. How then, will you persuade them to give up their close communion, till you will give up yours?

"But, since water baptism can do no harm, why might not those holding the Quaker views conform (as some individuals have done) out of courtesy to their brethren, and for the sake of enjoying church privileges without division?"

This question has been asked, by those who hold pedo-baptist views. The question might be turned upon them (as it often is) by Baptists with equal force.

"All parties, admit," say they "that immersion of adult believers, is scriptural baptism, whatever may be said of the sprinkling of infants. Now only gratify us by conforming to what you admit would be scriptural."

But, "no," says the pedo-baptist. "I think my way is scriptural too, and the Baptists are evidently making too much of their forms, and ought not to be humored in their superstition, which tends to disparage the evangelical doctrine of salvation solely by a spiritual faith in Christ."

And just so the Quaker thinks of you! When the Quakers began their sect, they stood up alone, in the face of all Christendom, in affirming that same doctrine of salvation by a spiritual faith in Christ alone, in contra-distinction from the almost universally prevalent doctrine that salvation must come through the water baptism administered by the priest! In this way, the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ though not denied (it is verbally admitted in the church of Rome) had become murred and obscured. The superstition prevails extensively still.—The Quaker thinks he detects it in you, and therefore he is repelled.

But admitting (as indeed we do) that the Quaker reasons incorrectly in this matter, that he ought to be baptized with water,

just as you, who exclude him, ought believe and to do many things that decline believing and doing what, I have you, as a Christian, to keep and Christian out of the church?

The truth of the matter is, one extreme begets another. The bigoted and artful perversion and abuse of the symbols of Christianity, by the body of professing Christians, coming along church history inform us, in second century, and running on, undiminished force to the present. This was the first, the great, the overshadowing evil of Christendom, and, even the present hour, it constitutes one of the grand obstacles to the revival of a true spiritual religion, not only among Romanists and High Churchmen, but with nearly all the dissenting sects. It teaches men to place sacrifice before mercy, ceremonies before humanity, just as same error did in the worst times of Jewish church, when Christ himself came up to reprove it, and "of the people there were none with him!" All efforts to terminate the divorce of religion from fundamental morality must prove powerless, till we strike at this corrupt root of the whole mischief. And the minion of a priestly caste can never be broken so long as the clergy hold the monopoly of the sacraments, and these made necessary to the fellowship and privileges of the church. The Episcopal historian of "spiritual despotism" has shown us how the "keys of St. Peter" were forged upon this very anvil, as early as the second century, by the Congregational Pastors. And this is very plain. If nobody but ministers may baptize, no unbaptized person can come into church, then, of course, the ministers hold the keys of the church door. So the mere symbols of religion are substituted for the reality, and converted into an engine of priestly power, so long as priestism bear rule, and "pure and undefiled religion" be trampled in the dust.

(Concluded in the next.)

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, April, 1847

J. Stanton, Cassville, 5.00	W. Weare, Clear
B. Church, Tallma-	Cycli,
idge, O. 1.00	G. Chase, Flewanna,
J. W. Parker, Cambridgeport, Mass. 1.00	N. Backus, Bath,
O. Thompson, Sau-	L. Jones, do.
quoit, 1.00	E. Keyes, do.
W. H. Olin, W. Bloom-	S. Hall, Salem,
field, 0.50	T. W. Stevens, Fre-
H. Daniels, Oakland	donia,
Liv. Co. 0.50	O. Brand, Spring-
L. Whitehead, do. 0.50	ville,
D. C. Wells, Kents	C. O. Shepard,
Hollow, 0.50	ArCADE,
R. W. Thompson, do. 0.50	H. Hodges, do.
D. Van Slyke, do. 0.50	Dr. G. Wells, Castile,
L. Pierce, do. 0.50	S. Hals, Union Cor-
R. W. Carver, Nun-	ners,
da, 0.50	A. Cronwell, Mercet,
C. Gilman, Rushford 0.50	M.
J. Oatlander, Ellicott-	A. Griswold, Kins-
ville, 0.50	man, O.
A. W. Chappell,	
Franklinville, 0.50	Commissions, col-
P. F. Noble, Napoli, 0.50	lecting &c.,
J. B. Nessell, Elling-	
ton, 0.50	

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V.—No. 5
Whole Number, 51.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. MAY, 1847.

WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 26.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 30 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:—
Twelve numbers, \$1.50 / Sixty papers, \$2.00
Twenty-eight papers for 100 / One hundred papers, \$3.00.

(Concluded from the last.)

No marvel that when they saw all Christendom under the yoke of these perverted and dead symbols, the advocates of a spiritual faith should have felt themselves driven to the alternation of rejecting them altogether. Certain expressions of Paul seemed to favor their views.—What he wrote concerning the "carnal ordinances" the "weak and boggardy elements" of the former dispensation, they naturally, in their situation, applied to all the outward ordinances of religion, especially as they found the same writer thanking God that he had baptized so few, declaring that Christ sent him, "not to baptize but to preach the gospel." Mistaken as the interpretations were, they honestly received them, and in their successors, the prejudices of education came in aid of the same views. Here we have the other extreme. The first error laid the foundation of the second, and the best way of removing the second is to abandon the first, which is not done by denying the name and the rights and privileges of Christians to all who are not baptized, and who do not see the subject in the same light with ourselves. If there were no other evidences that the majority of those who use the symbols of water baptism and the supper do still place an unwarrantable and anti-evangelical stress upon them, this same circumstance of their denying to unbaptized persons a place in the church, is, of itself, a sufficient evidence of the fact. For this is saying, either that true Christians must not come into Christ's household without conforming to these observances, (in other words, that Christians may shut Christians out

of the church) or else it is saying that without water baptism none can be Christians. Those who take this latter ground come so near embracing the sentiments of Dr. Pusey and the Roman Catholics that we cannot argue the question with them without repeating over again the substance of what evangelical protestants have written, in that controversy, which, by the bye, is known to have been very annoying to large numbers in most of the prevailing sects. Not a few methodists, baptists, presbyterians and congregationalist were sorely disturbed with the writings of Dr. Cheever and Dr. Potts, not long since, and the sudden and abrupt termination of the whole controversy with the Puseyites was evidently owing to this cause, along with the connected fact that the same train of argument was found to trench too closely upon the claims of the clerical caste, in other sects beside the Episcopal.

If any of our readers, do in reality still cling, in their own hearts, to the anti-evangelical sentiment, (so generally disclaimed in the dissenting sects, and yet so difficult to dislodge) that without water baptism there can be no spiritual salvation, we would affectionately beg of them to re-examine, prayerfully, the foundation of their own hopes. That thousands are, in reality, though unconsciously to themselves, resting mainly in these outward forms, there can be no rational doubt. The fact is revealed to the careful observer in a great variety of forms, among which there are few more significant than that of withholding fellowship from exemplary and pious Christians merely because they have not been baptized with water.

It may astonish some, and mitigate the astonishment of others, to be told, that from a variety of causes, it has occurred, many times, within our memory, that persons have been admitted to membership in the methodist episcopal church, without baptism. We once knew an instance in which a man eminent for his piety and Christian activity was appointed class leader, with the knowledge, on the part of the class, and of the ministers who had appointed him, that he had never been baptized, and that he had the views of the Friends on the subject,

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RUE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. VI.

If the reader shall have duly pondered the closing part of our last number, he will have been led to make two important reflections, viz:—

First, The policy of unrighteous compromise is signally subversive of its own object, in the end. Puritanism had become tired of being so unpopular. It must needs become more respectable in the eyes of the world, and less obnoxious to a worldly church. The first step was the violation of Christian unity and equality by a separation on account of different views of baptism,* the second was a propitiation of the clergy by a virtual surrender of the practice of lay ordination, though the empty theory was still retained; then came, in America, the false charity that first formed an affinity with the worldly churches in Boston, and then recognized as Christians, the corrupt and persecuting church of England with its membership of ungodly communicants,—in the eyes of worldly wisdom, what measures could have been more politic than these? Was not the reproach of ultraism wiped away, now? Surely it was, but mark the result. Real Puritanism is banished, by the new element thus introduced, and Puritanism has to bear the reproach of being the persecutor instead of the victim! The policy designed to make Puritanism respectable has made Puritanism a by word and a hissing even in Puritan New England, and the churches planted by the Puritans are no longer known by that name.†

*The reproach of admitting members who did not practice infant baptism must have been almost intolerable, at that period, in England, though it would seem that the separation in 1609 was chiefly on the part of the baptists themselves. The pedobaptist independents very soon learned the same lesson of close church membership, if not close communion, in the case of those whom they regarded as Christians.

†Whether the name of "Puritan" was laid aside from policy, or the name of "Independent" had been, or because the principle of a pure church membership was abandoned or because Puritan persecutions had become a reproach, we are unable to say. It is certainly remarkable that the name of Puritan went into disuse, soon after the distinctive principles of the Puritans were practically relinquished.

Second, Purity of church membership upon the basis of a rigidly defined Christian character, is the only adequate antidote to extended hierarchical organizations and governmental religious establishments. And hence, again, an aspiring clergy and the statesman who sympathize with them, are always arrayed against the puritan demand of a rigid church discipline and uncorruptness of church membership. It "disturbs the peace" of their extended ecclesiastical arrangements.—It opposes an insuperable barrier to the unbroken unity of a State church. As soon as the New England Congregationalists ceased to be puritan and gave up the doctrine of purity of church membership, by recognizing as Christian the State church from which their fathers had seceded, there remained no obstacle to their establishing, as they soon did, a State church of their own, analagous to the English, but varying, somewhat in its form. Only let the doctrine prevail again in this country, "that the tares and the wheat" may both grow together in the church the same as in "the world"—that Slave holders and their supporters are entitled to Christian fellowship, and what shall hinder an organized union, in some form, between the church and the State that thus mutually sympathize with and sustain each other? If men stealers and their supporters may belong to the church, who can be excluded? And if the whole community, irrespective of character may belong to the church, the grand objection to a State church (its impurity) is overruled, and what shall prevent "the tares" from having it all in their own way.—Seceders, for conscience sake, have always been hooted at, as bigots, unworthy of regard by the rulers of the State church, who hate those who are so uncharitable as to decline coming into church fellowship with such respectable gentlemen as themselves! And those who can hold religious fellowship with church members who withhold the bible from the slaves, could have no objection, on principle, against penal enactments to restrain and punish the disorganizing "come outers" that so much annoy them. The proposition to suppress the anti slavery discussion by penal enactments came indeed from that quarter, in the first place, and has not been subsequently disclaimed.

GRADUAL DECLINE OF PURITANISM.

Resuming the thread of our historical sketches, we must prepare to consider next, the congregationalism of the United

States, as it has been exhibited since its departure at an early period of our colonial history, from the distinctive marks of puritanism which first drove the pilgrim fathers from their native land. Those distinctive marks were purity of church membership, Christian unity on the basis of Christian character, church independency, the equality of a common brotherhood, and the absence of the clerical caste. In their tenets of *theology*, technically so called, they never dissented widely from the corrupt and persecuting church from whence, like the seceders of the third century, they came out "not for the difference of faith" but of *practice*.

In the matter of Christian unity, the puritan independents had indeed made shipwreck before they came to this country, in the baptist and pedo-baptist separation, of 1602, an event, in many ways unpropitious, not only as leading to the close affinity since witnessed between pedo-baptists independents and presbyterians, by means of which congregationalism, even in England, and much more so in this country, has at length become presbyterianized, but because the principles of equal Christian brotherhood were violated, by that needless division, and other violations of the same principle followed, almost as a matter of course.

The concessions made to public sentiment, in the matter of lay ordination, were likewise of transatlantic origin, as already noticed. Mr. Robinson has the credit, among the congregational clergy who succeeded him, of having relaxed from the rigor of his predecessors, and of having done much to "keep on foot a regular ministry." Clerical ordination, no doubt, was here introduced. "We acknowledge" says Robinson "that in the right and orderly state of things, no ministers are to be ordained but by ministers, the latter by the former, in the churches where they are, and over which the Holy Ghost hath set them." [Punchard's Hist. pg. 332.] This was directly in contradiction of his own book "The People's Plea for the exercise of Prophecy, against Mr. John Yates, his monopoly." [Ib. pg. 343.] And it leaks out that this "remodelling" was "in such a manner as to render the society less odious to his adversaries," viz: the monopolizing ministry of the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches! Here was another fatal misstep, never afterwards retraced.

How the puritan demand for purity of church membership was relinquished, in

this country, we have already seen.—When they left England, Mr. Robinson & his church were rigid separatists, regarding the church of England as essentially antichristian in its organization and government, they not only withdrew from it, but utterly rejected it, and denounced it, and would not so much as hear the ministers of that church." Punchard, pg. 350.—It must have been after this, as indeed Mr. Buck says it was, and while the Puritans were "in exile" in Holland,† that "the wiser part of them" (?) of whom Mr. Robinson is named the principal, set themselves to mitigate the severity of their founder's plan, and soften the rigor of his uncharitable decisions!" [Buck's Theo. Dict., Article Independents.] This was another part of the "remodelling" process "to render the society less odious to his adversaries!" This must have paved the way for the "charitableness"—such as it was—of the New England descendants of the pilgrims, afterwards, towards the persecuting mother church, and the introduction into their midst, of similar persecutions! "The early puritans of New England, and particularly of Connecticut, were non-conformists, and not separatists." [Cong. Ch. Order, pg. 14.] Let this be borne in mind, as a key to the subsequent history of Connecticut Congregationalism.

And let it be also noted, in the same connection, that "the puritans who came to New England, particularly those who came to Connecticut, were neither Presbyterians nor Independents, but Congregationalists." [Cong. Ch. Order, pg. 22.] In England, Independency and Congregationalism are still used as synonymous terms, and applied to the same churches and ministers interchangeably. The careful distinction in this country evidently means that the ministers making it, intended to introduce a mixed system, between Independency and Presbyterianism. Even in Massachusetts, where a pure congregationalism has been supposed to have prevailed, Mr. Mather the younger, in 1709, forty two years after the Cambridge Synod and Platform, published a book on "The Order of the Gospel, professed by the churches of Christ in New England," in which he affirms:

"It must not be overlooked that during the residence of the church in Leyden, some modifications were introduced into their practice, if not in their doctrines." [Punchard's pg. 350.] In the same connection Mr. Punchard intimates that Robinson & a few less severe against the church of England, at that time.

"The world is much mistaken in thinking that congregational churches are independent. That error has indeed been fastened upon them by their pretensions, but not Platform, chap. 2, sect. 5, discards the name." [Cong. Ch. Order, pg. 20. The section cited says—"The term independent, is appropriate not." 11b, pg. 53.]

"Much mistaken" indeed has the world been, in thinking the Massachusetts churches "independent." A pity their necessities should have thus slandered them, and still more so that the fault of these churches should have shared in the mistake, as they frequently have done. Another occasion of concession and compromise was the charge against the English Independents, of being democratic in their principles, a charge considered equivalent to that of disloyalty to a British throne. This charge it was difficult to meet, and explanations were given by Robinson and others, affirming that the aristocratic element was included in their plan. [See Pynchard's Hist., pg. 338 and 348.] And thus the dread of an angry monarch, or perhaps an educationist in favor of the constitution of government they were born under, prevented them from developing freely, the order of the Great Head of the church. Each of these particulars, it is easy to see that the persecutions they had endured, the dread of further difficulties, the desire of some respite or amelioration of their condition, induced the puritan Independents, even before they came to this country, to begin the process of concession, concession, and compromise which was but too fatally continued and added by their New England successors, who had less excuse, as having less available temptations to contend against.

proper understanding, and due estimation of New England congregationalism require that the connexion between the New England churches and European predecessors be constantly in mind, and the chain of cause and effect carefully traced. As in the church, the second and third centuries, the vital changes were so gradually introduced as to be scarcely perceived—the changes were so similar to those of early churches, that in tracing we seem to be writing the same story over again. The unrestricted of lay preaching, lay ordination, solemn church independence, in both were gradually and stealthily introduced, and almost precisely by the same means.

and general decline of vital godliness—the same love of the world, and idly favor—the same desire to be-

come popular and escape reproach—the same lofty aspirations on the part of the ministry—the same heedless and implicit reliance and submission of the people—the same noiseless but rapid growth of a clerical caste—the same method, precisely, of organizing the clerical body, in councils or synods, (now called associations) the same stated sitting of these "in conclaves apart by themselves"—the same assurance that the power is "only advisory"—the same empty recognition of the rights of the laity in the abstract, while constantly superseding their exercise—the same abject submission to "advisory" decisions, however onerous and unjust they may have been considered—the same ultimate union of the ecclesiastical with civil power—the same repudiation of primitive church discipline and purity of membership—the same corruption of public morals—the same indisposition to rebuke iniquity in the church, and in the State—the same persecution of faithful reformers—the same sympathy between the church and the world—the same exaltation of the rituals above justice, mercy and fidelity—the same pretences to piety in the absence of humanity—the same zeal for dead creeds in the absence of a living faith—the same reliance on mere frames and emotions—the same disregard and disregard of the Christian virtues and the relative duties—the same tenderness towards the worst of men who would continue within the pale of the church, the same unrelenting bitterness towards the best of men, who felt impelled to come out of it—all these, may be equally predicated of the churches of the third and fourth centuries, and, (in some periods of their history,) of the churches planted by the pilgrim fathers of N. England.

That the decline of vital godliness, since the earliest time of the puritan Independents has been marked and signal, is a point amply conceded by those in our own times, who stand at the head of the churches succeeding them. We hear the lamentation every day. It is reiterated, constantly, from the religious press. It is gravely descanted upon in Pastoral Addresses, and other documents of ecclesiastical bodies. It forms a portion of the common place topics of the weekly sermon. The statement is as familiar as home-bred words. The conservatives, as they think themselves, who dread innovation, who cry out against disorganization and disorder and schism would have us understand that

the model of the "Puritan Fathers" is the *beau idéal* of all they are intent on preserving. We take them at their word! Let them restore the usages of the "Puritan fathers" from which they have been so stealthily leading us—of the puritan fathers in their best days, when their piety was deepest—when their faith was most victorious—when they trampled the world under their feet—when they walked with God and had power—when the 'influence' they exercised upon society was not the influence of worldly respectability, but the influence of holy living—when they took joyfully the railing of their goods for Christ's sake, instead of seeking to elevate, and enrich themselves by striking hands with oppressors—when they embraced the scaffold and the stake, rather than compromise their principle, rather than hold fellowship with a worldly church—rather than give up the purity of church membership, the right of lay preaching and the practice of lay ordination—when they suffered all this from a persecuting clergy, who could not brook their repudiation and denunciation of a clerical caste! The churches founded by the Puritans have declined from the piety of their fathers! So the clergy of those churches are themselves forward to tell us. Let them tell us *when, how, wherein*, by what process, and under what seductive influences they have declined; and what a return to the footsteps of our Puritan fathers would include and involve.—Let them do *this*, and conform their own practices to those of the Puritan fathers in their best days. Then, we may hope to see a return of puritan piety—of puritan faith—of puritan power. The world has heard quite enough of eulogies of the puritans, and of lamentations over the decline of the puritan churches, from the lips of men who hate and deride all the distinctive principles and usages of the puritan age. The true way of doing honor to the puritans is by the cultivation of their virtues and the restoration of their purity.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN AMERICA.

Bearing in mind that "the early puritans of New England" (or at least the the settlers at Boston and Salem) "particularly those of Connecticut were non-conformists and not separatists"—

* I say emphatically, the distinctive principles—for we must constantly bear in mind that the orthodoxy of the Puritan creed did not distinguish the Puritan separatists from the church of England, from which they seceded.

that strict independency, was repudiated even in the celebrated Cambridge Platform of 1648, we shall be prepared to trace the particular and successive steps of declension from the original Puritan standard.

It is certain that the congregational Pastors were not banded together in any regularly organized body, distinct from the laity, at the period of their emigration to this country, nor until the lapse of several years afterwards. Of course they must have been members of the churches, and subject to the same discipline with their lay brethren. According to Neal's History of the Puritans, (page 212) the first association of congregational ministers in New England was formed in 1619 which was 28 years, (nearly a full generation,) after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth, who seem, nevertheless, to have brought with them the notion that none but a stated pastor could regularly administer the ordinances.—[Godrich's Church Hist. pg. 254.]—This heaven of the old superstition diffused in the churches and fermenting till the times of Edwards, produced that anti-evangelical reliance upon the ordinances with which he was obliged to contend.

CAMBRIDGE PLATFORM—SYNODS—ASSOCIATIONS.

In 1639, nine years before the adoption of the Cambridge platform, Richard Mather, a congregational minister, wrote a book advocating the lawfulness of "consecrations of churches into classes or synods." [Cong. Order, page 25.] This same writer is said to have been the penman of the Cambridge Platform of 1648. [Ib.] Chap. XVI of this Platform makes provision for occasional synods, to be composed of "elders and other messengers" for the "conviction of errors and heresies, and the establishment of truth and peace in the churches, which is the end of a synod." The power of the "magistrates" to call synods is distinctly recognized, though the right of the churches to do so, is likewise affirmed.—Here the basis of an hierarchy, and of a union of church and state, are distinctly perceived. In the same chapter it is said—

"It belongeth unto synods and councils to debate and determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to clear from the word holy directions for the holy worship of God, and good government of the church; to bear witness against mal-administration and corruption in doctrine or manners in any particular church, and to give directions for the reformation thereof; not to exercise church censures in a way of discipline, and any other act of church authority or jurisdiction, which that providential synod did forbear."

* Alluding to the council at Jerusalem, Acts xv, which was supposed to contain a precedent for such Synods.

The synod's directions and determinations, so far as consistent with the word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement therewith (which is the principal ground thereof and without which they bind not at all) but also, secondarily, for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in his word."

"It will be observed that the synods described in this chapter, are occasional meetings, and not permanent ecclesiastical bodies. Several such synods were had, on the invitation of the civil authorities, in the first and second generations of New England." [Cong. Ch. Order, pg. 14.]

From the same authority we learn that the stated meetings of the Pastors in associations, both local and general prevented further occasion for Synods, in Connecticut, and a similar arrangement has since been adopted elsewhere." [Ib.] It would seem that ministerial associations were first organized the same year that the Cambridge Platform was adopted, unless the historian, (Neal) has confounded together the two events. The Cambridge Platform did not, however, annul the church membership of ministers, nor provide any tribunal instead of the local churches for their discipline. Says a writer in the Boston Recorder, of Feb. 4, 1847:

On this point the Platform pronounced the earliest sentiments of our order, and for two hundred years it has stood without impeachment. It not only provides for the deposition of an offending Pastor, but for his exclusion. "The church that had power to receive him into their fellowship, has also the same power to cast him out, that they have concerning any other member." Plat. chap. 10, sec. 6. Hence the *Ratio Disciplina* on this subject, sec. 131. "According to congregational usage, no person becomes and remains a minister of a church, without also transferring his relationship, and becoming a member of the church."

How widely this principle has been departed from, out of Massachusetts, is nevertheless well known, and even there it has extensively become a mere empty abstraction, obsolete in practice.

According to the Cambridge Platform, "the ordinary power of government belongs only to the elders," but the power of privilege remaineth with the brotherhood, the "members must not speak in the church before they have leave from the elders, nor continue so doing, when they require silence, nor may they oppose nor contradict the judgment or sentence of the elders without sufficient and weighty cause, because such practices are manifestly contrary to order and government, and inlet to disturbance and tend to confusion." Chap. IX, sec. 8, 11. What an exact counterpart to the assumptions of the elders or bishops of the second and third centuries, that none might preach or exhort without their leave! Sad marks of clerical encroachment upon the usage of the early Puritan Independents, yet the "Cambridge Platform" is now accounted the purest charter of Congre-

gational liberty extant, and in the comparison with the Congregationalism of Connecticut, or the usage which obtained even in Massachusetts, it is certainly deserving of the distinction awarded to it those who quote its provisions, (instead of the New Testament) as the safeguard of Christian freedom. Beyond the Cambridge Platform no modern American Congregationalist thinks of urging claim.

The occasional Synods of the seventeenth century, like those of the second, very evidently and definitely indicated and constituted the period of an advance of the clerical power. The second of changing the occasional Synod of Pastors and delegates to the stated council association of the pastors only, was most simultaneously taken in America, a fact which marks a more rapid development of the modern congregational hierarchy than the ancient one. And yet, in both cases, the change was so apparent as to be scarcely perceived.

"The stated meetings of the Pastors in associations, both local and general prevented further occasion for Synods." So says the record already quoted. This fact settles the question whether or not congregational associations of ministers were designed to wield any ecclesiastical power. Even the Cambridge Platform allows to the Synods the power to "determine controversies" and to "give directions" to the churches. Their decisions are to be heard with "reverence and submission," not only for their agreement with the "word of God, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God." No marvel the name of Independent was abjured in the Cambridge Platform containing these sentiments. It is matter of regret that the name of congregational should have been retained, as Buck's Theological Dictionary testifies.—"Congregationalists are a denomination of Protestants who reject all government, except that of a single congregation, under the direction of a pastor, with their elders, assistants, and singers."

The course of the clergy of the second period is marked with the most striking inconsistencies, and such as indicate the earliest impatience to grasp hold of ecclesiastical power. In their Cambridge Platform they had reiterated the principles of the early Puritan Independents, nothing pertaining to church

left discretionary, but was provided for, in the written word. They had said—

"The parts of church government are all of them exactly described in the word of God, being parts or means of instituted worship according to the second commandment, and therefore to continue on and the people unto the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, as a kingdom that cannot be shaken, until he shall deliver it up unto God, even the Father. So that it is not left in the power of men, officers, churches, or any State in the world to add or diminish, or alter any thing, in the least measure therein." [Cambridge Platform, Chapter I. Sec. 3.]

Thus much the lingering remains of Puritanism required them to say, and a more direct contradiction of the "discretionary" plan of their successors, of the present day, could not be penned. It was this sentiment that obliged them to find or fancy a precedent for their authoritative Synods, in the action of the Jerusalem church recorded in Acts XV. [The wide distinction in the cases we have often pointed out, and need not repeat.] But almost, or quite simultaneously with these declarations against discretionary change, and this elaborate vindication of Synods, "orderly assembled and rightly proceeding according to the pattern, Acts XV., as the ordinance of Christ"—behold! measures are silently and quietly taken, without consulting the churches, to supersede this same "ordinance of Christ, the Synods, orderly assembled, &c. &c., according to the pattern"—by . . . by what? By the "stated meetings of the pastors, local and general"—"never formally adopted" (except in Connecticut, 67 years afterwards) by the churches"—a mere voluntary b. "meeting for council and mutual improvement," [Cong. Ch. Order, p325.] a body irresponsible to the churches, and with which, as it was then said, and is said still, it is impertinent for the churches to intermeddle! The action of such a body, we are told, "prevented further occasion for the Synods" composed of "elders and other messengers of the churches" delegated for the purpose! Such palpable inconsistencies betray the fact that the usages and the principles of the Puritans were in process of rapid subversion by their appointed guardians and defenders.

We anticipated some items of this history of American Congregationalism in our December number, for the purpose of placing them side by side, with the "introduction of Synods, or General Councils" among the nominally independent churches of the second century, a measure which Congregational as well as Episcopal writers of church history, have noted as a sign of declension, and of the

rise of ecclesiastical despotism in the ancient churches. To those items which we must not here repeat, the reader should again recur, in this place, and he will then have the facts fresh in his mind. He will see how from the smallest beginnings, the most formidable despotisms have had their rise. The pastors first assembled, forsooth, for mere "mutual improvement." The unsuspecting among them, perhaps the majority, had no other view. But there were men among them, and some of their names are preserved, who understood what they were about!—"We must have constant meetings of ministers," said they, "to settle the consociation of the Churches, or we are undone." "We," the "ministers," shall otherwise fall of establishing our power over the churches! This, in the light of their doings, we have a right to conclude, was the import of the language. And so they "assembled for mutual improvement" and "settled the consociation of the churches." By way of "mutual improvement" they proceeded to the practice of "examining and licensing candidates"—and (all for mutual improvement, no doubt) the churches were led into "the usage" of recognizing this power of determining who should in future, be ministers and pastors, "as belonging to the associations." For "mutual improvement" too, they took upon themselves all the work which the "Cambridge Platform" had recognized as belonging—not to mere voluntary and self constituted associations of ministers "for mutual improvement," but to "Synods orderly assembled" by appointment of the churches. For "mutual improvement," they proceeded, therefore, to "determine controversies" and give direction to the churches, "expecting their decisions to be received "with reverence and submission, not only" on the ground of the rectitude of their decisions, but also on the ground of their authority and "power" as being "an ordinance of God."

Let it not slide away from our recollection that the New England Churches, except in Connecticut, (and under the Saybrook Platform of 1708,) never authorized by any direct act of theirs, any of these assumptions of power on the part of the associations of ministers.—They could never, with the above exception stated, be persuaded to recognize any such ecclesiastical bodies at all. As they originally professed to be mere voluntary associations, they determined to

let them remain so. They have been viewed with jealousy and distrust from the beginning. And in order to allay this jealousy, the profession of being mere voluntary associations "for mutual improvement" has been kept up, to the present hour. And the churches are still told that it is none of their business how many voluntary associations "for mutual improvement" their pastors may form.—The "licensing of ministers," the usage of considering that power as "belonging to the associations" goes on, nevertheless! And so does the practice of "determining controversies" and "giving directions to the churches" by "Pastoral Letters," "Resolutions," &c. And while a few of the more intelligent and independent among the laity understand perfectly, the usurpations thus practiced, and are, and always have been, indignant at it, yet for the most part, they have kept silence, rather than disturb the general peace, because the mass of uninformed church members, male and female, take it for granted that "their decisions are to be received with reverence and submission, not only" on the ground of their agreement with scripture, but "also for the power whereby they are made, as an ordinance of God." The Cambridge Platform had thus spoken of the Synods, and "the stated meetings of the Pastors in Associations"—(so the authorized historians of New England Congregationalism inform us,) have stepped into the shoes of the Synods, and "prevented further occasion" for them. [See Cong. Church Order, published by direction of the General Association of Connecticut, p147. This is not only affirmed of the Connecticut Associations, under the Saybrook Platform, for it is added "a similar arrangement has since been adopted, elsewhere."] That the associations of Congregational ministers, even in Massachusetts, exercise essentially, the same functions, is a fact beyond dispute.

It will be no "vain repetition" to refer again, just here, to what was said in our December number, respecting the corrupting influence of this same process, in the churches of the second century.

"Another step in the path of declension was the introduction of Synods, or general councils, with authority to make laws for the government of the churches." The first appearance of these assemblies was about A. D. 170, or 173.—At first they were mere chosen representatives of the independent churches,

erected for the express purpose of deliberating in behalf and in the room of these churches. It was not long however before they assumed to act in their own name. [Punchard's Hist. p21.]

In our January number we adduced the corresponding testimonies of Miller, and Miller, and Lord King, and Neander, and Taylor, (the historian of "spiritual despotism,") and Murdock, and Tyler, to the same point. To these we might have added Mosheim, and almost all the writers on church history. Now we ask whether that which is so universally regarded as a mark of religious declension and the rise of spiritual despotism in the second century, should not be regarded in the same light, when appearing in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? The churches were nominally congregational, in both cases, without papacy, or diocesan episcopacy in any form. And one additional mark of declension and of despotism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in America, was that union of the ecclesiastical with the civil power, which, in the ancient churches, was not reached till the 4th century.

STATE OF RELIGION.

Of the state of the New England churches, in respect to vital piety, practical godliness and purity of church membership, during the progress of these events, it were easy to conceive. A period of the growth of clerical power is uniformly, in all ages and nations where it is manifested, a period of religious declension, love of the world, increasing moral corruption, laxity of church discipline, and the consequent easy admission and tolerance of worldly and ungodly men, in the church. What little of piety remains in such times, assumes a sickly aspect, and is too feeble to roll back the general tide of ungodliness.— That such was the fact with the congregational churches of New England during the progress of these clerical encroachments, is a fact too well known to be disputed or questioned.

Congregationalism had become the established religion of the New England Colonies, except Rhode Island, and other sects, if tolerated at all, hold their privileges as a matter of sufferance. The honors and offices of the State could be held by those only, if the congregational sect. Even the right of suffrage was restricted to church members. The corruptions of the State Church of England,

from which the early Puritans, on that very account, had seceded, were then introduced into the bosom of the churches they had planted. Church membership was a badge of respectability and a condition of office. Add to this the fact that the baptized children of church members, were recognized by the Cambridge Platform as church members themselves, in consequence, and entitled to all the privileges of the church, (a sentiment naturally in harmony with a state church, with extended ecclesiastical arrangements and priestly power,) and it is easy to see that the Puritan principle of purity of church membership, was not very likely to be preserved. And it was not. A decent exterior deportment, tacit assent to the creed and the Platform, with the due observance and use of the ordinances, supplied a ready passport into the churches, and to all the secular privileges which church membership secured. The gentle hint of the Cambridge Platform that "the members must not speak in the church before they had leave from the Elders" had not been without its legitimate effect. Mr. Robinson's "Plan of the people for the exercise of prophecy against Mr. John Yates, his monopoly" had probably gone out of print, and the lay exhortation, the meeting for the free social conference and prayer, were almost or quite obsolete.

"Like people, like Priest." the deterioration of the membership and of the ministry went hand in hand. Church membership on the mere ground of infant baptism, and ministerial competency on the ground of regular education for the office, and due official induction into it, by the organized clerical body exercising that prerogative, were only corresponding parts of the same system. As the churches were filled with members, made such by their baptism in infancy, and claiming their church privileges for the sake of the secular advantages connected with them; so the ministry, to a great extent, was soon in the hands of men who, commencing their religious life in the same manner and on the same basis of birth-right, church membership, proceeded to select the work of the min-

— See Goodrich's Ch. Hist. p259.

+ "The children of such" (i. e. visible believers,) who are also holy, are enumerated among the suitable "matter of a visible church." Chap. I. Sec. II. The Saybrook Platform, 60 years after the Cambridge, incorporated the same element—"the whole multitude of visible believers and their infant seed" into "Christ's spiritual kingdom in this world." Heads of Agreement, Art. I.

istry, if they preferred it, as they would either of the learned professions, by a due balance of their comparative advantages. It is no slander to say this. It is certain as any thing transmitted by traditionary anecdote for one hundred, or one hundred and fifty years, that such things were easily said, by the parties concerned, by college students, by young ministers, and by old ministers, educating their sons for the ministry, and without any concealment or apparent misgivings that all this were not exactly as it should be. Men are still living, or have but very lately passed off the stage, who have attested to this state of things as having been common within their recollection. And there is abundant evidence that it traces back almost or quite to the date of the Cambridge Platform. The notions of baptismal regeneration (implied in hereditary church membership,) and of the converting power of the eucharist, so prevalent in Pres. Edward's time, (1740) could not have sprung up in a day, and must have been gradually introduced along with the growing claims of priestly power, from which they are never divorced. It may be true (we fear it is) that the state of the churches and ministry for the last half century, has been little better, in general, than it was during the period we are examining.

But the theological opinions of the age do not now, as they then did, admit the idea of church membership and of ministerial competency without the profession of some regeneration beside that of water baptism, and the participation of the sacrament.

In this feature, again, we have a striking resemblance between the declining congregational churches of the seventeenth century, and those of the second. The spirituality of evangelical religion in both cases, had given place to a superstitious idolatry of the rituals.

The same period was marked, likewise by a corresponding dereliction of moral principle, and of disregard to the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and fidelity. The period of the almost utter disappearance of the distinctive features of Puritanism, was the period of the introduction of slavery into the churches and especially the ministry of New England. An aspiring clerical caste could have no very nice scruples in regard to the invasion of human rights.

And this brings us down to period of the far famed "HALF WAY COVE."

ANT," the greatest theological and ecclesiastical curiosity, perhaps, of our age, or any other land; an anomaly of American birth, which nothing could have generated but such declensions as have been described, operating upon the mouldering and putrid remains of a dead pagan faith. A description of this singular phenomenon we must reserve for next number.

Christian Investigator.

WONEOYE, MAY, 1847.

LETTERS FROM BAPTISTS.

The following is an extract of a letter from a Baptist Minister in New England:

Enclose one dollar for the Christian Investigator, which I read with deep interest; but that I agree with you in all your statements and conclusions. — It is very much, as put forth in your little sheet, has a strong claim on the attention of Christian and Christian ministers. There are some jealous "attributed" to Baptist churches, which certainly agree with our principles, nor our practice, in religion. The churches are independent in regard to churches not only, but dismiss and exclude members, without councils of Ministers or Laymen.

Another respected friend writes as follows:

Hamilton, March 11th, 1847.

Good Sir, — In your February number of the "Christian Investigator," in your article upon the subject of Spiritualism, you seem to class the Baptists with the Catholics, Methodists, Congregationalists, &c., entering that despotism, making an unconstitutional union between clergy and laity, and building up ecclesiastical hierarchy. Is such a just representation of the "Baptists?" If so, I do not understand you.

Following are fundamental principles in Baptism:

The entire independence of the churches, (1) each church in its organization, discipline and government, is entirely independent of any and every other church.

That there is no ecclesiastical body above or over each individual church.

That the ministry, (2) Pastors, Bishops, are servants of the church, and have no power, or privilege, to transact any ecclesiastical business, — cannot license, appoint, or depose each other. —

done by the individual church of which they are members, and can be done by no other church or

They are subject to the same rules and discipline as all other members of the church.

Councils are only advisory, whether in the case of discipline, or on whatever occasion they be held, they have no ecclesiastical authority and can perform no ecclesiastical act.

Individual church calling the council, can reject its advice as it may choose. Associations

are the same in nature, and have no more authority as councils.

Each church therefore is a pure, independent body. Such we believe the primitive Christians

been.

A BAPTIST.

ANSWER.

We are obliged to those brethren for the kindness and frankness with which they have expressed themselves. We do not mean to mis-state any thing, and are always glad to receive and make corrections. We have often given credit to the Baptists for either being, or at least, for having been, more thoroughly congregational than the *Sect* known by that name. This is accounted for by the intimacy of Congregationalists with Presbyterians, since the separation in 1608, between the Baptist and Pseudo-Baptist independents, in England. For some years past, the Baptists in this country, have seemed to be in a transition state, and we have hardly known how to speak of them. Sometimes, in this paper, after having mentioned other sects, we have inquired — "shall we add Baptists?"

In our February number, we alluded to the solicitude of ministers of the non-episcopal sect, to maintain their "ministerial parity," while they seemed little troubled about the "purity of the common brotherhood with the ministry." — Here we did mention Baptist, along with Presbyterian and Congregational ministers, because we had in mind instances in which prominent Baptist ministers had earnestly contended for the principle of equality between ministers, without hinting, or seeming to reflect that it was the inequality between *Christians*, and not the inequality between *ministers*, merely, that constituted the pith of the disorder to be remedied. In the same article we mentioned "the proscription and intolerant bearing of the leading Baptist, Presbyterian and Congregational clergy in America towards those of their own communion who are engaged in works of philanthropy and reformation." This, we supposed was the fact, as understood by not a few Baptist ministers, as well as laymen, who have been so unfortunate as to give offense to "leading" ministers. A pretty respectable number of unimpeachable Baptist witnesses, ministers and laymen, would be ready, we think, to testify to this point. We might venture to cite Elder C. P. Grosvenor, of Utica, and Elder W. Tillinghast, of Antwerp, to begin with.

To "dismiss and exclude ministers without councils of ministers or laymen," is indeed an honorable badge of distinction from Presbyterians, and modern American Congregationalists. We are

happy to hear that it is retained by the Baptists in New England. Whether this is common in our own State, the letter from Hamilton leaves us in doubt.

The statement of "fundamental principles of Baptist organization," is doubtless correct. With exception of some of the specifications under the 3d head, the Congregationalists would claim that these principles are their own. If mere *declarations of principles* would secure the churches from a spiritual despotism, our modern Congregationalists would have done very well. And so would the Congregational churches of the second and third centuries. Were not, are not, their churches, declared to be independent? — Were not, and are not, their councils, associations and synods, "only advisory?" And have we not witnessed the crushing weight of that kind of power? If, on such grounds, the Baptists must be absolved from any share in a "spiritual despotism" — why not the Congregationalists of New England, and of the third century?

If "there is no ecclesiastical body above or out of the individual churches," what mean the "associations" — the county or provincial association and the State association? Do or do not the churches send delegates to these bodies? Do or do not the pastors go as pastors? Do churches send their pastors and delegates to do nothing for the churches? Are there no deliberations and measures in these bodies affecting the churches? Can there be such bodies without ecclesiastical power? Without being ecclesiastical bodies?

Are we to understand by the statement, that all the licensing, appointing, ordaining, deposing, &c., of Baptist ministers is done by the local churches to which they belong? Is this so? Is it the common usage of Baptist churches to ordain their own ministers? Do Baptists commonly understand that this is the proper business of the common brotherhood? We shall be glad to find that this is so. But if it be, we marvel greatly that we should have lived so long in the midst of Baptist communities, and witnessed Baptist ordinations without finding it out. Still more do we marvel that a single instance (not among Baptists) of lay ordination, should have astonished and alarmed all Western New York, and Baptists among the rest. Our correspondent probably did not mean to claim for the laity the prerogative of ordaining their ministers. But without this the people are dependent on the ministers

already in office, for the ordination of their successors in office.

Thirty years ago we could live in a baptist community without knowing that they had any associations. Whether they had any at that time, we cannot tell. But ask a baptist now, what position he or his church holds, on this or the other question, and he must first ascertain the doings of the association. It was but the other day that certain action in a baptist church on the subject of slavery could not be had because such action would bring the church in collision with the association. We have been present at two important Baptist Associations, and noticed something of the claims set up by them. But we cannot further enlarge. We do most heartily wish that the Baptist churches would take the lead in reducing to practice their principles of "independent democracy," to which Mr. Jefferson was so much indebted, but we fear the current is setting in the other direction, and that, as in all former instances, those in the current will fail to be aware that there is any.

SIGNIFICANT FACTS.

William W. Patton, congregational minister at Hartford, Conn., in the course of his Review, (in the Charter Oak) of the late Report of the Board alludes to the course of the American Tract and Home Missionary Societies, as follows:

"Look now at the Tract Society. It has been pretty well chastised of late for its immorality in altering the facts of history and the sentiments of authors, and it may seem cruel to inflict now stripes on a fresh account—but the truth must out. This Society professes to act through the press in promoting holiness and overthrowing sin. In the prosecution of this laudable design, it has published tracts against adultery, theft, Sabbath-breaking, lotteries, gambling, intemperance, &c.—Did they ever issue from their 'House,' a tract against the great crime of *man-stealing*, or *slaveholding*? Never.—Why not? It surely is a sin, a common sin, a great sin, forbidden by every principle of the Bible, and moreover prevalent in our land. Yet the Committee never would agree to issue a tract on that subject, no, not even one of the mildest kind—they would not administer a homeopathic dose! One gentleman offered to place in their hands fifty dollars to be proposed according to custom, as a premium for the best tract on that subject, but they altogether scouted the idea.

The connection of the Home Missionary Society with slave holding, arises from their aiding churches in the slave States, into which slaveholders, remaining such, are received. This is the money of abolitionists is used to build up pro-slavery churches, just such as have cursed the South, and sanctified the system and practice, till it has increased four-fold.

ASTONISHING INCONSISTENCY.

The following extract from the proceedings of the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is taken from the United States Gazette, of April 3d.

The Rev. Mr. Gungly proposed that each candidate should be asked whether he is a slave holder and whether he was engaged in any of the modern movements for promoting the abolition of slavery; and none dissenting, the question was severally asked as follows:

Bishop Hedding.—"Are you a slaveholder?"

To which all answered, "No."

Bishop Hedding.—"Glory to the Conference! not one of their souls is stained with the blood of Africa!"

The Bishop then informed the candidate that he was about to put a question, the meaning of which, before put, he was in duty bound to explain as he understood it. By an "Abolitionist," in the sense he was about interrogatively to use it, he meant not one who was opposed to the holding of men in bondage for mere gain, for the purpose of growing rich by slave labor; to grind the faces of the poor, that the master might be exalted; but he meant those who uncharitably denounced men who happened to have been born in a slaveholding State; born in the possession or heritage of slaves; who treated them well, used them well, and protected them well; who nurtured the sick and the poor; who did not hold them for mere gain, but for goods; who did the best they could under the circumstances. After this explanation, the Bishop said in asking them if they were Abolitionists, he meant to ask if they were prepared "to curse all who were slave holders, under any and all circumstances."

Bishop Hedding.—"Are you an Abolitionist?"

To which all answered, "No."

Bishop Hedding.—"Thank God! there is none of them willing to cut off the heads of our Southern brethren because they happen to hold slaves!"

Now what can ministers mean, by such contradictions? The Bishop glorifies the Conference—not because none of its members hold slaves for gain, and ill treat them! No! But because they are not slave holders! In case they were, the implication is, that their "Souls would be stained by the blood of Africa!"—Then he turns a short corner and thanks God that none of them are prepared to condemn this same slave holding!

When the secular press, not distinctively anti-slavery, notices these discrepancies, it is evident that existing religious bodies are losing, rapidly, their hold on the public mind.

THEOCRACY AND DEMOCRACY.—It is often supposed that there is such a contrast between a theocracy and a democracy that we cannot use in the latter, the divine maxims that were given to guide men, under the former. On this ground it has been recently denied, by some 'Liberty men' who wish, on special or for-

gencies, to vote for those who are not "just, ruling in the fear of God" that no maxim must have been intended exclusively for the Jews!

A theocracy is the government of God over a nation. That government is theocracy that is based on the divine authority. Now the very fact that God lays his commands on a people in respect to civil government, placing the responsibility of obedience or of disobedience upon them, is a fact that lies at the very foundation of democratic government, and not only authorises but requires the people to see to it, that civil government administered in accordance with the divine will.

The sovereignty of the people, under God, is one of the foundation principles of a democracy. And accordingly, in the Constitution of the Jewish Theocracy that contained the first authoritative provision the exercise of the popular suffrage, of which history gives us any record: "Judges and officers shalt thou make in all thy gates, and they shall rule the people with just judgement."

When the Hebrews abandoned the democracy and chose to be ruled by a monarch, they thereby abjured their theocracy, and refused the government of their God! So God said expressly to the prophet Samuel, I Sam. VIII. 7.

The democracy that is not at all so theocracy is an atheistic sham—an abortion. The pretended theocracy that is not so democracy must bring with it very strange and peculiar credentials, not to be branded as an imposture.

HEAR JAMES G. BIRNEY.—In a letter to Gerrit Smith, in the Signal of Liberty for June 27, Mr. Birney says:

"How to reconcile an intelligent love of freedom; and a desire to remain in a pro-slavery church, and under the preaching of a pro-slavery minister. I know not. The duty of leaving them appears so plain, I have, long since, withdrawn from them."

"Whilst at Detroit, for several weeks last winter, my wife and I, on this account, were confined to one church, the minister of which was a colored man, a very eloquent, impartial, and independent preacher."

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, April, 1854.

S. French, W. Bloomfield,	0.50	A. Beecher, Livonia,	
J. Hawley, N. Milford Pa.	1.00	J. J. Johnson, Pottsville,	
W. Drayn, Danielsonville, Conn.	0.90	M. Wooster, Tuller,	
E. Wilson, Farmington (Ill.)	0.50	M. Trowbridge, do	
C. S. Cado, do	0.50	D. Miller, Fulton,	
N. Van Alstine, Minneden,	1.00	E. A. Bristol, do	
C. Oils, Leyden,	1.00	W. S. Lany Lee,	
P. Baldwin, Sennett	1.00	J. Munson, Paris,	

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

Vol. V—No. 6.
Number, 62.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JUNE, 1847.

WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR. FIVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

Subscriptions for one year, or the
here, 50 cents, always in advance, and
person who will procure four subscri-
forward the money without expense to
her, shall have one copy for his ser-
Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall
copies for his services;—Or, if procu-
subscribers, shall have four copies for his

OR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

any particular number will be sold, sepa-
the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
per dozen, \$0 50 | Sixty papers, \$2 00
papers for 100 | One hundred papers,

SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PRO-
AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS
WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED,
WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE
ABANDONED.

NO. VII.

struggles between religious liberty
clerical caste, have ever been,
ago, with few exceptions; the
of vital piety as defined by the
theology, with empty rituals
and forms.

THE NEW ENGLAND COVENANT.

copy of the New England suc-
of the Puritans furnishes as strik-
Illustration of this remark as could
be selected from any portion of the
that preceded it; either before, du-
or after, the Lutheran Reformation.
the progress of the declension in
England, there was evolved one
form of the contest, or rather, of
diplomatic compromise, between the
ing elements never before witnessed,
we know of, during the whole course
controversy, from Novatian to the
nt time. Perhaps the characteris-
genuity and shrewdness of the New
and character, may help us to ac-
for this singular and most remark-
device of their clergy. The priest-
of other ages had indeed been ac-
med to substitute the term *church*
world in our Lord's parable of the
and the wheat, and thus they had
their warrant for introducing un-
and unregenerated men into the
ch, and retaining them there. From
ise of Church and State Unions un-

der Constantine, in the fourth century,
this profane commingling of "reeds with
whort" of light with darkness, and of
Christ with Balaam had been enforced by
the secular arm. With all this, the
New England clergy of the seventeenth
century had been familiar, all this they
had inherited, not from their puritan pro-
genitors whose sepulchres they had gar-
nished, and who had won crowns of mar-
tyrdom in opposing the claim, but from
the persecutors of the puritans by whom
the anti christian alliance had been en-
forced.

The flame of evangelical piety, howev-
er, seems not to have been quite extinct.
There was left, at least, the monumental
testimony of the ancient faith, in the in-
herited written creed. Perhaps also, the
presence of the Baptists, at this period,
in the colonies, with the controversies be-
tween them and the Congregationalists,
may have had some influence in checking
the anti evangelical sentiment that bap-
tism in infancy confers regenerating
grace, and that baptized children are
rightfully entitled to a standing in the
church. Be this as it may, the tide of
worldliness and impurity had now risen to
such a height, that it had become evident
enough to all men, that there was a glaring
discrepancy between the theory and
the fact, the profession and the practice.
Into the ecclesiastical polity, moreover,
there had been striking incongruities in-
troduced. Upon the old puritan principle
of admitting "only such as gave visible
evidence of piety" there had been
strangely ingrafted, by the Cambridge
Platform, the rule of regarding the bap-
tized children of believers as church
members. [Chap. iii. Sec. 2.] The fruits
of this anomaly were soon visible.—
Here were whole communities, entire
parishes, entitled by the ecclesiastical
canons, to church membership, in virtue
of their infant baptism, the greater por-
tion of whom could not, with their known
deportment and habits, make a creditable
figure in churches that had retained any
traditionary knowledge of Puritanism.
To any thing like experimental religion,
in the Puritan sense, they made no pre-
tensions at all. Nor were the duties
or privileges of church membership to

their taste, any farther than they were
the badge of respectability, and the condi-
tion of social and civil immunities.

The problem, for the dominant clergy,
in this condition of things, evidently was,
how to avoid a disruption between the
church and the state, how to retain their
hold upon the worldliness without giving
offence to the piety, and "preserve the
peace" of their Zion. If they adhered to
the puritan principle of purity of church
membership, their churches would be re-
duced to a mere handful, and the union of
church and state rent in twain. If they
attempted to carry out the opposite prin-
ciple, how should they satisfy the scru-
pulous, and retain even the shadow of ad-
hesion to the puritan faith?

To bring all the world into the Church
was the old but now half exploded and
worn out expedient of the clerical caste.
It was too late in the day to attempt en-
forcing a repetition of that arrangement.
The next best expedient, within the
reach of the leading clergy of New
England, was to contrive a method by
which men could stand with one foot in
the church and the other out of it, re-
taining their hold on the world and yet
enjoying, to some extent, the privileges of
the church. As the clergy of the early
centuries had invented a mid-way position
between the abodes of the righteous and
the wicked, in the future state of exist-
ence, for those whom they considered too
religious to be lost, but not religious
enough to be saved, so their successors of
the seventeenth, improving, perhaps, up-
on that hint, determined upon the erec-
tion of a similar retreat, for the same
class of community in the present life.—
The purgatory of Rome was scarcely
more convenient than the "half way cov-
enant" of New England. If the former
brought revenues to the clergy for the
benefit of the delinquent dead, the latter
contributed to the emolument and ascend-
ancy of the clergy, for the accommoda-
tion of the worldly minded, among the
living. New Englanders, at least, would
pay more for the assurance that they, and
themselves, might safely repose in a
"half way" religion, than they would to
be told that their benefactions had deliv-

ored their dead fathers from the penalty of the same deficiency.

Last some of our readers, the younger portion of them, out of New England, should suspect us of exaggeration or hyperbole we will introduce here an extract from C. A. Goodrich's church History, a modern New England book, in current use and good repute.

"About the year 1650, an unhappy controversy arose in the church at Hartford, Connecticut, respecting church membership. Hitherto, great watchfulness had been exercised to admit only such as gave visible evidence of piety. The clergies of pastors also had been confined exclusively to the church, and all the honors and offices of the state, had been distributed to professors of religion, who only had the right of suffrage, in meetings of a political character.

"During the lives of the first generation, little trouble had arisen on these points, as most of the first emigrants were professors of religion. But the fathers were nearly all now removed; a new generation had succeeded, many of whom, on account of their not belonging to the church, were excluded from their proper influence in the community. Most of them had been baptized, and by virtue of this it was claimed that they might own their covenant and have their children baptized, and thus perpetuate the church.

"The controversy which thus arose in Hartford, soon extended to other churches, until, at length, the whole of New England became more or less agitated on the subject. In 1657, the disputed subject was referred to a council, composed of the principal ministers of New England, at Boston. In consequence of the decision of this council, the half way covenant, as it has since been termed, was introduced, and adopted by many churches.

"The decision of this council declared, that it was the duty of those come to years of discretion, baptized in infancy, to own the covenant, that is, the duty of the church to call them to this, that if they refused, or were scandalous, in any other way, they may be censured by the church. If they understand the grounds of religion, and are not scandalous, and sole only own the covenant, thereby giving up themselves and their children to the Lord, baptism may not be denied to their children. In consequence of this decision, many owned their covenant, and presented their children for baptism, but did not unite with the church in the celebration of the supper. Hence, it was termed the half way covenant.

"The decision of the above council was far from producing peace in the churches. Those of Massachusetts generally adopted the practice recommended; but those of Connecticut, for many years, refused, and, in some of the churches, the practice was never introduced. Towards the conclusion of the eighteenth century, the practice was generally abandoned, throughout New England."

Goodrich's Ch. Hist. pg. 359.

The discriminating reader of this brief record will find in it abundant matter for reflection, and instructive comment. Here was a grave council composed of the "principal ministers of New England." The voice of the churches, even by lay delegation, unequal as that would have been (balancing one minister against an hundred laymen) was not heard. Still less had the remaining piety of the churches a voice, there. As in the parallel corruptions of the second and third centuries, the downward current of apostasy was accelerated and guided in conclaves of the clergy, apart, from the brotherhood, by themselves. This is the rank soil of every pernicious delusion and error from age to age. Beginning, as a clerical caste always does, in a vio-

lation of the equal brotherhood of believers, for the elevation of the few, what better or other fruit could be expected from such a root, than the corruption of the masses for the benefit of the privileged caste. The clerical monopoly were a thriftless abortion, unless wealth, respectability, influence, and numbers, could be embodied in the churches over which the clergy were to preside, whose emoluments they were to enjoy, and whose energies they were to wield. And consequently such a clergy, (or the "principal" the controlling men among them, who lord it over the rest, as they do over the laity) are always found on the side of wealth, worldly respectability, and numbers, in every struggle in which the purity and the freedom of the churches are concerned. So it was in Novatian's time, so it was in the times of the Paulicians, so it was in Luther's day, so it was with the congregational clergy of New England in the middle of the seventeenth century, and so it is, with their successors, now, near the middle of the nineteenth. The "peace of the churches," was the watchword, sixteen hundred years ago, and has been faithfully re-echoed down to the present hour.

A high tone of Christian ethics will always conflict, of necessity, with the aims of such a clergy, and as religious teachers, they will take care, in some way, that it shall never predominate. The high toned theology, that, clustering around the great propitiatory sacrifice, proclaims the inviolability of the Right, the immutability of penal laws and the utter impossibility of compromise under the moral administration of God, if openly denied, must be kept out of sight; if not kept out of sight, must be thrown into the back ground (by showy ceremonies, superstitious rituals, hero-worship of christian worthies, and the merits of saints)—if no longer to be thus thrown into the back-ground, must be perverted by antinomian distortions, or explained away, or denied. Church membership must not rest on the basis of regenerating grace, christian experience, and gospel holiness, or else the very ideas of regeneration, vital piety, and experimental religion must along with the christian doctrines that define and inspire them, be perverted and thus changed into mere reverence and rhapsody, and delusion; or perhaps, in turn as the popular taste indicates, be derided and exploded, altogether. Sometimes the church doors are thrown wide open to all who maintain a decent exteri-

or deportment, a morality of the able standard (not over rigid, of along with a tacit consent to the creed and the reception of it. At other times the condition is a prescribed set of mere frames of tions, easily produced or in which, passing with the superficial evangelical piety, trample fundamental morality and humanity under more legalism! In all these eternally rung, by the leaders clerical caste, the strait gate and narrow way of Christ's true church, changed for the wide gate and the way which brings into the church respectability and the wealth of a godly world. The faithful preachers, consistent lives of some few godly men, (as I found among the reformed "principal" ones who moulded ecclesiastical measures,) furnish only exceptions contributing to the religious reputation of the clerical body, but easily corrupted and absorbed, by the majority of leaders.

The position of the New England council of ministers at Boston, in 1812, it is not difficult to understand. They were ritualists and outward moralists, a conveniently moderate and quiet set. Among them and their legitimate successors, particularly in Massachusetts, many of those who either held to a baptism distinct from infant baptism, explained the terrible terrors of a general improvement upon the native character of men, which they were far from considering very corrupt. They were much in the position of the principal clergy of the church of England then and afterwards, whom, Watson, methodist biographer of Wesley denotes as the disciples of a "Paganized Armonianism" as far removed from Armonianism of Wesley, perhaps, from the Calvinism of Edwards and King and Emmons. Revivals of religion, whether spurious or, genuine, had charms for them, at least if they were men very zealous, or created much excitement. Nobody was ever much troubled under their preaching, provided they were not disturbing themselves, and adhered to the dominant sect, the "established order" of Church and State. Yet literary, dignified and somewhat polished were these "principal ministers of New England," not without a good degree of what is called "moral worth" though chiefly of a negative and conservative

Neither theological knowledge, nor the spirit of inquiry, nor philosophy, nor reformatory nor missionary adventure, nor religious activity, were very characteristic of their times. The Puritan morality declined. Few sinners were reformed; few sensualists were reclaimed. The preaching was, at the temporary and partial end of that quiet slumber, nearly dead afterwards, incidentally revealing, that the standard of morals had sunk exceedingly low, and that ignorance widely prevailed, in sad contrast with the state of society among settlers of New England.

The "principal ministers" of 1657 constructed the "Half-way covenant," shrewd ecclesiastics, were not sound theologians. They knew swim with the current. They preached gravely enough on the Sabbath, cracked their merry jokes during the week. In the art of popular story they had few equals. If the sermon was sometimes dull, the conversation was never known to flag. They were all duly christened, or at least no fault of theirs. The dead were buried, and what could a community ask more? "Fashion" was kept at arm's length, and but little trouble about "schism" as they were so well agreed. The swigged his cider; perhaps, his England Rum. The parson could drink cider too, and, with a professorial air, his good glass of wine. — At gray wig, and the spruce lined, marked his clerical pretensions. All went smoothly along. A few, for domestics, might be seen, along with wig and bar as the insignia of the caste. The "half-way covenant" Doctors were spiritual fathers or grand fathers, theologically, morally, and otherwise, of New England ministers, of the next century, not excepting the really literary and liberal clergy of New England, and of Cambridge, and we should add, of Andover) it is curious to inquire, had we time and scientific skill for the investigation of all these, the Boston decision of an encyclopedia of ecclesiastical history of itself, and wraps up in a paragraph the natural history of clericalism,

Numbers!—numbers! numbers! especially under a popular government like ours, respectability, wealth, and numbers, these are, overmore, the elements of power coveted by a clerical caste. To secure these for the church, in other words, for themselves, irrespective of character, so that it be not "scandalous" that is disreputable, is the grand object of never ending pursuit. Against those who either with or without, the great "moral transformation" of the gospel, refuse to come into the church and sustain its ministry, the "censures of the church" are in reserve. Only come into the church, say they, and do nothing that will disgrace us in the eyes of the community, commit no unpopular sins, understand something, creed-wise, of "the grounds of religion" and all shall be well. Come into the church, in the first place, and rely on the teachings and the ordinances provided for you there, to work in you, afterwards, the great "moral transformation" your souls need. So said the half-way covenant Doctors of New England, in 1657. And so said their successors, of the Missionary American Board (in respect to their mission churches) in 1846. That, in the latter case, a nominal repentance and conversion were mentioned and not in the former, was only because, from the intervention of religious revivals, both genuine and spurious, a different theory had now gained the ascendant and a different phraseology was required. The real meaning in both cases, was the same. The great "moral transformation" was as expressly excluded from the terms of admission, in the latter case as in the former. The theology and the policy of a "half-way" religion is as popular with the leading clergy now, as it was then. And there are fewer now in New England, to protest against the arrangement, than in 1657.

It is important to notice, as we proceed, the mutual and reflex influence upon each other of these two things, viz. first, the organization, growth and power of the clerical caste, and second, the decline of vital godliness, experimental religion, sound morals, and the ethics and theology that correspond with them.

We have seen how, when the first love of the Puritan Churches began to grow cold, and their faith falter, and their power of enduring reproach and persecution decreased, one of the first perceptible effects was the almost unnoticed because steady re-appearance, among

them, of the clerical caste. This, in its turn, accelerated the growth of worldliness, till the churches became carnal enough to tolerate, quietly, the organization of the clerical body in associations and their assumption of the functions and rights belonging originally to the whole brotherhood. The clerical body thus organized and operating, could not fail to hang, like a dead weight, upon the remaining piety and activity of the brotherhood. And behold, in the very short period between the rise of clerical associations, in 1649 and the era of the "half-way covenant", (only nine years,) the churches, or a large portion of them, were prepared to follow their clergy, blindfold, into that strange and anomalous position, and open their doors to the half membership of all who would comply with the accommodating conditions.

THE SAYBROOK PLATFORM.—ITS ORIGIN.

So flagrant an outrage upon the theology and the piety of the Puritans, could not fail to accomplish its legitimate object, the still further elevation and aggrandizement of the clerical body. The Cambridge Platform had only made a few encroachments upon the rights of the laity, and now that, by means of the new terms of church fellowship, a large portion of the world had been admitted "half way" into the church, the clergy, emboldened by this success, determined, it would seem, to follow up and improve their advantages, by an early extension of their privileges and increase of their power.

As early as 1662 there was another Synod held at Boston, the same place where the "half way covenant" Synod had held its sittings, only five years before. Undoubtedly the same "principal ministers" were present and prominent, on both occasions. At this second Synod the question appears to have been distinctly broached, whether or no there could not be formed a consociation of the churches that should more authoritatively wield because duly authorized, the powers that could not so conveniently be exercised by the "advisory" decisions of the associated clergy. And they intimated, in allusion to the "communion of churches" obscurely and cautiously, hinted at, in the Cambridge Platform, that, some few particulars referring to the continuation and combination of churches needed yet a more explicit stating and reducing unto

practice.* And we find, allusion to this Synod in the preface to the Saybrook Platform, of 1708. Perhaps the remnant of the Old Plymouth leaven stood in the way, in Massachusetts, and in that colony there had been less admixture and contact with Presbyterians than in the colony of Connecticut.

We cannot now trace, minutely, the gradual progress of causes leading to the erection of the Saybrook Platform. But among these causes the presence and the agency of Presbyterianism is by no means to be overlooked. From the era of the Baptist disruption from the body of English Independents, in 1608, twelve years before the landing at Plymouth, an event which left the remaining Independents in the position, definitely, of pedobaptists, there was an evident tendency to fortify themselves in their new and sectarian position by an alliance with their neighbors of the same pedobaptist faith, the Presbyterians, whose clergy, on their part, were very well pleased with the opportunity of spreading over them, the sheltering mantle of their ecclesiastical protection.

"The Puritans who came to New England, particularly those who came to Connecticut, were neither Presbyterians, nor Independents but Congregationalists, and 'the voice of the churches was for Congregationalism in form.' [Cong. Order, page 22.] Yet a strong leaning towards Presbyterianism or the nearest practicable approach to it, was very manifest in many of the clergy. In Newbury, Mass. and some other places, the standard of Presbyterianism was openly raised, and some few churches of that order remain in that part of New England, to the present day. But the prevalent policy was that of gradual innovation, compromise, and the quiet introduction of Presbyterian usages, without hazarding the excitement to be apprehended, from the change of the name. Even those among the clergy who were distinguished by their writings and efforts against the introduction of Presbyterianism proper, such as John Cotton, of Boston; Thomas Hooker, of Hartford; and John Davenport, of New Haven; were equally solicitous to introduce that 'con-

association of the churches" which is now well understood to be, virtually, Presbyterianism, under another name. It was Hooker who said, "We must agree upon constant meetings of ministers and settle the consociation of churches or else we are undone."

That the system of consociated churches established by the Saybrook Platform was concocted in the associations of ministers "in conclave by themselves, apart from the laity" (as were the kindred innovations of the second and third centuries) is a historical fact, that should never be forgotten. And it is equally evident and not worthy that the leaven of Presbyterianism work at among the nominally Congregational clergy of New England, particularly of Connecticut, from the beginning, had an agency in the same transaction. The book on "Congregational church order" to which we have referred, recently "published by direction of the General Association of Connecticut," presents, in both the preceding particulars, the account of the origin of the Saybrook Platform that we have here given. We hope to escape the charge of misrepresentation and unfairness, when we rely on such authority for our statements. The words of Hooker, above quoted, are given (page 27) in an "historical account of the Saybrook Platform," and so are the facts concerning the presence and influence of Presbyterianism in the colonies.

The same "historical account" informs us that the "Hheads of Agreement adopted at Saybrook, were the same with those that had been adopted as a compromise between the Presbyterians and Independents in England." "They were drawn up and assented to by the ministers in England, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational." [page 31] How completely were all things pertaining to the churches, in the hands of the ministers, at this period! Again,

"Adopted in such a spirit" [i. e. of "concession"] the "Hheads of Agreement effected a union between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England. 'The brethren of the Presbyterian way in England,' says Cotton Mather, are lately come in 'such a happy union with those of the Congregational, that all former names of distinction are lost in the blessed one of United Brethren.' With like spirit, the 'Hheads' were adopted at Saybrook." [ib. pg. 33.]

*What portion of the Congregationalists in England came into this measure, what became of the movement, or whether it is still in existence, we are unable to say. The general facts we know, however, that Congregationalists and Presbyterians in England, now, are two distinct bodies, that Congregationalists in England are less assimilated to Presbyterianism than in this country, and that neither consociationism as in Connecticut, or Associationism as in Connecticut and Massachusetts are known among them.

"From this, the inference is not to be drawn, that any of the delegates, were Presbyterians. Such was not the fact, nor is it evidence that any of the churches then in Connecticut acknowledged Presbyterianism, though there may have been before few ministers and professors who embraced it, there have been a few since. What [the historian of Connecticut] says about the views of the delegates is this:—'The council were unanimous in passing the discipline, yet they were not all of one mind. Some were for high consociational government, and in their sentiments nearly Presbyterians; others were much more moderate and rather on independency, but exceedingly desiring the unity of the spirit in the bond of charity. They exercised great Christian condescension and amiableness towards each other.'"

By the "delegates" we are to understand the lay members, or "members of the churches. None of these, the churches they represented acknowledged Presbyterian principles, some were "nearly Presbyterian" was the desire of unity that brought churches under the yoke. How is to call the unholy surrendry of the body of Christ into the hands of aspirants, by the soft and complaisant names of amiableness, condescension, brotherly love! The concession, except in more matters of name, is almost uniformly on the part of the laity. The lovers of distinction and pre-eminence never "concede" give up their ambitious schemes. The bitter fruits of this unfaithful concession of christian liberty, will be in the sequel.

The "historical account" gives us to understand that the immediate occasion or necessity for the Saybrook Platform was the dispute in the church at Hartford growing out of a controversy between the pastor and ruling elders, which "afflicted them exceedingly. In fact, all the churches in New England, other difficulties, arising in the churches, afflicted them also." [pg. 31] Whether the case at Hartford, belonged to, be the same, concerning membership, of which we have no account of Goodrich and which, all over N. England, gave rise to the "half way covenant" we are not informed. From the co-incidence of the general interest excited by the similar position of so many churches, we conclude it was the same controversy, or some question connected with, or growing out of. We remember in reading the History (the book is not now in the church, for a long series of years) the curse of which Gov. Webster

*Cong. Order. Historical account of the Saybrook Platform, page 27.

The "continuation of churches" was provided for in the "half way covenant," but the whole needed to be reduced to a system and rendered more authoritative, as many of the churches declined.

defence of thorough Congregationalism, against the encroachments of the clergy. A church was afterwards gathered there, under Mr. Whiting, being zealous for the strict Congregational way, A. D. 1668. A very alarming and dangerous precedent, to be sure! It was in this very year according to the "historical account" that the "first step" was taken towards establishing the new constitution of the churches known as the Saybrook Platform.— And the State, by this time, was prepared to second the movements of the Clergy. Immediately following the allusion to the difficulties at Hartford, &c. the "historical account" proceeds.

"The Legislature were so annoyed by these, that in 1669 they conceived the design of uniting the churches of Connecticut in some general plan of church government and discipline, by which they might walk, notwithstanding their difference of sentiment in points of less importance." *Ib.* pg. 29.

The Legislature therefore appointed four clergymen "to devise a way in which this desirable purpose might be effected." And yet it required 40 years after this, for the plan to be matured, and the churches schooled into it, a fact sufficiently indicative of the perseverance of the clergy, and of the scruples they had to overcome, before the "delegates" could be prepared to exhibit sufficient "condescension and amiableness." The ministers could meet at their leisure and contrive. But before it would do to risk the matter in a Synod including lay delegates, they must secure the assent of the churches, and be sure of having the right men selected as delegates. The record already extracted from Goodrich informs us that it required "many years" to bring the Connecticut churches to adopt the "half way covenant" system. Until this lesson of worldly compromise and profanation of Christ's house could be well drilled into them, it would be useless to attempt getting their necks under such a yoke of clerical domination as that of the Saybrook Platform. "From this time" [1668] says Trumbull, as quoted in the "historical account," "it became more and more a general object of desire and pursuit: tho' many years elapsed before the work could be accomplished." *pg.* 29. The "account" proceeds.

"The occurrence of new difficulties, from time to time, showed that it was necessary something should be done. For the want of a more general and energetic government," that same writer (Trumbull) observes "many churches ran into confusion, councils were not sufficient to relieve the aggrieved, and restore peace. As there was no general rule for the calling of councils, council was called against council, and opposite results were given to the same case, to the reproach of councils, and the wounding of religion. Aggrieved churches and brethren were discouraged, &c. in this

way their case seemed to be without remedy.— There was no such thing, in this way, as bringing their difficulties to a final issue." *pg.* 30.

And what, pray, had become of the 18th chapter of Matthew, Christ's own constitution of church order? Alas! The problem of governing a worldly church, by Christ's rules remains yet to be solved! And what had become of that prudent device, the "half way covenant" for preserving the peace of the churches? It was manifestly an apple of discord, and to heal the wounds it was inflicting, still further violations of New Testament church polity were requisite. Thus it is, always. One departure from gospel simplicity requires twenty others to heal its mischiefs, and so on, till the climax of apostacy is reached, and the church sleeps the sleep of spiritual death, in the arms of the clerical caste.

When, at length, the plan was matured by the clergy, and the churches, or a large portion of them sufficiently drilled the Legislature of the colony issued its summons in the form of an act "requiring and ordaining" &c. for thus runs the statute.

"And it is, by the authority of the same, ordained and required, that the ministers of the several counties in this government, shall meet together at their respective county towns, with such messengers as the churches to which they belong shall see cause to send with them on the last Monday of June next, there to consider and agree upon some methods and rules, for the management of ecclesiastical discipline, which, by them, shall be adjudged agreeable to the word of God, and shall, at the same meeting, appoint two or more delegates, who shall all meet together at Saybrook, at the next commencement to be held there, where they shall compare the results of the meetings of the several counties, and out and from thence draw a form of ecclesiastical discipline." [Cong. Order. Hist. account, *pg.* 30.]

Such was the origin of the celebrated Saybrook Platform. Of its distinctive features and characteristic doings, when in full operation, we intend to treat, in our next number. At this point, there is opportunity to pause and reflect. How readily, according to the well known saying of Emmons, "associationism leads to consociationism" the reader will have observed. The association contrived the consociation, and, as will be seen as we proceed, for the very purpose of carrying out its own objects, and extending its own power. The consociation system established by the Saybrook platform, did not come in the room of the association, but only acted as its handmaid. Says the "historical account" published by the General Association of Connecticut, in 1843, "the advice of the General Association was very generally adopted by the Associations and Consociations." In what manner this power was wielded, we

shall see, in due time. And let not the reader forget the solicitude of the statesmen, composing the colonial Legislature, to elevate the power of the clergy and thus strengthen the church and State Union. They were "greatly annoyed" by any demonstrations of church independence and conscientious secession, by which the authority of the clergy was impaired! From the landing at Plymouth, in 1620, to the Saybrook Platform, 1708, a lapse of 88 years, what a downward stride! The "pilgrims" fled from a clerical caste allied to the state. They would sooner encounter martyrdom than submit to such a dictation. But their sons, in an evil hour, consented to remain in churches, whose ministers, only "for mutual improvement" forsooth, established clerical associations, then "licenced ministers," and in 60 years afterwards, (the lapse of time between the Cambridge and the Saybrook Platforms,) laid the liberties of the laity at the feet of a state church, binding them hand and foot. Only give the clergy a Cambridge platform or an "association" to stand upon, and they can reach any point they please.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, JUNE 1847.

COMMUNICATED TO THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT UNION CORNERS.

It is well known that, for months past, I have refused to support this church by my presence, means or influence; and I think duty to myself and this church requires that I should fully and frankly give you my reasons for so doing.

1st. I remark that when I united with the church, nearly fifteen years since, I knew that Slavery existed in our country, but, regarding it as I now do, as a system of injustice and wrong, the most cruel that ever saw the light of the sun, better described by John Wesley, as the "sum of all villainies," and knowing that Bible Christianity consisted in the opposite; doing the will of God, or the sum of all good, therefore I did not suppose that slavery existed in the church, or was countenanced or fellowshiped by the church, or by any persons calling themselves christians.

2nd. I understood the confession of faith, and covenant of the church, as I now understand it; as binding its members

to live a life of opposition to sin, and in no case to suffer sin upon a brother.

3rd. I understood, as I now understand, that the design of Christ, in establishing his church on the earth, was, to promote and disseminate virtue, truth, and righteousness, and that by opposing sin, and wrong whether practised by professors or non-professors the learned or the ignorant, the rich or the poor, the oppressor or the oppressed; for I learn from his word, that Christ is no respecter of persons; but "whoso feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him."

4th. I also understood, as I now understand, that any church organization, departing from the principles and designs if it author in its establishment, and lending its influence and support of other, and opposite principles and designs, is regarded by him, as an apostate church; and as having forfeited all claim to the rights and privileges of a christian church—Now, it being a fact that has come to the knowledge of all of us (unless we be criminally ignorant) that slavery is not only tolerated by the Presbyterian church, but that it is also fellowshiped by this church, in such a manner as to imply approbation; this church being represented in, and belonging to the Presbytery, and through them represented in the New School General Assembly in common council with men thieves upon whom is pronounced the sentence of death by their Creator, for, mark his language—"Whoso stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." In whose hands, let me ask, is found the stolen man? Is it not in the hands of the Presbyterian church, in the hands of ministers and deacons of the Presbyterian church, with whom this church is in fellowship, and with whom, this church, by your representatives meets in common council from year to year in General Assembly, and that, too, after they have been petitioned from time to time, in vain, to withdraw all fellowship with slavery, and as conclusive evidence of their apostacy they have freely legislated against sins of minor consequence, such as were practised by the non-professor, thus showing to the world, that they were always ready to condemn the sins of the world, such as they themselves were not guilty of, while they were ready to cover up their own sins.

Do you wonder, that the Presbyterian church has been cursed of God? Do you wonder that she has been visited with

blighting and mildew, ever since the condition of our brethren in bonds, has been presented to the church, and they have turned their back upon them, passing by on the other side saying, be ye warmed and be ye filled, while they have continued to support ecclesiastical organizations that were governed and controlled (so far as human rights are concerned) by the oppressors and robbers of God's poor?—Go then, to the Book that you have covenanted to take as your only rule of faith and practice and there read "Whoso covereth up sin shall not prosper." Go then to your broken covenant, and there learn that you have sworn, in the presence of God, angels and men, to live a life of opposition to sin, and in no case, to suffer sin upon a brother. Go to the history of the church of Rome, and there read the past, present and future history of the Presbyterian church—Go to the history of the Jewish church and then read the present history of the Presbyterian church emphatically described by the head of the church, in Matt. 23. Chapt. 23, and 24, verses. "Ye unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for ye pay tithe of mint, anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and truth."

You hold it criminal in your members to drink, and be drunken, yet support through your ecclesiastical organizations, a system of heathenizing and robbing of all their rights both temporal and spiritual, three millions of men, women, and children, formed in the image of their Maker; and that too, in a gospel land. You hold it criminal in your members to take the name of God in vain, while you fellowship and call those Christians, who enter the precincts of the Kingdom of Heaven, and lay hold of the image of the Son of God, bought with his own blood, and drag him down to the condition of a brute!

Is not this straining at gnats and swallowing camels? Are not such teachers of religion blind guides?

Do you still wonder why the Presbyterian church is in darkness and forsaken of its Leader? Look then to the history of your own church, and then read: "Whoso covereth his sin shall not prosper;" for has He not said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee?" The time has been when this church needed only to have the wants of suffering humanity presented to them, to meet with corresponding sympathy, and action—

then was this church blessed: the Lord hearkened and heard her prayer—sinners were converted. Has God's word failed? Has he left his church, that is written in the palms of His hands, that is dearer to Him than the apple of His eye? Or has this church apostatized and by turning their backs upon his precepts forced him to depart, virtually excommunicating the Son of God, the Head of the church? In reverence to his word, we are bound to believe the latter—that Christ has been crucified in the house of his friends, they desiring murderers. (Mayholders,) to be granted them, desiring rather to fellowship known sin, than to put it away, and fellowship Christ, for he says, I can have no fellowship with sin. Another evidence of the entire apostacy of this church is the fact that a great portion of its members are practical infidels, Notwithstanding they profess to believe the word of God, in works they deny it, God says, "Whoso ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." But the majority of this church say by their fruits (by which they are to be known) that whoso ruleth over men may be unjust, and actually deny to three millions of human beings all their rights.

God says, "when the wicked rule the people mourn," but the majority of this church say, let the wicked rule, that the people may be blessed, and we will sanction it with our votes—I understand it to be practically the same doctrine that was taught our mother Eve, in the garden. God says, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die!"—But the serpent says—Not so. "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely be blessed, shall be as god's knowing good and evil."

As a still further evidence of the apostacy of this church, is the fact, that when Gerrit Smith, that friend of God and man, was in this place, he could not have the privilege, in the name of his Master, to present to the congregation assembled in the house dedicated to the service of God, the condition of three millions of law and gospel made heathen notwithstanding he has practically demonstrated, that his commission was from the Head of the church, by fulfilling that commission, in crying aloud and sparing not: and showing the people their sins, and the House of Israel their iniquities—by visiting the widow and fatherless in their afflictions by preaching deliverance to the captive, the opening of the prison to those who are bound—by distributing the Gospel to

the poor, by making the poorest of God's poor the recipients of his benevolence—by entering the streets and lanes and inviting the blind, the halt, the lame, and the bruised, to partake with him of the fruits of God's bounty.—Christ says "My sheep hear my voice." Will they not then hear the voice of Jesus Christ, as it flows from the heart of his servants, in words and works of benevolence, love, mercy, and truth?

"In taking my dismissal of you, will you say, that I am a covenant breaker? Does this session so decide, in the face of facts that stare you in the face; that will force the admission from every one of you, that Christ the Head of the church has left you, and is visiting you together with the whole Union of Slavery with his judgments?"

Will you say that I am a covenant breaker for doing what Jesus Christ has done, and what he commands me to do. Be ye not partakers of other men's sins?" If so, judge whether it is right to obey God or to obey man, remembering, that whatever you may do, if not approved of Christ, is null and void, and I need not fear.

That covenant is an everlasting covenant, to it I hold and claim its blessings and privileges for myself and household, it is sealed and signed in the blood of Christ.

I make no conditions—I make no reservations, it is mine to obey—it is God's to fulfill.

SAMUEL HALE:

Union Commers, April, 15th 1847.

STATE OF RELIGION IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The following extracts are from the narrative of the state of religion in the Presbyterian church, O. S., presented by Rev. Chas. Hodge, moderator.

"It is our painful duty to announce—that to most of you is but too well known—that the last year has been one of general spiritual drought and barrenness—from not a few of our churches the comforting influences of the Spirit seem to have been wholly withdrawn; and in a large majority of those churches to which members have been added, the number is smaller than in former years."

"The mention of such facts will prepare you for the announcement of another of the same melancholly character; viz: that the professed people of God generally have evinced less of the vitality of

godliness and more of the spirit of the world. In this respect, indeed, our church is in the same condition with those branches of the church which are in correspondence with us. But so far from reconciling us to our present languishing state, this alarming fact should awaken a more anxious desire to know wherefore God has withdrawn to such a degree the quickening and renewing influence of his Spirit. It should lead us to a more solemn and searching scrutiny of our hearts and lives; to a deeper humiliation of ourselves under the frown of and offended God; to more importunate supplications for the visitations of his grace; and to more zealous endeavors to glorify him with our bodies and spirits which are his."

The narrative concludes with a paragraph on war.

"In closing this brief view of our religious state, we cannot but revert to the peculiar circumstances in which we as a people are now placed. After a long period of peace with the nations of the earth we are once more embroiled in the horrors of a foreign war. It is not our province to inquire into the immediate causes, or the necessity of such a conflict; our duty is to look beyond the secondary causes to Him who controls and directs the destiny of nations; to inquire wherefore he has thus visited our favored land with this destructive scourge; to confess before him those national sins, which have provoked this nation judgment; and humbly to plead, that while these judgments are abroad in the earth, the nation may learn righteousness."

"We exhort you, brethren, to make daily and fervent supplications to the Sovereign Ruler of nations, that he would impart wisdom to our rulers, so that they may guide our affairs with discretion; that he would, if consistent with his righteous will, shorten the day of trouble and rebuke; and that he may over rule this fearful calamity to the furtherance of his kingdom in this and in other lands."

REMARKS.—1. If the above picture of spiritual declension and worldliness in the church be true, then all the moral dereliction we have ever charged upon it, was to be expected, as a matter of course.

2. So long as the watchmen upon the walls do not think it within their province to rebuke rulers and people for specific and aggravated sins, such as slavery and pro-slavery wars, they will be smitten

with spiritual barrenness for their want of fidelity to God.

3. It is easier to confess the decline of vital godliness, and the prevalence of worldliness, in general terms than it is to reprove, to repent of, and forsake cherished sins.

THE TWO PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLIES—OLD SCHOOL AND NEW—THE AMERICAN BOARD.

We frequently hear comparisons between the New School and Old School General Assemblies, in respect to their position on the subject of slavery. It is common for New School Presbyterians, and for Congregationalists who support the American Board to speak with a sort of holy horror of the pro-slavery position of the Old School Presbyterian Assembly. For the purpose of reference and comparison therefore, we have thought it well to place their testimonies together, side by side.

The following is, in substance, the action of the Old School General Assembly, in May, 1845. We copy from the Cincinnati Herald of May 28, of that year. Though an abstract, it is probably correct, and we have no other copy at hand. The action of the same body this year, if we remember correctly, was only a repetition of the old testimony of the former Assemblies.

Committee on the subject of Slavery, consisting of Dr. Rice, of Cincinnati, Dr. Lord, of Buffalo, Dr. McGill, of Alleghenytown, Rev. Drury Lacy, of N. O., Rev. N. H. Hall, of Lexington, Judge Leavitt, of Ohio, and Mr. Dunlap, of Philadelphia—Reported by their chairman in substance as follows:

The memorialists are of three classes: 1. Asking amelioration of the slave's condition. 2. Those which ask the Assembly to discontinue, and urge members in slave States to strive for the repeal of the slave laws. 3. Those denouncing slaveholding as sin and asking for discipline.

It is impossible to discipline slaveholding, as sin, without denying some of the plainest declarations of the word of God. It would be charging the apostles of Christ with wishing as sin.

Yet the committee hold that there is evil connected with slavery, particularly in those defective and oppressive laws by which, in some States, it is regulated. But since Christ and the apostles did not make slaveholding a bar to church fellowship, we can not scripturally do so. Nor can we remove the evil of slavery by ecclesiastical action. But we rejoice that ministers and members in slave States are awakening to the importance of giving instruction to slaves, etc.

1. Resolved: That the Assembly, was originally constituted on the limitation that slaveholding is not necessarily sin.

2. Therefore to make slaveholding a bar to communion would be to dissolve itself.

How much this differs from the famous Brooklyn Report of the American Board, we leave our readers to decide, if they can.

The New School General Assembly, in June 1846 adopted the following, prepared by Dr. Duffield, after rejecting several of a higher tone offered by Wm. H. Beecher and others, viz:

1. The system of slavery, as it exists in these U. States, viewed either in the laws of the several States which sanction it, or in its actual operation and results in society, is intrinsically unrighteous and oppressive and is opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel and to the best interests of humanity.

2. The testimony of the General Assembly from A.D. 1787 to A.D. 1818 inclusive, has condemned it, and it remains still the recorded testimony of the Presbyterian Church of these United States against it, from which we do not recede.

3. We cannot, therefore, withhold the expression of our deep regret that slavery should be continued and countenanced by any of the members of our churches; and we do earnestly exhort both them and the churches among whom it exists, to use all means in their power to put it away from them. Its perpetuation among them cannot fail to be regarded by multitudes influenced by their example as sanctioning the system portrayed in, and maintained by, the statutes of the several slaveholding States wherein they dwell. Nor can any mere mitigation of its severity, prompted by the humanity and Christian feeling of any who continue to hold their fellow men in such bondage, be regarded either as a testimony against the system, or as in the least degree changing its essential character.

4. But while we believe that many evils incident to the system, render it important and obligatory to bear testimony against it, yet would we not undertake to determine the degree of moral turpitude on the part of individuals involved. This will doubtless be found to vary in the sight of God according to the degree of light and other circumstances pertaining to each. In view of all the embarrassments and obstacles in the way of emancipation interpreted by the statutes of the slaveholding States, and by the social influence affecting the views and conduct of those involved in it, we cannot pronounce a judgment of general and promiscuous condemnation, implying that destitution of Christian principle and feeling which would exclude from the table of the Lord, all who should stand in the legal relation of masters to slaves or justify us in withholding our ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship from them. We rather sympathize with and would speak to succor them in their embarrassments, believing that separation and secession among the churches and their members, are not the method which God approves and sanctions for the reformation of his Church.

5. While, therefore, we feel bound to bear our testimony against slavery, and to exhort our beloved brethren to remove it from them as speedily as possible, by all appropriate and available means, we do at the same time condemn all divisive and schismatical measures tending to destroy the unity and disturb the peace of our Church, and deprecate the spirit of denunciation and unfeeling severity, which would cast from the fold those whom we are rather bound, by the spirit of the gospel, and the obligations of our covenant, to instruct, to counsel, to exhort, and thus to lead in the ways of God; and toward whom, even though they may err, to exercise forbearance and brotherly love.

6. As a court of our Lord Jesus Christ, we possess no legislative authority; and as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, we possess no judiciary authority. We have no right to institute and prescribe tests of Christian character and church membership, not recognized and sanctioned in the Sacred Scriptures, and in our standards, by which we have agreed to walk. We must, therefore, leave this matter with the Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods—the judicatories to whom pertains the right of judgment to act in the administration of discipline, as they may judge it to be their duty, constitutionally subject to the General Assembly, only in the way of general review and control.

Here, again, what have we, but the same indefinite double faced doctrine of the American Board? Slavery is bad, to be sure! Very bad! But not bad enough to be shut out of the Christian church!

The American Board too, could affirm the unrighteousness of the entire system of slavery.

As to the above reference to "the testimony of the General Assembly from A.D. 1787 to 1818 inclusive," let it be noted that this testimony stands as firmly recorded on the records of the Old School General Assembly as of the New!

Both Assemblies claim to be the regular "Simon pure" Constitutional Assembly that bore that testimony! Since the recent division a proposition to recind the ancient testimonies of the General Assembly against slavery was almost unanimously rejected. The Presbyterian slave holders could not afford to part with that testimony! It was their certificate that they were as much opposed to slavery as any body, and always had been, that their church was not a pro slavery church!—The Old School as well as the New, "do not recede" from that.

The principal difference between the two assemblies, we take to be this. The Old School, like the Old democratic party (falsely so called) is too strongly entrenched at the south to curry favor with the abolitionists. The New School, like the whig party (and most or all of its leading men are whigs) find it necessary to propitiate the Anti Slavery feeling at the North, by talking large words of little meaning, for its amusement and gratification. If the former be more hardened, unblushing, and inaccessible, the latter is most ambiguous, two sided, deceptive, insincere, and mischievous. And open enemy is more respectable than a treacherous friend, and less to be dreaded.

DEFENDING THE CHURCH.—Two children met in this city the other day, one a catholic and the other a protestant, when the little protestant girl told the boy that his people worshipped images, He denied it but the little girl was positive, and referred to some pictures, &c., in the catholic churches. The boy, true to his training, got enraged, and fell to swearing terribly, thinking doubtless in this way to prove his point. Image worship must not be confessed, but swearing might be religiously restored to, to beat down his little antagonist. This little incident, which was observed by one of the hands in our office, illustrates very well a principal mode of defence to which Catholics resort when charged with idolatry and other abominations. They will deny, and deny, and when this fails, will heap profane curses on those who bring the charge. This is their standing argument.—Boston Recorder.

A very apt "illustration," too, of the "principal mode of defense to which" a great many Protestants "resort, when charged with sustaining" slavery and its "abominations" and when the proof is too stubborn to be set aside. In one partic-

ular, a difference may be noted. Instead of the "profane curses" we meet, more commonly, with polite and dignified appeals to "popular indignation" theological and literary invocations of "the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures" along with plentiful charges of "infidelity, disorganization, and schism!" The little Catholic boy was not more "true to his training" than are multitudes of grown up Protestant men.

THE AMERICAN BOARD.—GLEANINGS FROM THE MISSIONARY HERALD.—The Missionary Herald is the organ of the American Board. Let it tell its own story.

Instructions to certain Missionaries in 1830.—The committee says:—

"The Board is not an Ecclesiastical body. There are Denominational Missionary institutions in our land, but the Board is not one. It is a Catholic institution, in the primitive sense of that most abused term. So far as its constitution is concerned, it can act for any evangelical denomination, and it is now acting with equal ease and freedom for four or five."—Missionary Herald, vol. 36, pg. 217.

"Nor, second, is its object of an Ecclesiastical nature. The Board is no more an Ecclesiastical institution than it is a civil one. It has no ecclesiastical powers—no purely ecclesiastical duties. It has not even a denominational character. It is an association of men from different, though kindred denominations. It sends forth Congregational, Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Lutheran missionaries—and it could also send missionaries from the Episcopalian and Baptist denominations, were it not that the whole body of missionaries, acting under our direction, should be able to recognize the validity of each other's baptism and ordination."—ib. 35, pg. 217.

Why then may not abolitionists of the same sect, sustain missionary effort without breaching it?

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, April, 1847.

W. E. Whiting, New York,	2.00	J. Brock, Penn. Yarn,	0.50
B. B. Weber, Springfield,	1.00	A. W. Neell, Farmer,	1.00
C. J. Judd, Warsaw,	1.00	R. O. Manchester, Lavanna,	2.00
E. Gilbert, Honcoyo,	1.00	L. H. S. Butler,	0.50
S. D. Porter, Roches,	2.00	E. Smith, W. Butler,	0.50
A. S. Cady, do,	1.00	B. Clarke, Palmyre,	1.00
W. B. Stone, Gardner, (Mass.)	1.00	J. M. Barber, Litch-	1.00
I. Pettit, N. Milford, (Conn.)	0.50	S. B. Franklin, Hono-	1.00
G. Roberts, do,	0.50	W. Twichell, Cohoes,	2.00
E. Brewer, do,	0.50	E. H. Rice, Concord,	1.00
J. Bonney, Cornwall Bridge	0.50		
			22.50

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series Vol. V—No. 7. HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. JULY, 1887. WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz: Papers, per dozen, \$0 50; Sixty papers, \$2 00; Twenty-eight papers for 100; One hundred papers, \$3 00.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISK, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. VIII.

THE SAYBROOK PLATFORM,—ITS DISTINCTIVE FEATURES, AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ITS WORKINGS.

It is of no small importance to notice, how gradually, and almost imperceptibly, the independency of the churches planted by the Puritans, as well as of the ancient christian churches, was undermined.—The Cambridge Platform, of 1648 had incidentally mentioned "councils" of churches for advice, as among the methods in which it was lawful for the separate, local churches, to communicate with each other. It could hardly have been supposed, at that period, that from this hint a usage should have arisen that, in 60 years, would ripen into the organization of fixed and stated bodies, to act as councils and clothed with judicial power over the churches. Yet this seems to have been the fact.

The "Hints of Agreement" adopted in 1708, in connexion with the Articles of church Discipline commonly known as the Saybrook Platform, appear to have been framed with a special view to the introduction and establishment of this change in the ecclesiastical polity of the churches.

"These provided for cases of more consultations in each society, which should be standing, known, and responsible tribunals, with appellate and final jurisdiction, to which particular churches might refer cases too difficult to be well adjudged, and issued themselves, cases in which there should be need of a

council for the determination of them, and in which aggrieved individuals might apply for redress.—One principal thing says President Clapp, wherein these articles differ from what had been before generally received and practiced in the New England churches was this, that whereas the Cambridge Platform had said, in general terms, that councils should consist of neighboring churches, and some questions had arisen who should be esteemed neighboring churches, and what number should be called in particular cases, these articles reduced it to a greater certainty, that councils should consist of neighboring churches of the county, they arising themselves into one or more associations for the purpose. The object was to prevent picked councils, separate councils and councils upon councils, which would give contradictory results, and plunge the churches into deeper troubles." Cong. Church Order, pg. 34, 35.

And so the privilege of asking advice when they needed it, and of those whom they judged most competent to give it, was almost imperceptibly yet rapidly transformed into the obligation of submitting to the "final jurisdiction" of a "standing tribunal." It is not to be supposed that the entire stride was understandingly taken at the period of adopting the Saybrook Platform. The churches must have been gradually trained, as we know they had been, to consider the "advice" of their councils as "decisions."

The "Historical account of the Saybrook Platform" published "by direction of the General Association of Connecticut," A.D. 1843, had informed us (page 24) of the annoyance of the New England clergy by certain books which "came out of England, some in defence of anabaptism, and other errors, and for liberty of conscience, as a shelter for their toleration" &c. &c. Mr. Hooker who was so anxious, according to the same account, to "settle the consociation of the churches" was engaged likewise, in answering those troublesome books, as the same account tells us, so that the grand scope, end, and design, of these ecclesiastical arrangements and innovations, for more than 60 years before the adoption of the Saybrook Platform, is no matter of concealment by the General Association of 1843, and can be no matter of conjecture with the readers of their "historical account." The Platform of 1708 "set-

"Yet the 'Historical Account' might have been enriched with still further references to Trumbull's History of Connecticut. Among other items it might have recorded the definition of Congregationalism by a prominent minister, Mr. Stone of Hartford, viz: 'A speaking aristocracy' [i.e. the clergy], 'in the face of a silent democracy.' [Trumbull, pg. 308.] His ideas of Congregationalism appear to have bordered less on independency than those of the first ministers of the country in general."

led the consociation of the churches."—How it fared with "liberty of conscience" and "toleration" under the reign of that Platform, will be seen, as we proceed.

"Visible believers and their infant seed" were recognized in this Platform, as constituting the membership of the churches [Head I.] Whether this was intended to lay a foundation for the "full communion" membership of those who, at that time were only in part, members, under the "half way covenant" we are unable to say. It was but a virtual repetition of the Cambridge Platform, and the "half way covenant" appears to have been kept up many years longer, or until nearly the close of that century.—Whether its disuse, at that period, should be attributed to the prevalence of higher or lower views of the proper terms of church membership, it might be difficult, perhaps, to determine. The pious portion of the church must have been disaffected with the "half way" membership, all along. But in the mean time, the course of events, on the whole, may have tended, as we think it did, to prepare the church and the community, for the full membership of the same description of persons who, in a previous age, retaining more distinct apprehensions of Puritanism, would have not been considered more than "half" qualified for so sacred a privilege. The period when the "half way covenant" went into disuse, is within the memory of many now living, who do not conceive of the change as being marked by the introduction of any higher standard or tone of piety in the churches of New England.

To return.—The Saybrook Platform, in its recognition of local church power, places it in the hands of the "pastors and other elders," leaving it "to the brotherhood to consent, according to the rule of the gospel" (vii.) It declares "That in so great and weighty a matter as the calling and choosing of a Pastor, we judge it ordinarily requisite, that every such church consult and advise with the Pastors of neighboring congregations, [iv of the Ministry.] Another Head [vii] provides a similar usage in respect to persons entering the ministry.

There, the clergy provided a double lock for the door of the clerical body. — In the first place, nobody must commence preaching without their consent. — In the second place, no churches must select a pastor, even from among those whom the clergy had licensed, without the consent of the neighboring pastors. To all this it may be added, that even after the regular choice of a Pastor, in the form prescribed, he could not administer the ordinances without the imposing ceremony of a public clerical ordination.

To excommunication of members "the Pastor and other elders if there be such, are to lead and go before the church, and the brotherhood to give their consent, in a way of obedience unto Christ, and unto the elders, as over them in the Lord." Art. 3 of *causes*.

"They ought to have frequent meetings together, that by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they strengthen the hearts and hands of each other, in the ways of the Lord." Art. 1 of communion of churches.

But why could not the brotherhood come among them? The clerical caste, perhaps, in that way, would not be sufficiently "strengthened." "In conclusion of the clergy, apart, from the lay brotherhood, by themselves," say our clerical historians of the ancient church, the fetters of Spiritual Despotism were forged. In that "impious divorce" of the ministry from the brotherhood, the Man of Sin, say they, undoubtedly, had its rise. — Why then, repeat, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the impotence of the second and third? Has human nature changed? Has that, which was corrupting then, become conservative now?

Another article provides "in order to concord and in other weighty and difficult cases, for 'occasional meetings of ministers,' to 'consist of smaller or greater numbers, as the matters shall require,' and 'particular churches, their respective elders and members, ought to have a reverential regard to their judgment, so given, and not dissent therefrom, without apparent ground from the word of God, vii, 1.'"

This provision is the more remarkable, as it seems to be in addition, not merely to the "standing, known, and responsible tribunals, with appellate and final jurisdiction," viz. the consociations or councils, but also in addition to the stated General and county associations of ministers, with their regular meetings. The formal and tardy movements of these, might have left some room and time, in certain possible cases, for the operation and action of the lay element, in some form, even with its "obedience unto Christ AND the elders" of the local

church. In case of any apprehended danger to the supremacy of the clergy, any number of them, more or less, as the case might require, were to rally together, like so many patrols at the given signal, and utter their mandate, to be heard "with reverential regard." Had the second or third centuries any devil so equal to this? New England ingenuity bears away the palm from the ancient bishops who laid the foundations of episcopacy and papacy, before the era of Constantine.

Thus much of the "Hounds of Agreement." "The Articles on the administration of Church Discipline" which "are especially the Platform" are in keeping with the preceding. In the notes appended to the articles by authority of the General Association of 1843 the current usages under the articles are likewise stated. The decisions of the "consociations in all cases brought before them from the churches shall be final, unless orderly removed from them," and "the council, so hearing and giving the result or final issue, in the said case, as aforesaid, shall see their determination or judgment duly executed and attended in such a way or manner as shall, in their judgment, be most suitable and agreeable to the word of God." Art. v. On this, the committee by authority of the General Association, remark as follows:

"We find the general practice has been to consider the decisions of the consociations final, with the exception specified in the article. This may be done, as it is sometimes done, by advice of the consociation. Though some have maintained that the consociation can only advise, its advice is nevertheless universally without appeal. The instances have been rare in which a church has refused to comply with the decisions of a consociation regularly convened. In a few cases, churches have preferred to come under the censure of the consociation, and submit to non communion, or to withdraw and declare themselves independent. Some of these after the excitement passed away, have returned and been restored. It appears that one or two consociations choose to call their decisions advice rather than authoritative decisions, but even here, their determinations are considered final."

"The 2nd part of this article prescribes the duty of the council, so hearing and giving the result or final issue in a case coming before them, which duty is, 'to see their determination or judgment duly executed and attended.' So far as the committee have information, usage corresponds with the consultation on these points. Consociations have rarely permitted their decisions to be trifled with, though a commendable degree of Christian forbearance has been exercised where churches felt aggrieved by their decisions." [page 273.]

Such is the official history of the workings of the Platform, after a lapse of one hundred and thirty five years. How humiliating and yet how thrilling! How painful and yet how instructive! What

"Provision is made in the articles for carrying a cause from the consociation to a council of the consociated churches of the circuit" &c. &c., but the directions for this are complex, and calculated to repel the experiment, which it seems, has never been adventured.

portion of Christendom, what form of church polity, can afford statistics more degrading or more appalling?

"A MORAL INFLUENCE."

There is no room for calling the influence of these councils "a moral" influence, as the authors of "Congregational catechism" have strangely done, in the following paragraph, which confirms, after all, the views we have expressed, as well as the statements of the General Association.

"The decision of a council is considered merely advisory; and as such may be either accepted or not accepted by the church, yet the moral influence of the councils is so great, that the churches are seldom known to disregard their advice. And indeed, it would be thought disrespectful to a council, and a breach of Christian fellowship, if a church should refuse to accept its advice, in matters more by prudential. [vide Upham's Cong. Catechism, pg. 91.]

Now, what have we here? A "moral influence!" Yes, truly! Just such a "moral influence" as all spiritual despotism exerts. A "moral" blight! By a "moral influence" we should understand the influence of godly example, of Christian instruction, of scriptural argument, of sound moral reasoning, which should command the rational assent, and win the affectionate confidence of those for whom it was designed? But, Oh! no! Nothing of this at all. The churches felt aggrieved. They were unconvinced. They were indignant. Rather than conform to decisions they believed to be unjust, subversive of their liberties, and it may be inconsistent with the purity and order of Christ's house, they would, for a time, "submit to non communion, or withdraw and declare themselves independent." But after a while, they "returned and were restored." Why? Were they rationally convinced? How? "Usage" was against them. Consociations rarely permitted their decisions to be trifled with. It was accounted "disrespectful, to the council." It would be a "breach of Christian fellowship to refuse to accept its advice, in matters more prudential! — And what must be the moral character, and what the "moral influence" of an ecclesiastical body that could enforce its decisions with the penalty of excommunication, not suffering its decisions to be trifled with, "in matters merely prudential?" "Christian forbearance" forsooth! to hesitate at crushing with their anathemas a Christian church, "in matters merely prudential!" Has the Vatican ever urged pretensions beyond this? And this power, is merely "advisory" let it be understood. Just such advice as Romanism

and Episcopacy wield; and enforced upon the same principles and the same penalties. Will it be said that it is only a "moral influence," because no physical pains and penalties are inflicted? What physical pains and penalties do Episcopacy and Papacy wield in the United States of America, where they can't get the power? But do Episcopacies and Papacies wield no spiritual despotism, here? What mean, then, the comparisons instituted in the "Congregational catechism" between Congregational churches, and the Protestant Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and the Methodist Episcopal church?—The contrast will be found, by impartial readers, to be less striking than the authors appear to have supposed. As to physical pains and penalties, we shall see which of the sects, in this country, has the advantage of the argument, before we have done. What sect, except the nominally Congregational, has ever wielded, in New England, the secular power? But it was a Congregationalism only in name, as we have already shown. But let us record further illustrations of the fact:—Article III. of the Platform properly is as follows:

"That if any Pastor and church doth obstinately refuse a due attendance and conformity to the determination of the council that hath the cognizance of the case and determineth it as above, after due patience used, they shall be reputed guilty of scandalous contempt, and dealt with as the rule of God's word doth in such cases provide; and the sentence of non communion shall be declared against such Pastor and church. And the churches are to approve of the said sentence, by withdrawing from the communion of the pastor and church which so refuseth to be healed."

CONGREGATIONAL INDEPENDENCY.

On this article, the committee of the General Association remark, thus:

"This article is deemed essential to the constitution, and is, in substance, uniformly observed. The churches have, generally, and with scarce a known exception, sustained the doings of the association; that is, they have sanctioned the doings of their pastors and delegates, and where individual members of the associated churches have refused to observe the sentence of non communion with a delinquent church, they have been considered as liable to censure." Cong. Order, pg. 274.

It would be an interesting inquiry, just here, what remnant of Congregationalism or of independency, deserving the name, can the Connecticut churches retain under this Platform? Can it be marvellous that Episcopal Churches are springing up like mushrooms, in the parishes of Connecticut? Thus tutored in the school of spiritual despotism, for a century and a half, what great objections can the people of that state have, to a mere incidental change in the shape of the hierarchy that is to govern them? They are doubtless made to believe, as in every

instance where an onward step is taken in the road of clerical domination, that they are rather receding, and gaining a little relaxation of the burthen. The introduction of this very system of "con-sociations" was advocated by some, on the ground that the lay delegation in those bodies would afford some security to the churches which they did not have in the mere clerical associations which had become so powerful. They failed to see that while the sanction of the churches was thus gained, as it had not been before, the clergy would still control the whole.

Presbyterianism is growing unpopular in the state of New York and in the Western States. There is a tendency towards the introduction of the Congregationalism of New England. If the leading ministers think they cannot hold on to Presbyterianism, they will favor the measure, rather than turn the attention of their flocks to the New Testament, or to the usages of the early Puritan Independents. One object we have, in writing and circulating these historical sketches, is to let the people of these states distinctly understand what the so called Congregationalism of New England is. In some of its aspects, particularly this system of consociationism, the Congregationalism of Connecticut more nearly resembles Presbyterianism than the Congregationalism of Massachusetts and the other eastern states. But the power of the Associations, in those other states, nearly equals that of the consociations of Connecticut, though in a different way. We shall show, as we proceed, that even after the adoption of Consociationism in Connecticut, in 1792, the most efficient instrument of the clergy, is the association of ministers. And to the present day, it is a question between the ministers of Connecticut and Massachusetts, which system is most efficient, and between the laymen of the two states, which burthen is the most tolerable. On the principle of "choosing the least of two evils," not a few, in both states, are hazarding the plunge into the Episcopal Church. So long as Christians in the middle and western states can supply themselves with New Testaments, or even with the 18th chapter of Matthew, they can do better, in our opinion, than to plant their feet upon either the Cambridge or the Saybrook Platforms.

METROPOLITANS.

But we proceed. The Saybrook Plat-

form, Article x, designated the "minister or ministers of the county towns" as holding a priority in the matter of fixing the "time and place" of assembling consociations. The mention of so small a circumstance may excite a smile. And so in the second and third centuries, no doubt, would the mention of the seemingly unimportant priority given to the metropolitans of that age. We all know what grew out of that priority among the ancients; and it needs no great discrimination to trace its operation among the moderns. The extravagant deference paid to the pastors of the first churches in Hartford and New Haven is well known. On a recent occasion, one of those dignitaries, at a meeting of ministers, (association or convention) objected, very gravely, to the adoption of certain resolutions, that the other, from the other city, was not present, and it would be discourteous to act in his absence, or against what might be supposed to be his opinions. And the objection prevailed.—Half the country ministers in the state might have been absent as they probably were, without any mention being made of them. What is more to the point, they would have had to sanction the proceeding, or be virtually, though indirectly ostracised. Is it strange that some such ministers should step into the Episcopacy, as they have done, saying, "If I must be under a Bishop, it shall be in a communion where I can have a voice in electing him, and be myself, eligible to the office." The two Bishops of the Congregational Churches and ministers in Connecticut, are as well known, to day, as is the Bishop of the Episcopal church. They rule authoritatively through their associations, and consociations, and are irresponsible to boot. Massachusetts has long been famous for such Bishops, and other N. England States are beginning to have theirs.

ASSOCIATIONS FIRST RECOGNIZED.

The same Platform that established the consociations, in Connecticut, gave also, and for the first time, in New England, an ecclesiastical sanction and recognition of those "associations of ministers" that first came together as mere "voluntary associations for mutual improvement," and then improved themselves by "licencing ministers," and "sanctifying the consociation of the churches." It was now ordained that these "associations shall assemble twice a year at least" (just as did the synods or associations under

Constantino,) "to consult the duties of their office, and the common interest of the churches, consider and resolve questions and cases of importance, which shall be offered among themselves or others, who also shall have power of examining and recommending the candidates of the ministry to the work thereof," Art. xii. pg. 279.

"To the associations, and to them alone" says the committee "belongs the business of examining and licensing candidates to the ministry." Ib.

THE LEGISLATIVE POWER. A SHIELD FOR REPUTATION.

Here, then, very evidently, lies the legislative power of the churches. This is the form of overseeing the interests of the churches, and resolving questions, submitted by its own members or others, is committed solely to the ministers. How absolutely unlimited this power is, may be inferred from the vague and general terms of the charter; and is amply illustrated by the subsequent history. This is the Legislature,* as the consociation is the Judiciary. The Legislature, too, holds a most remarkable appointing power, in the item of "licensing ministers." By this power, the legislative body, composed wholly of ministers, nominates its own successors, and perpetuates itself!—From another Article, (the 13th) it appears that this same legislative body, acts as a sort of Grand Jury, to find bills of indictment, if necessary, against any of their own number, preparatory to their trial by the council, or consociation. On this article the committee remarks as follows.

"There is not a strict uniformity of practice, under this article. We suppose, however, that the usage has generally been for the association not to try and pass judgment upon a consociated pastor, but only to investigate, so far as to ascertain whether there be just occasion for calling the council (or consociation.) "Happily for the reputation and usefulness of the ministry in Connecticut, precedents for settling this inquiry are rare." pg. 281.

From the first part of this comment, it would seem at least questionable, whether the associations had not, sometimes, tried, as well as indicted, clerical offenders, which the terms of the Platform, manifestly, gave no power to do. But the naivete of the closing remark is altogether inimitable. Very "happily for the reputation and usefulness of the ministry

* The Digest, &c. pg. 312 does indeed say "the general association has no legislative or judicial power over ministers or churches." This disclaimer, the perfect counterpart of those of the clergy of the third century, will pass for its proper value with those who read and ponder the other statements we have quoted from the same authority.

of Connecticut" the cases were "rare" in which they had either indicted, or tried one of their own number for any offence! Rather an equivocal compliment, one would think. Select from the body of the community any other equal number of men, erect them into a privileged caste, with the power of perpetuating the body, give them the exclusive right of indicting their members and bringing them to trial, and you would probably find, after a lapse of a century and a half, that "precedents" for settling inquiries concerning their mode of action would "rare." The "reputation" of the "brethren of the mystic tie," under such circumstances, would probably be as "happily" illustrated as in the present case. Our southern patriarchs, in much the same way, are "happily" shielded in their "reputations" in respect to their relations to the inferior caste. The "cases" of indictment for harsh treatment, are certainly "rare." Seriously, can it redound to the "reputation" of any body of men, ministers or laymen, that they have thus separated themselves from their equal brethren sheltered themselves from the common liabilities to impeachment to which others are subject, refusing to be indicted except by their own clique, and then trumpet their "reputation" on the ground of the infrequency of arrests and trials among them? If there is any thing which should make a clergyman blush for his order, it is the thought that he belongs to a body that must needs be thus "happily" shielded from the wholesome discipline of the equal christian brotherhood. If any thing should make a lay man ashamed of his position it is the thought that he calls himself a Congregationalist and a republican, and yet submits to clerical pretensions like these.

ILLUSTRATIONS IN POINT.

We cannot forget a number of "cases" in which the "reputation and usefulness of the ministry in Connecticut" would have been more "happily" secured, if the associations had not failed to take the action which would have increased the number of "precedents. In one case, within our memory, the gross misconduct and intemperance of a consociated Pastor failed to elicit any action of the association until the public excitement on the subject rendered any further delay impracticable, and even then the ungracious manner of taking the step which could not longer be delayed, the stern frowns upon those among the laity who would

not longer consent to cover up the matter, and then, the arts and appliances by which after all, the offender was not only acquitted but forced upon the church for a long time afterwards, and until his habitual drunkenness excluded him from society, evinced, but too plainly, in the sight of all men, that the clergy had one rule for their flocks and another for themselves, and that their ecclesiastical polity was moulded in accommodation to their convenience. A generation further back, say about 70 years ago, witnessed another instance in which a pastor in Connecticut was the owner of two slaves, male and female, whom he received into his church, and united together in marriage. In their old age he separated them forever by selling the wife to a clerical brother at a distance. The bereaved husband treated in vain, and died of a broken heart. Yet that minister was never called to any account for his crime.—The church of which he was Pastor and of which his injured victims were members, had no power to discipline him, if they would. The association took no notice of it, and of course it never came before the Consociation. But "happily for the reputation and usefulness of the ministry in Connecticut" say their General Association "precedents for settling inquiries" concerning the modes of punishing and trying ministers "are rare!"

THE TRUE SAFE GUARD OF THE MINISTRY.

Let us not be misunderstood. It gives us no pleasure to record illustrations of this kind. Nor is it in any indiscriminate condemnation of the ministry of that period or of their successors that we indulge. There were good men among the ministers of Connecticut, in those days, and so there are now. What we deplore and protest against is, that good ministers, in any age, should be bound up in ecclesiastical ties with bad ministers and under arrangements which render it almost a moral certainty that the bad will bear rule, reduce the best among them to a state of degradation and servility that Christianity forbids, that tends to corrupt even the good, and subjects to persecution those whom they cannot corrupt. For the sake of all honest and faithful ministers as well as on behalf of the lay brotherhood, we demand that such arrangements shall be laid aside. The most holy and exemplary ministry in the world cannot properly nor safely come into such arrangements. The entire body

to be pure, when the arrangements entered into, and without any introduction of new members, the deterioration of the system would be visible in years. Christ designed the union and mutual watch care of the brotherhood for his ministers as well as for other christians. They need every restraint as much as other people do, and the very fact that they imagine otherwise, or so far forget it as to get out of the local church and form a separate body for discipline by themselves, is evidence that they are, not wanting in christian watchfulness if they are already coming under the influence of spiritual pride that preceded a fall.—The problem of a spiritual ministry, to a great extent, or for any considerable part of a ministry in which holy living prelates in general, and deadness and selfishness are only the rare exceptions, has never yet solved in any religious community, ancient or modern. It limits the arrangements of a clergyman, removing the ministers from the care and the discipline of the common brotherhood, with the prerogatives of impeachment within themselves. We do not limit the resources of self-purifying and preserving grace, but pretend that these are to be expected as a law-abiding use of heaven-appointed means. If God has made men of virtue in all conceivable positions, a sentiment to be admitted with caution and many exceptions, he fully contemplates, in his institutions, the removal of his people from many positions which he knows to be too hazardous for them to occupy. A ministry disengaged from the common brotherhood, his people do not contemplate, and in such cases they can never be safe. Extract from the page of universal church history.

OF THE CHURCHES BY THE MINISTERS.

In the "Digest of Rules and Usages" adopted by the General Association of Connecticut, in 1843, (in connexion with the historical account, and the "Platform and notes of comment") we learn that each pastor of a consociated church is a member of the council of the consociation; nevertheless he cannot vote there, unless the pastoral relation is entered into "with the presence and concurrence of the council of the association." pg. 201, 2.

So the judicial body as well as the legislative, is virtually, a self-perpetuating body. At least, it holds a veto upon the introduction of new members, by the constituency, or brotherhood. Not only so, the legislative and judicial bodies are composed of the same ministers, the only difference being that the consociation, or judicial body, has a lay delegation which is not admitted into the association, or legislative body. In civil governments it has been thought a very important safeguard of liberty, to separate the legislative from the judicial functions, not uniting them in the same persons. In this ecclesiastical polity, the two are closely united; the same persons, namely, the ministers, holding the control in both, and wholly exercising the one.

Complaints against ministers are to be brought before, not the consociation (except in N. London county) but "to the associated pastors of the District, through the moderator of an association." pg. 270. If the Association see fit, they bring the case before the consociation.

A minister, dismissed from his pastoral charge is nevertheless subject to the association, and under his inspection. He may also sit in their meeting, and "assist in his advice and vote," Digest pg. 305. By this arrangement it will be seen that the clerical body intend to control all ministers within their jurisdiction, whether pastors or not. Even when not exercising the pastoral office, they must by no means be degraded to the level of a layman, by being subjected to lay watch care, and discipline. More than this.—Though the church may have procured the dismissal of a minister (through the consociation), as being dissatisfied with his treatment of them and bearing towards them, yet so long as he can retain a standing in the ministerial "association," he can continue to exercise legislative powers over the church that rejected him. He can "aid with his advice and his vote," in "resolving questions and cases of importance" "and the common interest of the churches" (pg. 279) including of course the church from which he had just been dismissed. And in this way, by his vote, he may decide against the church, the very principle or usage in respect to which it had ventured to dissent from him. So that they find themselves, after all, under the controlling power of his vote. He may be guilty in their view of grave misdemeanors, requiring solemn censure. But they can

neither administer any censure to him, nor escape from his ecclesiastical power through the association, over them. For should they refuse submission to the decision of the consociation which (as will be seen) seldom or never fails to correspond with that of the association, they come of course, by the "Platform" under the ban of excommunication or non-communication, by all the consociated churches, [Digest, page 302.] "And the churches of the District are to approve of the said sentence, by withdrawing from the communion of the Pastor and church" &c. The coolness with which the constitution enjoins that all the churches within the limit of the consociation "are to approve" of its decisions, whatever their own consciences and judgments may dictate would be a great curiosity in any other archives than those of an organized clerical caste. Nothing is too absurd or too morally obtuse for enactment, here.

PROVINCE OF CONSOCIATIONS.

The "Articles" provide that the Consociations are to afford assistance to the churches "upon all occasions ecclesiastical" page 267. This, the committee explain as including, by usage, "ordinations, installations, examination of candidates for ordination, or installation, in respect to their soundness in the faith and their qualifications for the work of the ministry, occasions in which advice is regularly asked by the churches or individual members, the hearing of appeals from the decisions of a consociated church, hearing and determining cases of discipline or difficulty submitted to the consociation previous to trial, trial of pastors, accused of scandal or heresy or compliant or call of the association, and in general, deliberations and advice concerning matters of common interest to the churches" pg. 268.

Here again, the legislative seems blended with the judicial. "Previous to trial" cases of "discipline and difficulty" may be "heard and determined."

POWER OF ASSOCIATIONS.

"The associations and consociations have been co-extensive." [Hist. account pg. 47.] That is, they cover the same territory, commonly one but sometimes two, in a country. A delegation from these county associations, compose the General Association, all clergymen, of course. Yet, as will be seen, only a small part of the ministers of the state

came into the General association, a circumstance well calculated to bring the ministry and churches under the control of a few leading ministers. The associations, which contain a lay delegation, are only for each county. There is no general body in which the laity are represented at all. The General association, a body of select ministers, sometimes, if we remember correctly, less than 20 in number, have often assembled and by their decisions, on the most important questions, controlled virtually, all the ministers and churches in the state.* If is accounted the highest ecclesiastical body of the sect in the state, and its decisions, by usage and courtesy, have the force of law. Of this, the "Historical account" published by the General Association in 1843 bears explicit testimony.—After some allusions to the severe struggles even in that dead state of the church, with which the "Platform" had to contend, before the little remnant of Puritan piety and liberty could be brought under the yoke, "particularly the well known Wallingford case, in 1758," the "account" records, very complacently, the quiet that followed. "After this," continues the history the advice of the GENERAL ASSOCIATION was very generally adopted by the associations and consociations." Let the record be pondered. "After" the first "excitements had time to subside," (for so reads the record) after a few ineffectual struggles, and finding the fetters forged for them too strong to be easily broken, the whole body of churches and ministers, understanding, now, who their masters were, gave up further contention, and from that time to the present, the 16, 20, or 30 principal ministers, as the case may be, composing the General Association, have held undisputed dominion over the churches of Connecticut! In 1843, they publish the boastful "account" of it, themselves for the edification of the brotherhood, and the book, duly "entered according to act of Congress" is on the book sellers shelves.

Yet "the churches did not, at once, nor very soon, fall in with what was

* If I remember correctly, the General association of Connecticut, that assembled at Norfolk, in 1835 consisted of only 16 members proper, exclusive of a few Presbyterian ministers from other states. (I was in the room where they met, a few months since, and think it smaller than a common District School house.) But this little "conclave of the clergy, apart by themselves," closed every Congregational pulpit in the state against anti-slavery lecturers!

done," lb. pg. 51. And it should be remembered that "the well known Wallingford case, in 1758" which the General Assembly seem to regard as their great Waterloo victory over the laity, was a number of years after the terrible persecutions perpetrated by the General Association, in the days of Whitefield and Edwards. Of these we must speak, in due time. The weight of its iron arm when wielding the civil power, and exerting the "moral influence" of fines and imprisonments, inflicted upon holy christian ministers, "of whom the world was not worthy" had much to do in breaking down the feeble virtue of the times; onthroning a priestly caste upon the ruins of Puritanism, and consolidating the sepulchral order that now reigns over that wide moral waste, that like the mountains of Gilboa, receives neither the rain nor the dew.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS.

(Before we pass from our present standpoint, a few other particulars should be noted.

"Of the ministry" the Heads of agreement, say, "The ministerial office is instituted by Jesus Christ for the gathering, guiding, edifying, and governing of his church and to continue to the end of the world." pg. 254.

The right of governing the churches" is here explicitly challenged for "the ministry" exclusively. "This confirms all we have said of the identity of the principle of domination, in all the varied forms of an organized clerical caste."

The articles do not specify the number of delegates that a church may send to the consociation! The notes state that in previous councils, in Massachusetts, the churches had sent sometimes one delegate, sometimes five or ten or more, the vote of each member being of equal weight.—The fourth article, therefore, without fixing the number, provided as follows:

"That according to the common practice of our churches, nothing shall be deemed an act of judgment of any council, which hath not the majority of the elders" (i. e. ministers) "present, concurring, and such a number of the messengers present as makes a majority of the council, provided that if any such church shall not see cause to send any messengers to the council, or the persons chosen do not attend, neither of these shall be any obstruction to the proceedings of the council, or to validate any of their acts." pg. 270.

† But "the General association has no legislative or judicial power over ministers or churches." Certainly not. Its "advisory power" was amply competent to all this, of course. Its little finger was heavier than the whole carcass of any other ecclesiastical body ever known in America.

The design and operation of this is parent. Whether the weight of churches was equitably balanced equal numbers of delegates or no, framers of the article did not seem to care. But the laity must by no means preponderate over the clergy. Nothing could be done without a majority of the ministers present. But a measure gaining the consent of a majority of ministers might be carried with the votes of a small minority of the laity!

The Notes, page 60, inform us this article occasioned some dissatisfaction in some quarters. It is then added:

"There is a tradition also that this article intended to prevent the overpowering influence of the churches, as it was customary for those days, to send to consociations a number of delegates. The custom was an unhappy one, liable to abuse, and to become the occasion of satisfaction and mischief." lb.

"An unhappy custom" was it? For a church of probably 100 members to 5 or 10 votes in a council where a minister had a vote? Liable to abuse was it? "Dissatisfaction?" To what mischief? What mischief? Greater "abuse" than to give one minister the same weight in the council, as 50 or 100 laymen? If the churches with their 5 or 10 delegates were "dissatisfied" why should the ministers be? But it would be "mischief" to an ecclesiastical tribunal that could not be perfectly controlled by the clergy, in cases, a tribunal that had power, to try clergymen! The committee (271) in commenting upon this 4th article close their remarks, by saying, "In justice, the principle deemed objectionable by some, is now laid aside." What this refers to the manner of voting to the sending of a number of delegate messengers, we are not quite certain. But from the whole we should infer the churches now send only one delegate. And, from the "Digest of Rules and usages" pg. 299, we should infer the rule requiring a majority of the ministers was no longer followed, even in the consociations of Litchfield and New Haven East, in which "a majority of the elders must concur with a majority of the messengers," while in N. Haven west, two thirds of the ministers are necessary to the decision. In these variations, the preponderating unequal power of the clergy is preserved. "Being thus formed, the Platform sanctioned by the Colonial Legislature as soon as practicable, went into operation." pg. 88.

REMARKABLE FIRE.—Leonard Ba-
of New Haven, in 1833 or 4, made
of the most abusive and contemptu-
language concerning abolitionists, be-
cause they would not "cease the bewil-
dery of immediate emancipation."
abolitionism was the only wise and prac-
measure, then, in his view. But
1838 he is reported as having declared
in favor of immediate abolition.
speech before the General Assem-
of the New School Presbyterian
ch. And yet the dignified gentleman is
as abusive and contemptuous in his
towards abolitionists as ever!—
is only one specimen among thou-
of the spirit and temper of those
whom we are called to contend, in
struggle. It is, in fact, an exhibition
of real character, of the great major-
of those in the churches and especially
ministry, who do not enter heartily
through anti-slavery measures.—
the entire movement, in any
way. They contest the ground inch by
and when forced to yield, the argu-
item after item, instead of being
conciliated towards those who have
led them, their rage only increases.
more they are compelled to concede,
more bitter and abusive do they be-
come, just as men in desperation fight
fiercely when they are driven into a
corner, and do not mean to submit.

we should like to know whether
such a course and such a temper are char-
acteristic of good men? Would they
if they were humble and pious Chris-
tians be grateful to those who had helped
to correct their mistakes? Would
they not frankly acknowledge their error,
earnestly espouse the cause they had
served? On our own part, we want no better
proof than this, that the error lies not
in the head but in the heart, that it is re-
quiring grace that they need, and not
further light in the understanding.

Salem Church, Ross County, Ohio, has re-
ceived \$200 from the American Board, a com-
pensation for its urgent remonstrance against the pro-slavery
policy of the Board, to which they say, "We
have no relation to the Board, implying approbation
of the principles we have been reprobating."
This was said in evident reference to
language used by the American Board,
in which they declared they could sustain no
relation to slavery implying approbation.
The Salem church can see, plain-
ly enough, that the declaration of the
Board disclaiming approbation of slavery

was of no value, so long as they contin-
ued, in matter of fact, to uphold and sus-
tain pro-slavery churches among the
Choctaws and Cherokees. Why can-
not the Salem church see that its own dis-
claimer of approving the position of the
Board is equally of no value, so long as
it continues to sustain it? One can hardly
help feeling that there was something
like levity or jesting in this very singular
allusion, under such circumstances, to the
language of the Board. Could the
church have intended a serious remon-
strance by this message, along with its
\$200 donation, which the anti-slavery
Missionaries so much need, at this time?
What can men mean when they thus talk
one way, and act another? Or which do
they suppose speak loudest, their words,
or their acts? "We don't like your
principles, at all"—say they, to the
Board and to the Missionaries that frat-
ernally receive slave-holders. But here
are \$200 to help you carry out your
principles. "We agree with your prin-
ciples and approve your course," say they
(if their words mean any thing) to such
Missionaries as Lorin Andrews, J. S.
Green, and William Raymond—Go on!
with your self-denying labors, but we
have not a single cent to give you. We
have just contributed \$200 to sustain the
Missions which we highly disapprove, in
the hope that we shall be able to reform
them! No marvel that the wisdom of
the world is foolishness with God, if this
be a specimen of that wisdom. And sure-
ly, it cannot be any better kind of wis-
dom, the wisdom that is "first, pure."

CHURCH ACTION AGAINST PO- LITICAL ABOLITION.

After all that has been said about the
impropriety of ecclesiastical interference
with political questions, it turns out that
the very persons who have been loudest
in this clamor have been actually using
their ecclesiastical organizations, all the
time, for political purposes. An instance
of this is shown up, by the Editor of the
Cincinnati Weekly Herald. The Gen-
eral Conference of the Methodist Episco-
pal Church, in 1886, at Cincinnati, adop-
ted the following Resolution.

"Resolved by the Delegates of the Annual Con-
ference, 1st General Conference assembled, That
they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism,
and wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention, to
interfere in the civil and political relations between
master and slave, as it exists in the slaveholding
States of this Union."

The "civil and political" bearings of
this ecclesiastical resolution are apparent

indeed upon its very face. The Confer-
ence evidently volunteers its conservative
influence in favor of the "civil and politi-
cal relations between master and slave, as
it exists in the slave holding states in
this Union." Its disclaimer of "inter-
ference" was gratuitous and unmeaning,
unless the conference meant to say that
it was "opposed to modern abolition" be-
cause of its "interference in the civil and
political relations" &c. &c. But we are
not obliged to rest on any inferences of
our own. The Editor of the Western
Christian Advocate, defends the course
of the conference, as follows,

"By modern abolition, the General Conference
meant, and was so understood as meaning, the or-
ganization of abolition societies in free States for
the express purpose of doing away or abolishing
slavery in the slave States. The Conference
viewed recent abolition as operating in a civil or
political way, in reference to the civil character of
slavery. The Conference believed that the church
acted on slavery in its moral and ecclesiastical
character alone. The church foresaw, and facts
prove the correctness of her foresight, that the or-
ganized abolition societies would, ere long, be iden-
tified with some political party, or would form an
independent one."

In other words, the Methodist General
Conference foresaw that "modern aboli-
tion" would either succeed in arraying
one or both existing political parties
against the slave laws, or else, failing to
do so, would be driven to organize, as it
has since done, an anti slavery political
party of its own. And for this reason,
according to the Methodist Editor, the M.
B. Church was "wholly opposed to mo-
dern abolitionism!"

MORE TAYLORISM.—A correspondent
of the Liberty Press, from N. Haven,
speaking of Doctor Taylor, says as fol-
lows:

"He stated, not long since, in a lecture
before the Theological class, that he had
no doubt, if Christ was now on earth,
that he would, under certain circumstan-
ces, be a slaveholder. I have this from
students who heard it, some of them
agreeing with him in opinion, and some
not."

"We won't comment on such a sentiment.
If the Rev. Doctor thus teaches his Theo-
logical scholars, he does but teach his
"two devils" doctrine—that's all.—*Cort-
land Free American.*

**WHO ARE THE "TROUBLERS IN ISRA-
EL?"**—We take the liberty to give a
new caption to the following which we
find in bro. Leavitt's Emancipator.

WHO ARE THE POLITICAL ABOLITIONISTS?—Dur-
ing the discussions in the New School General
Assembly, the Rev. Mr. Page, of Perry, N. Y., said
he was not an abolitionist, but he felt bound to
correct the representations of some others in regard
to the political abolitionists. He came, he said, in

from the section where Myron Holley, first organized a district political party of abolitionists; he said at least one half the Clergy of that section were political abolitionists, more than one half of the Elders are the same, and one half or more of the members are also political abolitionists. They are members of Bible Societies, and although more than one half of his own church members were abolitionists, he was constrained to say, they were the very salt of the earth in that section."

We were not aware that political abolitionists were so numerous in that region as Mr. Page is said to have reported them. But waiving the question of numbers and making all due abatements on that score, we have a word to say in reference to the testimony here given. Without boasting we may intimate that a similar testimony and on as good grounds, might perhaps be borne in all the free states, and that, to our certain knowledge it has been borne, in many of them, by ministers and church members who are not abolitionists and whose position enables them to judge. Now notice another fact. The "political abolitionists," especially in Central and Western New York, where that movement originated, are the very men who have been most complained of for "disturbing the peace of the churches" to which they belonged, by their agitations on the subject, some of them taking measures for seceding and organizing new churches. [And hence the National Anti Slavery Standard that opposed distinct political organization opposed the movement for distinct church organization, for a long time, on the same grounds, though more recently, that paper has come into the hands of those who are for church secession (without reference to new organizing,) but not in favor of political secession, except by not voting, and thus seceding from the Union.] We do not know of a single individual in favor of the stand by the "Christian Investigator" on the subject of secession, and re-organization of churches, who is not a political abolitionist, though we are sorry that many political abolitionists do not yet come into the measure. The most efficient and consistent political abolitionists are, with few exceptions, the very men to whom the enterprise of church reform, as we advocate it, looks for support.

This testimony concerning the marked and decided christian character of these "troublers in Israel," is an item in the ecclesiastical history of our times, that should not be lost, and it would not be very difficult to collect a pretty formidable list of testimonies, (mostly verbal, to be sure,) very similar to this which is said to have fallen from the lips of Mr. Page.— If "political abolitionists" in Massachu-

setts, or any where else, connected with churches at all, or supporting them, expect to maintain their political fidelity for any long time, without becoming ecclesiastical abolitionists, we think they will find their mistake, or at least, the community will find it out for them, as indeed they are beginning to do, in some cases, already.

"SLAVERY AND SANCTIFICATION."

Under this head, a writer in the Western Citizen of April 15, relates the following incident, which perfectly agrees with many other things that have been witnessed, within a few years past. "It is painful to know and to record such facts, but little or nothing can be done for the revival of a pure religion, until men learn to detect and repudiate the false."

During the period when the churches and houses of colored people were being destroyed by mobs, the Methodist Episcopal Church papers were zealously enforcing the great doctrine of sanctification upon the members, and so absorbed were they in this subject, that the prevailing outrages seemed only to be regretted, lest they might interfere with its attainment. The then editor of the N. Y. Advocate denounced the celebrated Geo. Thompson as a foreign renegade and incendiary, and seemed to exult when he was driven from the country.

OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Civil government may be defined to be that control which God requires every community of men to hold over its members.

The nature and extent of the powers of government are accordingly, to be defined and limited by the nature and extent of that control which it is practicable and proper for human beings to maintain over human beings. It must be such as does not interfere with their free moral agency, in the exercise of their original rights.

The nature of man, as a free moral agent, and his position, as occupying a state of probation, preparatory of a review of his conduct and a righteous award by the Great Judge, forbid that the control of man over man should be extended beyond the absolute necessities of his condition, and the incidental illustration of the nature of the divine government therein involved.

The essential equality of man with man, the need that both ruler and subject have of a common ruler over them and umpire between them, the fallibility of

the ruler, and the danger that the abuse of power will render its power despotic, are considerations which the propriety of restricting the functions of civil government within narrow well defined bounds.

In a consideration of the question whether this or that particular work society should be committed to civil government it is not enough to show that wants of human society require that office work to be done. There remains still further inquiry, whether civil government is the appropriate instrument or agency to be employed.

In all such inquiries it is important to remember that whatever is done by government is done with authority forced by compulsion and that this authority and this compulsion are to be exercised by fallible man over his fellow man.

Nor may it be assumed that civil government is bound to provide for all that is indispensable to the existence and the fulfilment of civil government like. For this is beyond the capacities of government, which (as Montaigne observes) can never be wholly upheld by its own coercive power.

HEAR PRES. BLANCHARD.

In a Letter to the Editor of the Western Citizen, and for the use of W. A. S. Convention, Pres. J. Blanchard Galesbury, (Ill.) writes as follows:—"Men may differ as to the proper method of organizing political parties, church organizations, Boards for Missionary and other benevolent institutions, but no mind who has once received a just impression of the inherent injustice and wickedness of slave-holding, can fail to perceive and admit, of organization which fellowship or upholds the wrong of man or the holding of men enslaved, ought long retain the confidence of pious and moral men. This once admitted, the points in main are not questions of principle, but of wisdom settling which charity may easily bear with the argument falls to correct."

Pres. Blanchard is a very careful and looks well ahead; before he takes onward movement. When such express themselves in this manner, depend upon it there is an under current work that is preparing to carry many who are not now unconscious influence. Great changes are before

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, July, 1847.

J. Richmond, Liveria, 1.00	W. P. Greer, Troy, 1.00
J. Stunt, E. Cayuga, 1.00	J. T. Dickinson, Durham, Conn.
Gertrude Smith, Peterboro, 10.00	W. Lyman, do.
G. W. Barber, Hudson, Ohio, 0.50	R. Fletcher, Astoria, Ill.
O. Allen, Ovid, 1.50	J. Gaston, Gap, Conn.
W. H. Burdell, Danversville, 1.00	C. T. Gaston, Libby, Ill.
J. Hillman, Clyde, 0.75	T. W. Merrill, Greenland, do.
W. H. Childs, Niagara Falls, 1.00	M. Hoxen, Honesky, do.
M. Buckney, Lockport, 1.00	L. B. Lane, Oberlin, do.
G. G. Jessup, Pakeny, 0.50	E. Hinchcock, Peru, do.
J. C. Habcock, Phelps, 0.50	H. Harwell, Oak Co., do.
P. Z. Gates, Augusta, 2.00	A. G. Allen, Gilbert Mills, do.
Dr. Gaylord, Sodus, 0.50	H. Giblin, do.
J. Mills, Perryville, 0.50	M. McCann, do.
J. F. Clark, Sandwich, 1.00	J. Kendall, do.
T. Nash, do. 1.00	
T. Nash, do. 1.00	
S. H. Allen, do. 1.00	

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. V—No. 8 }
WHOLE NUMBER, 64.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. AUGUST, 1847.

{ WILLIAM GOODALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separately, from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz: Fifty, per dozen, \$0 30 | Sixty papers, - \$2 00
Twenty-eight papers for 100 | One hundred papers, \$20.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EXHIBITED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. IX.

SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM OF NEW ENGLAND CONGREGATIONALISM.—POWER OF CLERICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

We have traced, in the preceding numbers, the decline and subversion of Puritanism and Independency in America.—We have witnessed, at every step in this decline, the corresponding rise of the clerical power. We have arrived at the period in which the fire of puritan piety, as well as the light of the puritan doctrines, had well nigh gone out, and the landmarks of puritan church order and discipline were nearly all swept away or removed. Even the theology of the puritan creed, was faintly held, if at all, and those highest in ecclesiastical influence were farthest removed from the faith and holiness of the pilgrim fathers. All this, had we no other data, might be inferred from the distinctive features of the Saybrook Platform, as well as from the course of events and habits of feeling which gave rise to it. All accounts agree in the general fact that "the state of religion was low," that conversions were rare, and that the church was vain to perpetuate herself by the reception of "half-way" Christians! Equally undeniable is it that even the theory of regeneration had been, to a very great extent, displaced, among large numbers of the ministers, by the notion that human depravity, if there were indeed any such thing,

which some questioned, was by no means so deep and inveterate as to require a radical change. A little gradual amendment might indeed be very well, but for this the sacrament of the supper, (the holy eucharist, so potent in the second and third centuries, of similar ecclesiastical features) was deemed amply sufficient, if administered by duly authorized hands, and whatever was needed in addition to the benefits of infant baptism, (which was the qualification for "half-way" church membership,) could be readily thus supplied, and the amphibious disciple prepared, whenever he pleased, for promotion to a "full communion," to repeat the term then in current use.*

There are many reasons why the spiritual and theological, as well as the ecclesiastical features of this period should be carefully marked. Affinities reveal themselves here, that should not be unobserved. Evangelical piety does not thrive under the shadow of a growing or matured hierarchy; and the soul-humbling yet life-sustaining doctrines of a pure gospel are not the foundations upon which imposing ecclesiastical edifices are to be reared.—If too deeply imbedded to be removed, they must be smothered into silence and covered over into forgetfulness by thick layers of ritual formality and worldliness. For fifteen centuries previous to the culmination of ecclesiastical power in New England, these methods had been uniformly in requisition in the old world, and the exception was not now to be witnessed in which the tree should be found diverse from its fruits.

There is another lesson, supplied by this record, which cannot be too faithfully conned. As Puritanism has had to bear the reproach of being a persecuting religion, because the persecuted Puritanism of Roger Williams' day neglected promptly to secede from the apostacy which had usurped the puritan name, just so the evangelical theology has still to bear the odium of the Saybrook Platform and its

* Isaac Taylor, in his "Ancient Christianity," has noticed the fact and analyzed the theory of that remarkable usage of the third and fourth centuries, the deferring of the use of the "holy eucharist" by a large portion of the people until the apparent approach of death. Something of the same feeling and usage arising from similar causes were witnessed during the experiment of the "half-way covenant" in New England.

despotic doings, because the little remnant of living evangelical Christians in the churches at that period, and against whom it was designed to operate, did not do themselves and their religion the justice to come out from under the anti-evangelical arrangements and unevangelical clergy by whom the persecution of evangelical ministers and laymen was perfected and carried on. This is nothing new under the sun. The evangelical party in the Church of England, whenever there has been any there, deserving the name, has always had to stand in the awkward position of being at once the victim of persecution and the chief element of the continued credit and perpetuated influence of the persecuting power! What pious Christian ever looks with an eye of filial or brotherly regard upon that Church without being led to do so by the thought that such precious names as those of Whitefield, Wesley, Newton, Cowper, and Thomas Scott were connected with that communion? Who thinks with respect of the Romish Church, without reference to such names as Fenelon and Guyon? What keeps in countenance and repulse the Saybrook Platform hierarchy but the memory of the Edwardses, Brainerds, Tennants, Bellamys and Hopkiness, whose names have somehow become associated with it? How could the Pharisees in our Saviour's day, have spared the capital they had inherited from the prophets whose blood had been shed by just such men as themselves? Or who can doubt that if the Churches of America, of the present day shall be remembered with any degree of respect a century hence, it will be because the then honored names of Emmons, Lovejoy, Torrey and their co-adjutors in the cause of holy christian freedom and reformation will have been found there enrolled? And how readily it slips from the recollections of men that these time-honored worthies, so far from being specimens of the prominent religionists of their own times, were rather exceptions to the general rule, and if not actually crushed to death under the persecuting hierarchies to which they lent the most effective support, were kept, all their lives long, under the ban of proscription and hate, barely tolerated by the

communions to which, for the most part, they but made a shift to adhere, not perhaps without conscientious qualms, misgivings, or doubts, and always at the expense of being hampered, crippled, and half shorn of their strength to do good, and well nigh furnished, heart broken, chilled, or spiritually fettered, in their own souls, for want of the christian co-operation and sympathy which they needed, but could not, in their anomalous position receive! Thus it is that the very best of men remaining in corrupt communions, in violation of Christ's explicit command to "come out of" them, become partakers, more or less, in their sins, and receive, more or less, of their punishment. All this we can see clearly enough, in turning over the pages of *D'Aubigne*—but how slow of heart we are to see the same thing acting over again, in our own midst! Who can tell how much christianity has been dishonored and kept under the iron hoof and yet within the polluting embraces of anti-Christ, how many generations of men have been kept in baptised heathenism or driven into stark infidelity by this unholy amalgamation of elements that the Great Head of the Church had solemnly and authoritatively divorced!

Would to God that the little remnant of true Christians in New England, in the early part of the last century, could have heard and honored the divine summons to separate themselves from an ambitious, unconverted, unevangelical hierarchy—from a worldly and unregenerated church! The history at which we are now to direct our attention would never have been written, then, or would have assumed altogether, another aspect. Whatever of ungodliness and violence might have marked that period, they would not have been so skilfully commingled, as by Satanic art, with the remnant of the true seed, as to draw sustenance and secure transmission to the former, from the admixture of the latter. The true theology, to-day, would not have to bear the disgrace of an *apparent* identification with its persecutors of a century ago.—Nor would the Saybrook Platform or the "General Association of Connecticut" have retained the power of excluding anti-slavery lecturers from the Churches in that State in 1830, as they had excluded Whitefield and his fellow laborers nearly an hundred years before. Nor, at the present time, should we witness the

strength of the ecclesiastical bands which bind hundreds of sincere but miseducated Christians, as by a stern necessity, to arrangements from which, in their innermost souls, they instinctively recoil, and to ecclesiastical bodies which they cannot but regard with hearty disgust.

But we are anticipating the history of which we must hasten to present some brief outlines. We cannot longer pause upon the general and every-day workings of a system, by which, among other characteristic incidents, the regular resident of the "rural parish," whatever his religious views, was "taxed" for the support of the "parish minister," under the laws of the Colony, the non-payment of which, in due season, subjected the delinquent to a legal process, the distraint and seizure, in many an instance, of the poor man's only cow! We must hasten onward to notice the repetition, in Connecticut, of the standing contest of the fifteen centuries previous, between the spirit of evangelical Christianity, whenever, to any depth and extent, revived and developed, with the ever incumbent night-mare of an organized clerical caste, sitting "in-conclave apart from the people."

"THE GREAT AWAKENING."

"The year 1737 was distinguished for an extraordinary excitement throughout New England, on the subject of religion. The attention of thousands was arrested, converts to the faith of the people were multiplied, and vast numbers united themselves to the Churches in the land. In some places, unhappily, a degree of extravagance prevailed, which among many, brought the work into discredit, and by such it was strongly opposed. "The good effects of this work, among many, were long happily seen. They adorned their professions and became strong pillars in the Church of God. With others, the excitement was only temporary, and among these latter, a serious defection took place. Errors and corruptions greatly increased and sadly marred the beauty of the spiritual edifices of the land."—[Goodrich's Church History, page 260.]

In the vague impression commonly afloat among Congregationalists and Presbyterians, at the present day, concerning this "great awakening" in which President Edwards, President Finley, Davenport, Whitefield, Pomeroy, Tennant and others bore so prominent a part, the erroneous idea is commonly included that those names, now so venerable and honored, were equally honored then, that they held positions of influence in the ecclesiastical arrangements of their own times, that the Saybrook Platform, with its powerful machinery must have been wielded by such men, or the like of them, that, at least there must have been a hearty co-operation and tender sympathy between the governing clergy of New England and the instruments and agents of

the "Great Awakening," a hundred years ago. Almost universal, among the mass of the people, at the present time, if we mistake not, is this mischievous illusion, even among New-Englanders and especially their descendants in the Middle and Western States. With the religious portion of them, it would be almost impiety and sacrilege to call in question the propriety and the godly influence of the ecclesiastical arrangements of New England in the times of the Edwardses, Brainerds, Bellamy and Hopkins, so perfectly associated together, in their minds, are those arrangements and those names. On the other hand, among the *irreligious* who happen to know anything of the oppressions and persecutions perpetrated under those arrangements, the names of Edwards, Brainerd, Bellamy and Hopkins, along with the evangelical doctrine taught by them, are instinctively loathed because of the supposed identification of such men and their doctrines with such measures! What vast mischief to religion would be averted, could this illusion be dispelled! The history we are about recording may do something to this end. The only real difficulty is that the persecuted evangelical party (like the persecuted abolitionists of our own times) did continue, and under the same false notions of policy, a nominal connexion with the anti-Christian power of the dominant clergy. This error, as it can never be excused, can never be so explained as wholly to save evangelical religion, or rather the evangelical party in the church from the disgrace of it. Thus must even truth and wisdom suffer from their contact with error and folly. What communion hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial?

"Extravagances"—"errors"—"corruptions"—"defections"—says the historian, "sadly marred the beauty of the spiritual edifices of the land." Very likely. But did the writer, or does the reader rightly apprehend wherein they consisted? Or what it was that was "marred?" Those "spiritual edifices" that were composed chiefly at the outburst of the "great awakening" of "half-way covenant" members who thought it evidence of fanaticism to profess any experimental knowledge of regeneration; and were governed by "masters in Israel" who were as much amazed as ever Nicodemus was, at the mention of the new birth—were such "spiritual edifices marred" by the introduction of new members

who had been born of God and who adorned their profession?"

That there was ignorance and fanaticism among the new converts may be easily conceived. The school in which they had been trained was directly calculated to develop such results, whenever the occasion should be furnished by any earnest attention at all to religion. The superstitious ritualism in which they had been schooled was but the traditional, second hand fanaticism of its inventors, crusted over by time, and handed down to them. To be in earnest about religion, and yet be so ill informed as to recognize such "edifices" as "spiritual" was to breathe an atmosphere in which spiritual order and "beauty" could hardly be expected to thrive. Whatever "disorders" sprang up among them, could there have been anything more disorderly than the engrafting of living spiritual members upon the dry and sapless trunk of a dead and withered Church? Here was "a serious defection," doubtless, nor can we wonder that "errors and corruptions greatly increased." If any one is incredulous, or marvels that the spiritual fathers of the "great awakening" should have silently admitted such disorders, we might present a parallel case in the most successful and celebrated "revival preachers" of the present age, who published, in a religious journal, some years ago, his conviction that the majority of the new converts apostatized in the very act of joining the church, but whose influence then and since has been steadily exerted against the "come out-ism" that would enroll the disciples of Christ by themselves in a "spiritual edifice" that should not knowingly be "marred" with ungodly members. Such sad work in the strongest and best minds is made by the mania of maintaining the outward unity and unbroken continuity of whatever is called "the Church" and especially of the undisturbed "succession" of an organized clerical body.

It would be an interesting inquiry, if we had time and materials to do it justice, what was it, after all, that was considered "extravagant," fanatical and disorderly, in the converts of the "great awakening," by that portion of the ministers who were of evangelical sentiments, and, on the whole, favored the reformation then in progress? The only documentary evidence at hand, while we are now writing, and perhaps the very best, the most ample, the most impartial and discriminating that

has come down to us is "Edwards on the Revival"—a well known and very interesting volume, containing allusions to a great variety of particulars and introducing the reader into the very spirit of the times of the writer. President Edwards was one of the chief promoters of the work, but conceded that there were many defects and disorders. His discriminations, to a great extent, are exceedingly judicious and valuable. The work should be studied by all who would understand modern revivals. And many things which he describes and condemns as objectionable are well deserving of censure.

But what shall we say of the writer's condemnation of such alleged disorders as the following, viz:

(1.) The habit of some who were more "laymen" of attempting to judge of the characters and Christian experiences of ministers and private members "on the principle that the power of judging and openly censuring others should not be reserved in the hands of particular persons or consistories, appointed thereto, but ought to be left at large for any body that pleases to take it upon them, or that think themselves fit for it."—[page 254.]

(2.) The growing opinion that some of the new converts were fit to be licensed and ordained to the ministry, though they had never been regularly educated at "College," and that such a practice might be safely introduced! [page 255-6.]

(3.) The practice among spiritual Christians "of censuring others that are professing Christians, in good standing in the visible Church, as unconverted!" [Page 281. In what consisted "good standing in the visible Church" at that time, the reader of the previous number has already been told!

(4.) "The censuring of ministers" by laymen, and speaking of them as "unconverted persons." [Page 282 and onward.] The author (page 289) takes the ground that the people are not to determine, in respect to their ministers "how far opposing this work is consistent with a state of grace." Again he says—"God seems strictly to have forbidden this practice, of our judging our brethren in the visible Church." But what constitutes membership in the visible Church, according to the evangelical doctrines, if it be not credible evidence of piety, and who are to judge of their fitness for reception, if not the brotherhood? And what distinction can be drawn between receiving and retaining members?

In the prosecution of this discussion the writer remarks as follows:

"In those places where it is the manner to receive such and such only, to the communion of the visible Church, as recommending themselves by giving a satisfactory account of their inward experiences, these Christians may openly distinguish such persons in their speech and ordinary behavior, with a visible separation, without being inconsistent with themselves. And I do not now pretend to meddle with that controversy, whether such an account of experience be requisite to Church fellowship; but certainly, to admit persons to communion with us, as brethren in the visible Church, and then visibly to reject them, and to make an open distinction between them and others, by different names and appellations" (as "brother or sister") is to be inconsistent with ourselves, it is to make a visible Church within the visible Church, and visibly to divide between sheep and goats, setting one on the right hand and the other on the left. This bitter root of censoriousness must be rooted out, as we would prepare the way of the Lord.—[p. 290-1.]

The inconsistency of these new converts, gathered into "half way covenant" churches, and other churches perhaps, of a similar character, and yet undertaking to set out their evangelical sentiments and Christian instincts, was obvious enough, to be sure. But what could be more "disorderly" than their being there, at all, taking the Puritan fathers or the New Testament Christians, or the faithful of the intervening ages, from Novatian to Luther, as their exemplars? What is Church organization, or what is it for, if it be not "visibly to divide between the sheep and the goats"—"between him that serveth God and him that regardeth him not," according to the approving prediction by Malachi? How are we to understand President Edwards' labored neutrality, but half revealed bias concerning "that controversy?" And what became of the "great awakening" when that "bitter root of censoriousness" that "discerned between the righteous and the wicked" was "totally rooted out?"

(5.) Another disorder, to be corrected, according to President Edwards, was the Apostolic and Puritan practice of public lay exhortation, which broke down the grand distinction between ministers and laymen. [Page 294, and onward.] All the mutual exhortation the author admits is that of personal "Christian Conversation." No layman must set himself up as a public teacher, nor speak with the "authority" which is becoming and proper in a duly inducted minister, to whom alone it pertains "to teach and govern the flock." And he undertakes to define the lay exhortation or preaching which is improper.

"A man may be said to set himself up as a public teacher, when he, in a set speech, of design, directs himself to a multitude, either in the meeting house or elsewhere, as looking that they should compose themselves to attend to what he has to say." "and more still, when meetings are appointed, on purpose to hear lay persons ex-

hort, and they take it as their business to be speakers, when they expect that others should come, and compose themselves, and attend as hearers; when private Christians take it upon themselves in private meetings, to act as the ministers or presidents of the assembly, and accordingly from time to time, to teach and exhort the rest, this has the appearance of authoritative teaching." [Page 200] "No man but a minister that is duly appointed to that sacred calling, ought to follow teaching and calling, or so as to neglect that which is his proper calling." [Page 300.]

Whether this sounds most like Paul or Chrysostom, the reader will judge. A volume of history is revealed in this brief extract. We see to what depths the sons of the pilgrim puritans had fallen. We see the fact that the "great awakening" brought up the subjects of it, at once to the exercise of their rights and privileges as Christian freemen, as by the very instincts of their newly received spiritual nature. That they sometimes exercised their long dormant and abused gifts, somewhat awkwardly and unskillfully, we may readily conceive. We see the fact that this natural exercise of the functions of their new spiritual life, brought them, at once, into collision with the organized, self-appointed, self-perpetuating clerical body. We see the fact that even the chief instruments of the revival, by their unhappy connexion with this clerical body, were so bewildered as to set themselves at work to prevent the growth and mature perfection of the Christian fruits of their own evangelic preaching. We see the secret of the clerical persecution of the revival preachers, notwithstanding, for the most part, their continued fealty to the distinctive principles and claims of the clerical order. We see, finally, in the sequel of the story, the necessary termination of "the great awakening" as soon as the combined clerical body, including the promoters and opposers of the work, had succeeded in suppressing what the clergy considered "disorderly," as infringing upon their cherished monopolies. It will have been noticed that all the alleged "disorders" we have here cited from the pen of President Edwards (though he does speak of others, of a different character) were such as interfered directly or indirectly with the supposed peculiar immunities of the clergy, or put to hazard the unity of the anomalous bodies called churches, consisting of professed "half-way" Christians and Christians, upon which, as a basis, the hierarchical system reposed for its support.

THE SEPARATISTS.

That President Edwards discountenanced the Separatists who seceded from these Churches, may be readily inferred, and,

if we rightly remember, this appears in some portion of his writings, though we do not now light upon any direct allusion to it, in the volume before us, which may perhaps, have been written before the separations took place. It is well known that the seceders, however slandered, vilified and persecuted in their time—for the heaviest bolts of clerical vengeance fell upon them—comprized a large portion of the most burning and shining lights of their day, whose steady, consistent and exemplary piety did honor to their Christian profession, and the avow of whose godly walk in their families and neighborhoods contributed largely to transmit to us, of the present generation, the best impressions and influences that have reached us from what is now known as the Edwardean or Whitefieldian age.—Traditionary illustrations have come down to us, revealing what none of our books, all written by clergymen, have preserved, concerning the Separatists of the last century. There may have been some wrong things among them, but we should receive with great caution, the representations of their clerical opposers, whether of the evangelical or anti-evangelical school. However honest and intelligent, they must have been under a very strong bias, as the highest conceivable "disorder" in their view, was secession from the regularly constituted churches, whether one in ten of the members, or whether the minister even, believed in any such thing as regeneration or no, or whether they promoted or opposed the revival. One thing is certain. The parishes and neighborhoods known as having been the seats of the secession, were among the few spots recognized by evangelical ministers, in the early part of the present century, as exhibiting unequivocal signs of spiritual life, though the secession churches had become absorbed in the regular bodies. Sometimes this re-union was effected from the improved condition of the old churches, in parishes where the fact of secession had recalled general attention to neglected truths. In other cases, the decline of piety among the seceders led to their re-absorption. Or, more generally, perhaps, the reflex influence of both the preceding causes, led to a compromise, in which the "half-way covenant" was relinquished, by the one party, and a less rigid scrutiny of the Christian experience of candidates insisted upon, by the others. The general facts are unchanged and undeniable. The soundest, the most evan-

gelical, the most godly portion of the laity of the Churches were most inclined to secession. The Separatists embodied, preserved and transmitted the remaining leaven of piety, after the first excitement had subsided. The decline of the work of the Spirit and the decreased tendency to separation kept pace with each other. And, finally, the re-union of the two parties marked the period of the termination of the "great awakening," or, at least, of its decidedly marked and visibly enjoyed fruits. We do not mean that the great body of the spiritual members seceded. They did not, as the majority of the Puritans did not separate from the Church of England. They did not, and the disastrous consequences of their error have not yet ceased. The state of the Churches, now, is the result of that error.—The state of religion might have been a century in advance of its present position, had such men as Edwards been able to disentangle themselves from their ecclesiastical arrangements. From that time to the present, revivals of religion have followed the same precedent and run in the same channel. Each fresh accession of new converts has been absorbed and smothered in the old churches, under the preponderating influence of a worldly membership, and an aspiring hierarchy, where their salt has barely sufficed to preserve from absolute putrefaction and decomposition, an ecclesiastical polity intrinsically vicious and incurably evil, because based upon the communion of light with darkness, and attempting the concord of Christ with Belial. What Albert Barnes says of the evangelical clergy in the Church of England is, in substance, almost equally true of the really evangelical ministers (for all are evangelical in profession) in the nominally orthodox churches of New England.—That which their position obliges them to recognize as Christian, contradicts their definition of what Christianity is, and their sermons are neutralized by their ecclesiastical relations.

THE PERSECUTION.

But, we must hasten to record the persecution of the revivalists, the attempted suppression of the "great awakening," and the signal punishment of the separatists in particular, by the organized clerical body in Connecticut, in the appropriate use of their well constructed Saybrook Platform, and wielding, through the influence of their "General Association" of ministers, the willingly exerted author-

by of the secular power. If the reader shall have duly pondered the state of the churches, the character of the dominant clergy, the nature and workings of their ecclesiastical polity, and the union of the Church with the State, as exhibited in our former numbers, he will see at a glance, why all these confederated influences must have instinctively combined to oppose any thing like a revival of evangelical piety, directly tending to agitate and thus emancipate the popular mind, to en- throne conscience, to teach men to think, act, speak, and judge for themselves—and above all, to disturb that quiet harmony of religion and worldliness in the churches, upon which, as a broad basis, the whole hierarchical structure, and the union of Church and State, reposed. Not more readily did the same description of men, in our day, anticipate the disturbance of the Church—as they understood the term—when the Bastile of chattel enslavement was assailed.

The “great awakening,” as we have said, commenced in the year 1737.—“Mr. Whitefield arrived in America, it being his second visit, in 1739.” [Vide Goodrich, pg. 263.] “The old-side-men, under the influence of prejudice, regarded their opponents (the revivalists) as a body of extravagant and ignorant enthusiasts.” [ib.] This is said of Presbyterians in New York and New Jersey, but the same was true also among the Congregationalists of New England; and in Connecticut, early measures were devised, for counteracting the apprehended mischief. In Trumbull’s History of Conn., which contains an ample account of the origin, structure, and workings of the Saybrook Platform, this instance of its efficiency occupies a prominent place.—A few selections will put the reader in possession of some of the leading facts. We cannot pause to show how, in 1723, “the Rogerites, Quakers, and Baptists” in Connecticut, were subject to persecutions under the same “Constitution of the Churches.” [Trumbull, Vol II. pg. 33.] We come direct to the matter in hand.

The work of preparation appears to have been commenced in the Association of Ministers, and through their influence, the Legislature of the Colony was induced to call a “General Council at Guilford” which was held in November, 1741. Before its sittings, however, the precaution was taken, of maturing its measures in a more select and exclusively clerical

body. Accordingly, the “New Haven Association” drew up several Resolutions to be laid before the grand Council, about to set at “Guilford” among which was the following; viz:

“That for a minister to enter into another minister’s parish and preach, and administer the seals of the covenant, without the consent of, or in opposition to, the settled minister of the parish, is disorderly, notwithstanding, if a considerable number of the people in the parish are desirous to hear another preacher, provided the same be orthodox, and not notoriously faulty in censuring other persons, or guilty of any other scandal, we think it, ordinarily, advisable for the minister to assent to them; by giving his consent, upon their suitable application for it, unless neighboring ministers should advise him to the contrary.” [ib. pg. 193.]

Let it be remembered that the soil of Connecticut, every square rod of it, belonged to the “parish” of some Congregational minister. The right, then, to enter the State, and preach, without the leave of a Congregational pastor, was denied. Have we cited anything from Ignatius, or can there be, or from any of the Bishops of the ancient churches, that exceeds this?

The Grand Council of Guilford convened and reiterated the doctrine. “For a minister to enter into another minister’s parish and preach,” &c., “without the consent of, or in opposition to, the settled minister of the parish, is disorderly.”—[ib. pg. 224.]

Upon this, the historian, Trumbull, remarks, in a note:

“From this scrap of the doings at Guilford, which is all that I have ever been able to obtain, it appears that the extraordinary law for punishing ministers, HAD ITS ORIGIN IN THE CLERGY, who were opposed to the work” [i. e. to the religious awakening] “then in the country.” [ib.]

We will, next, record the Preamble and state the main provisions of this “extraordinary law” of the Colonial Legislature of Connecticut, enacted in May, 1742.

“Whereas, the Assembly did, by their Act, made in the 27th year of the reign of Queen Anne, establish and confirm a Confession of Faith, and an Agreement for Ecclesiastical Discipline, made at Saybrook, Anno Domini 1709, by the Reverend Elders, and Messengers delegated by the Churches in this Colony, for that purpose, under which Establishment his Majesty’s subjects in this Colony have enjoyed great peace and quietness, till of late, sundry persons have been guilty of disorderly and irregular practices, whereupon this Assembly did direct the calling of a General Council at Guilford in November last, which said Convention convened accordingly; at which Convention it was endeavored to prevent the growing disorders among the ministers that have been ordained or licensed by the Associations in the government, to preach;—and likewise to prevent divisions and disorders among the Churches and Ecclesiastical Societies settled by order of their Assembly.

“Notwithstanding which, divers of the ministers ordained, as aforesaid, and others licensed to preach, by some of the Associations allowed by law, have taken upon them, without any lawful call, to go into parishes, immediately under the care of other ministers, and there to preach and teach the people, and also sundry persons, who are very illiterate, and have no ecclesiastical character, or any authority, whither, to preach, or teach, have taken it upon themselves publicly to teach and exhort the people, in matters of religion, both as to doctrine and practice, which practices have a tendency to make division and contention among the people in this Colony, and destroy the Ecclesiastical Constitution

established by the laws of this Government, and also to hinder the growth and increase of vital godliness and piety in the Churches, and also to introduce unqualified persons into the ministry, and more especially, where one Association doth intermeddle with the affairs, that, by the platform and agreement above said, made at Saybrook, aforesaid, are properly within the province and jurisdiction of another Association, as to the licensing persons to preach, and ordaining ministers, &c.—Therefore,

Be it enacted, &c. [Sect. 1 takes away the salaries of offending ministers. Sect. 2 does the same to ministers who, in Association, interfere with the “rights” of other ministers. Sect. 3, 4 and 5 provides for the further punishment of offenders by fines, and sending out of the Colony as vagrants.—Vide Trumbull’s Hist. II. pg. 164.]

If any one should doubt whether Trumbull was correct in supposing that this “extraordinary law” “had its origin in the clergy”—after having compared it with the proceedings of the Council in Guilford and of the New Haven Association, and observing how the three were connected together, we will now invite him to accompany us a little farther, and notice how the law was regarded by clerical bodies afterwards.

“The Association of New Haven County, regularly convened at Wallingford, Sept. 23, 1742,” adopted an Address to the Legislature expressing “our grateful sense of the goodness of the General Assembly in May last, in so caring for our religious interests, and ecclesiastical constitution.” [i. e. the Saybrook Platform] and our just apprehensions of their wisdom in making the Statute entitled “An Act for regulating abuses and correcting disorders in ecclesiastical affairs,” and pray that it may be continued in force, being satisfied that it hath already been, in good measure, serviceable, and persuaded that it will be more so.” [ib. pg. 165.]

We will now notice the grounds the clergy had for saying the statute had been “serviceable” to them, and was likely to be more so.

President Finley of New Jersey, accepted an invitation of a Church of Presbyterians in New Haven, to preach to them. But New Haven was, of course, within the geographical jurisdiction of the Association and Consociation for New Haven County. And the invitation had been accepted without the advice and consent of the “regular ecclesiastical bodies.” By virtue of the law of May, 1742, President Finley was accordingly banished from the State as a vagrant, or notified to depart. [Vide Trumbull II. pg. 176.]

Mr. Davenport was banished to Long Island, under the same act. [ib.]

Benjamin Pomeroy, another minister, was also arrested, under the same law, and treated so rudely that the MOB were emboldened “to throw him down the stairs of the State House,” A. D. 1742. [ib. 168.] They “forbade his going into the meeting house,” and “lodged a certificate against him,” when he preached in the grove. [ib.]

Others “arrested Rev. John Owen, of Groton, and brought him before the Assembly” [i. e. the Legislature] “to answer for hard speeches, scan-

delisting the laws and officers of the government, and for branding principles tending to bring the government into contempt." [Ib. pg. 174.]

Certain "exhorters and lay preachers" at Canterbury "were imprisoned" under the same law. [Ib. page 178.] On this, Mr. Trumbull remarks—"These proceedings tended to alienate the minds of the people, more and more, from the Constitution of the standing churches," (i. e. the Saybrook Platform.)

Verbal tradition has embalmed the memory of Benjamin Cleveland, a lay preacher, one of the sufferers at Canterbury, a man of rare gifts and deep piety. Trumbull makes no particular mention of him, but gives an account of two young men, John and Ebenezer Cleveland, brothers, students at Yale College. They are believed to have been nephews of Benjamin Cleveland. Being on a visit to Canterbury, they attended the meeting of these "exhorters and lay preachers" (and probably heard their uncle preach.) For this offence on their return to New Haven, they were both expelled from College, by President Clapp with the Rectors and Tutors. Trumbull, who records this, adds the following particulars.

"John Cleveland, it seems, had joined in full communion with the Church in Canterbury, and, according to the account which is given of the matter, the President had before owned and communed with him, as a brother in Christ. The Church in which he had joined in worship, was the very Church with which he had covenanted, and with which they had both worshipped. Their parents worshipped there. [Ib. page 182-3.]

It is further recorded that "the meeting house" in Canterbury was "locked up against the Church," [page 182.] Meanwhile, the action at Yale College ripened into a standing regulation for the future.

The President and Faculty enacted a College law, "that no scholar, under pretence of religion, shall go to any public or private meeting, not established or allowed by public authority, or approved by the President, under penalty of a fine, censure, public admonition, or otherwise, according to the state and demerit of the offense." [Ib.]

Abolitionists will be reminded, by this, of the similar scenes at Canterbury, in 1833, the persecution of Prudence Crandall for keeping a colored school, the consequent law against such schools, the decision of Judge Daggett, &c.

THE PERSECUTORS AND THEIR INSTRUMENTS.

The reader has now a specimen of the manner in which the act of 1742 was made "serviceable" to the "Associations" of ministers in Connecticut. But, to this day, one may hear it said there that these Associations are "only for mutual improvement"—that they exercise "only advisory powers." What other power had they over the Legislature of Connect-

icut, than to advise them? And this was "the goodness of the General Assembly, in May last, in caring for our religious interests"! Such care as the wolf takes of the sheep!

The temper of the leading clergy before and during these disgraceful persecutions may be inferred from the following characteristic incidents from the same history.

The "pastors" imposed upon the dissenters at Guilford a minister "they did not consider an orthodox, experimental preacher," declaring that "they could not be edified by him." [Ib. page 126.]

"Many of the magistrates and ministers" were "bitter enemies" of the evangelical revival preachers of that day.—[Ib. See page 134.]

"Rev. Isaac Stiles" preached an Election sermon at Hartford, against the fanatics, and received a vote of thanks from the Legislature that enacted the persecuting laws. [Ib. page 107.] [Perhaps the reader should be apprised of the common custom of preaching an annual "Election Sermon" by some minister duly selected, on the "Election day," or induction of the Governor into office.]

"While the CIVILIANS were making and enforcing their severe laws, the CLERGY were adopting measures no less severe and unconstitutional." [Ib. page 177.]

That is, they exceeded, in the judgment of the historian, the provisions of their own Saybrook Platform. What else could be expected of a body of men who could consent either to frame or to administer a "Constitution" characterized by such vague, illimitable, and despotic powers? "Of the powers and duties of the Association" the Constitution says nothing. [Leonard Bacon.] "The Platform said nothing about the duties of this body." "They had been accustomed to go into consultations on the interests of the churches," &c. "Being general, the recommendation gave abundant scope for that range of consultation and discussion which has taken place in this body." [See Cong. Order, page 37.] So that all the indefiniteness of the "merely advisory" "for mutual improvement" body was transferred to a recognized "ecclesiastical body." By what standard shall it be determined whether such a body transcends its constitutional powers? Or what could it be "unconstitutional" for the "Associations" to do under an instru-

"Manifestly taking for granted," as the same writer adds, that "they would know without teaching" what they wanted to do!

ment which provided for their existence, assigned to them an exalted position, but never defined their powers? What would be said if the Federal Constitution had provided for "a Senate or a Judiciary in this loose manner? Who can wonder that Episcopal Methodists, Episcopalians proper, and even Roman Catholics, should successfully challenge a comparison with Connecticut Congregationalism, on the score of safeguards against Spiritual Despotism, and, in the face of the New England clergy, encroach upon them, on their own soil, with a jury of New England yeomanry for the umpires? Could the descendants of the Clevelands of Canterbury (still numerous in that region) hazard much by adventuring the exchange?

"The clergy," we are told, "bore animated testimony" at this period, "against the prevailing errors" (i. e.) of those who separated themselves, and especially against "lay preaching and exhorting." [Ib. page 182.]

The Windham County Council (i. e. Consociation) complained, in 1747, that certain churches "under pretence of Congregational discipline had set up as absolute an independency as ever was heard of." [Ib. 193.]

The "pastors" in "the county of New Haven," made a "violent opposition to revival ministers." [Ib. page 195.]

"This extraordinary act of the legislature, undoubtedly had its origin from the instructions which they gave to their delegates, whom they sent to the Guilford Council." [Ib. 165.]

The "President and Governors" of Yale College, A. D. 1744, because "a number of the Senior Class in College" had "set a subscription on foot for the re-printing of *Locke's Essay on Tolerance*, and obtained a considerable number of subscribers, and were about to engage or had engaged for the re-printing of it"—"reprimanded them for such a piece of conduct, and ordered them to make a public confession for what they had done, or else they should not have their degrees." "They all made their confessions but one." "The day before commencement he found his name was not on the catalogue of his class who were to have their degrees; he waited on the President and Corporation to know what was the reason," and "was told that he had been in the mischievous business of carrying about subscriptions for the re-printing of

"One of the Clevelands was recently Governor of that State. Episcopacy is dotting over the Connecticut parishes, with her miniature Gothics, at a rapid rate, and her quarrelsome puritan proselytes are to miss none of their religious liberties by the exchange."

Mr. Locke on Toleration. He told them to wns of age and had property, and if he could not have his degrees he would appeal to the king in council, that he had an attorney and would enter it soon.—The President and Corporation yielded, and gave him his degree." [lb. page 182.]

Fine specimens, these, of the control of an organized clerical caste over the government, and of the joint control of both over the education of a country! The sons of the pilgrims who fled from this same control under the British monarchy were now ready to appeal to the throne itself for protection from their own Congregational clergy, in America! Well informed and literary Catholic laymen, in this country, in our own times, have been heard to congratulate themselves that they are not under so hopeless a spiritual despotism as the laity of the Protestant sects. As a last resort they can appeal to the impartial decision of the universal father at Rome. More than once have we heard them silence Presbyterians and Congregationalists, by allusions to our Ecclesiastical History. Trumbull's History of Connecticut furnishes them with rich materials for the comparison:

The celebrated David Brainerd, afterwards missionary to the Indians, and son-in-law of President Edwards, was expelled from Yale College, for the alleged offense of having doubted whether a certain member of the Faculty was truly a regenerated person.

Thus sustained and pioneered by the leading clergy of the colony, in their ecclesiastical bodies, and through their literary institutions, the Legislature advanced to follow the lead by new strides of civil enactments. They "were growing more and more rigid" in 1743, says Trumbull, "in enforcing the Constitution"—i. e. the Saybrook Platform. [Page 173.] "The act for the indulgence of sober consciences was repealed." [lb.]

"The legislature (of 1744) enacted severe and unprecedented laws." "There were no such laws in any of the other colonies, nor were there in Great Britain"—laws "wholly inconsistent with the rights of conscience, making crimes of those things which the Protestant Reformers and the Puritans had not only judged to be right, but matter of indispensable duty." [Page 175.]

Had we prefaced this historical sketch

* Petitions on behalf of the Connecticut Quakers were presented to the British Government, and dissenters in England remonstrated against the persecution of Baptists in Connecticut. "Upon a revision of the laws, soon after, the laws which had given so much trouble, and done so much dishonor to the colony, were expunged or left out." [Trumbull, page 535-9.]

with a promise to show that New England Associationism had proved itself more intolerable than British Episcopacy, many a reader would have been repelled with disgust at our extravagance. But how shall we dispose of Trumbull's too well attested development of that fact? Both governments were what the leading clergy had made them. And nothing but the strongest necessity could have wrung the concession from Trumbull, whose pride in Connecticut and its institutions was excessive, and who, very manifestly, was favorably disposed towards even the Saybrook Platform.

The increased rigor of the Legislature was followed or accompanied by fresh acts of ecclesiastical outrage. "Rev. Mr. Coggswell," the minister in Canterbury, was supported by the Association and Consociation, against the majority of the Church. [lb. page 182.] So the people were not only debarred from having the ministers of their choice, but had obnoxious ministers forced upon them.—The same power was also exerted to prevent the regular exercise of Church discipline. "Thirteen delinquents, who were admonished by their brethren, for open transgressions of God's law," were sheltered by the Consociation, who "prohibited the church from dealing with them." [lb. page 182.]

TREATMENT OF WHITEFIELD.

In June, 1745, the General Association of Ministers adopted the following Resolution, viz:

"That, Whereas, there have been of late, many errors in doctrine and disorders in practice, prevailing in the Churches of this land, which seem to have a threatening aspect on the Churches; and whereas, Mr. GEORGE WHITEFIELD has been the promoter, or at least, the faulty occasion of many these errors and disorders, this Association think it needful for them to declare, that if the said Whitefield should make his progress through this government, it would by no means be advisable for any of our ministers to admit him into their pulpits, or for any of our people to attend his ministrations." [lb. Vol. II. page 190.]

A fair intimation that he would be sent out of the State "as a vagrant," under the law of 1742, along with Finley and Davenport.

TREATMENT OF EDWARDS.

President Edwards, located at Northampton, Mass., was out of the jurisdiction of the General Association of Connecticut, their Saybrook Platform, and their obsequious Legislature, both of which they wielded at pleasure. His studious habits and ardent labors at home, prevented his laboring much abroad. But in his own church his remarkable preaching produced equally remarkable effects.—

From his writings it appears that Northampton was considered one of the chief seats of the fanatical and disorder so much dreaded. Either from policy or from education, or both, he clung, as we have said, to the organized clerical bodies, and his own church appears to have been on the half-way covenant model, which, with all his evangelical preaching, he had never directly assailed. During the revival, great numbers were added to this church, as thus constituted, and there they were, "the tares and the wheat" together, according to popular model.—Having thus conducted the revival without violating any of the clerical rules of ecclesiastical order, he expected, no doubt, to witness the good effects of a course which he had recommended in his work on the revival. But, mark the result.—The oil and the water would not mix. The new wine in the old bottles ensured an explosion, if the new were indeed what it seemed. So the event proved. The "half way" Christians insisted that they needed none of the spiritual illumination spoken of, by the new converts. Had they not been baptized in infancy, and afterwards "owned the covenant"? And if this had brought them "half way" into the true fold, had not "the Lord's Supper" brought them the rest of the way? Was it not a "converting ordinance"? Had they not been thus taught by the learned and godly Mr. Stoddard, the predecessor and grandfather of Mr. Edwards? And had Mr. Edwards himself ever directly contradicted it?—To this claim, some of the new converts of the revival could not subscribe. In such a controversy Mr. Edwards could not retain the neutrality he had expressed in his book, (as already quoted) concerning the kindred and closely connected question of "half way" membership.—Scarcely was his book before the public, before Mr. Edwards was forced to re-examine that question. With all his theological accumen and evangelical sentiments he seems never to have called in question the prevalent dogma, until he found it controverted warmly by his lay converts. Even then, strange to tell, it cost him an effort of his gigantic powers to master the question, and arrive at a satisfactory decision. To the astonishment and alarm, not only of a majority of the Northampton Church, but of the whole region, the great and learned Mr. Edwards came out in a public denial of

the dogma that "the Lord's Supper was a converting ordinance." The "Great Awakening" had, like to have gone by without disturbing it. Neither Whitefield, nor Wesley, nor Davenport, nor Finley, had probed the sore spot, now touched for the first time, by Edwards. He preached—he wrote. New England was again convulsed. Pulpits resounded and the press teemed with pamphlets. Edwards, at his first answer, stood almost alone, so deeply was the superstition entrenched. A new touch stone, never mentioned in "Edwards on the Revival" nor "Edwards on the Affections," was now tendered to the new converts, and some of them stood the test, and retained their evangelical position, so far as their unfortunate church relations would permit. It does not appear that Edwards, even now, was prepared to regard the question as a church test. But his opponents, the ritualists, could no longer tolerate him. He had touched them in the sore place. If neither the Lord's Supper, nor yet infant baptism had converted them, they had no right in the church. 'This they understood!' he did not. They were clamorous for his dismissal. The clerical current was against him. No ecclesiastical body came to his rescue, as there would have come, had the church opposed him for teaching the opposite doctrine. The anomalous church he had fostered rejected him. The clerical caste he belonged to, and supported, stood aloof from him.—Even his spiritual children, (misled by his own teachings, in a measure) deserted him and the evangelical principles he had taught them, to remain with their church. Edwards was driven from the church of Northampton, and, virtually, from New England. Presbyterians, and of the Old School (as we should now term them,) opened their doors to the outcast of Congregational New England. He was chosen President of their College, in New Jersey, and soon after died. The Northampton church has never since been remarkable for its high tone of religion, by the definitions of Edwards, but still prides herself upon being 'the Edwards church'! A story to be pondered! If, under the best circumstances, after so glorious a revival, in connexion with such privileges, the princely powers and burning zeal of an Edwards could neither rear a spiritual edifice upon the foundation of an old dead church, nor secure the aid of the clerical organizations whose authority he had sanctioned, when he most needed their

support, who shall attempt the experiment after him?

THE REMONSTRANTS.

In Connecticut, the Iron reign of Associationism (wielding Consociations as its occasional hand-maids) continued unbroken if not undisputed until about the year 1758 or 9, when an unmanageable minority in New Haven County adventured to "claim their ancient privileges" under the Old Constitution. "prior to the Saybrook Synod of 1708." This privilege, for which the people had obtained a stipulation, before they would accept the Platform, had hitherto been kept in abeyance. But now it was successfully asserted, and the time honored names of JOSEPH BEL-LAMY and SAMUEL HOPKINS, then in the prime of life, are found recorded among the rebels, on this occasion, against the supremacy of the Clerical Association, marking them as "disorganizers" and "new lights" with the dominant clergy of that generation. A pity they could not have proceeded a step further, and proclaimed an everlasting separation from all those anti-Christian organizations.—The dominant New England clergy of the present age, (true children of their sires,) could not then have garnished with the honored names of those men, the very arrangements by which their predecessors attempted to crush them. The Jewish Doctors could preach peace—peace—to Jerusalem, so long as it contained the sepulchres of its murdered prophets.—The Doctors of New England can cry peace—peace—to New England, so long as they can decipher on their musty records the names of the pious ministers whom their fathers villified and banished. Despoil Associationism of the names of those ornaments whom it was designed to cripple, and has attempted to crush, and you write Ichabod upon its glory, and desolation upon its palaces.

Christian Investigator.

HONEOYE, AUGUST 1847.

SCRAPS OF ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE EDITOR.

From an aged Baptist Deacon—"I do think you have succeeded in showing the contrast between the present manner of organizing churches, and the method of the apostles and first Christians, far more clear than I have ever seen it done before, and I sincerely hope it will be the means of removing the veil from many minds."

From a Subscriber:—"Please send a copy of the Christian Investigator to Rev. —at—. He has had the reading of mine, and has become convinced that your plan of church organization is the Bible plan. He is about to leave the Presbytery, and take hold of the work of reform."

From a Pastor "Regularly Ordained."—(Remitting one dollar.) "Pardon my neglect of you, in your ill requited and thankless efforts to discover to us our sins, and convert us from them to God. I have been ill * * * * * otherwise I should have written sooner.—Moses had respect to the recompense of reward, which God gave him. Read Heb. xi, 24, 26, and be encouraged.—God will give victory to the truth."

PRINCIPLES AND ACTIONS.—It is common to say that if men's actions are only correct, we have no business with their creeds. So far as human laws affect men, this maxim is correct, for man cannot legislate beyond overt acts. It is also true that no professions of a correct faith are of any value without corresponding good works. But it is not true that the more outward act determinates the character of the man, aside from the motive or principle of action from which it proceeds, though no plea of good motives or profession of sound principles can answer instead of right action. There is no virtue in any action, any further than the man acts from principle. But principle cannot be separated from creed, faith, belief. A man can no more be a man of principle, and act from principle and thus become a trust worthy man, without a loving belief in correct principles than he can be and not be the same thing at the same time.

No system of error would be plausible enough to answer the purpose of the Arch Deceiver, were it not artfully interwoven with some attractive truths, or at least with the resemblance of them:—And it would be difficult to bring moral and religious truth into disrepute were it not unhappily mingled, by its advocates, with the leaves of remaining error.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, August, 1847.

M. Woodruff, Silver Lake, \$0.50	J. Cowman, Honeoye, 50
R. W. Hewitt, Hermitage, 50	do. for J. Wilson, Mich. 20
A. Ingalsbe, Oakland, 50	E. Wells, New York, 1.00
W. D. Babbett, Honeoye, 1.00	E. Alden, Taberg, 1.00
W. Wagoner, Lebanon, 1.00	L. Fletcher, La Platts, 1.00
S. Seymour, do., 1.00	S. S. Sheldon, Brockport, 1.00
E. Cambell, Hamilton, 1.00	

Not near enough to pay the printer's bill, this month.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. V—No. 9. } HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. SEPTEMBER, 1877. } WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
WHOLE NUMBER, 65. } AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, IX, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, separate from the set, (if desired,) as follows, viz: Papers, per dozen, 80 50 Sixty papers, 82 00 Twenty-eight papers for 100 One hundred papers, 120 00.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. X.

History is a continuous chain, composed of successive links, indissolubly connected together, and running on from the beginning to the end of time. There is not a link in the series that is not connected with every other link—not an age or generation that has not an important connexion with every age and generation that went before or that shall come after it. It is a constantly weaving web, the warp whereof runs from the creation of man downward to us; and so on, beyond us, and out of our sight, to the final consummation of all things. Each generation of men weaves into this web its own distinctive characteristics for a woof or "filling" but cannot disconnect its fabric from that of its predecessors on the one hand nor from that of its successors on the other. Every generation is, to a certain extent and degree, what the last preceding generation had made it. And every generation, in its turn, determines, in the same manner, and to the same degree and extent, the quality and condition of the generation that shall come after it. The responsibilities of any particular generation are not lessened, but increased by this connexion with the past generations whose influence is not of the nature of compulsion, and the present generation is always bound to imitate the virtues and to shun the vices of the past, from both of which it should derive instruction and guid-

ance. And the responsibilities of each generation become solemn beyond conception, in consideration of the influences to be exerted on the next generation, and through it, to all the future generations of men.

Now it is impossible, without the knowledge and right use of history, for any generation of men to profit by the excellencies and defects of the past, or to shape, wisely, the influences it should transmit to the future. And the proper study and use of history requires that the chain of moral cause and effect, running from generation to generation be distinctly and carefully traced. The scientific or philosophical historian learns how to infer both the past and the future from the present—how to estimate the present and solve its enigmas in the light of the past—and how to direct the present for the benefit of the future. Past, present, and future, are like the three terms in a mathematical series, either of which being given, an approximation, at least, towards each of the others may be found.

It is much to be lamented that the very portion of history of most vital importance to us, is that which it is commonly most difficult for us to understand; that is, the portion nearest to our own times, and connecting us with the generations that have immediately preceded us.—When we take up the histories of Josephus, of Rollin, or of Hume, we find no difficulty in tracing the connexion between one generation and another, between one century and another. We perceive how the same institutions, how the same political or ecclesiastical arrangements, the same order and succession of men, the same theories of philosophy, of morals, and of religion, are continued with slight modifications, and with few marked exceptions, from age to age. We are not backward to anticipate, before hand, the workings of these causes; and are not surprised that the legitimate successors, (in position, and in general objects and aims,) of those who persecuted Wickliffe, should in their turn, persecute the Puritans. We understand the truth of what the Savior affirmed, that those who arrayed themselves against him and his disciples were the genuine successors of those who

had killed the ancient prophets. But the scribes and pharisees, with the mass of that generation, had no suspicion of this. The persecutors, in the Puritan age, with the bulk of the British nation, had no idea that, in their treatment of the Puritans; they were acting over again the persecutions of the previous century. And, at the present time, the leading clergy of this country, and those who support them, never think of the connexion which posterity will discover between them, and the persecutors of Whitefield, and Finley, and Davenport, and Brainerd, and the Clevelandes. They pass for the successors of the men who were persecuted, rather than the successors of the persecutors, otherwise they could not hold up their heads in society, nor even among one another.

Now it is easy to resolve all this, in a general way, into the depravity and deceptiveness of the human heart. And this solution, in the main, is doubtless correct, so far as it goes. But it is desirable to go more into detail. Our general depravity will account for all the manifestations of intemperance, but in attempting the removal of the vice, it is requisite to ascertain and expose the particular ways in which it creeps in among us.—There is something deceptive in alcohol as well as in men's hearts, yet there is no necessity of being deceived. If the heart were right, the nature of alcohol would not long be misunderstood. Just so, in the case now before us. Men might learn, if they would, the connexion and resemblance between themselves and their predecessors, of a century ago.—Nevertheless, their ignorance is easily accounted for, though it cannot be justified.

Men do not learn without inquiry, what public events transpired in their early childhood, and without information from others, they know nothing of what happened before they were born. And—contrary from what we should at first suppose—the period of 50 or 80 years immediately previous to our own birth, or of perhaps, 100, before we came on to the stage of action, is the period of history least studied. With nations depending mostly on oral tradition, it is other-

wise. But modern and civilized nations learn history chiefly from books. Few well digested and impartial histories, bring the narrative down nearer than within half a century or a century of the present. How shall the man of twenty, thirty, or even forty years old, to day, get hold of the thread that connects continuously, and without a break, the events of the current year, with the events, the position, the habits of thinking, and the trains of action recorded on the last page of written history, terminating fifty or an hundred years ago? How can he, without this continuous thread, with satisfactory certainty, identify and trace the rise of now existing effects with the moral causes by which they were produced?—How shall he say, with confidence, that the dominant clergy of to-day are part and parcel of the dominant clergy of the middle of the last century? In the light of first principles, indeed, (and no light is surer,) he may compare the characteristic doings of the two classes, and find whether or no they agree. The lapse of thirty centuries makes no manner of difference here. But in complex cases, doubts may arise, and few are as well satisfied by noticing agreement of principles as succession of effects. The apparent grounds of action may differ, and various and plausible pleas and pretensions may be set up, difficult to be set in their proper light, before the masses of men, who are slow to perceive moral affinities, or trace moral causes and effects, without some visible and tangible ligaments connecting them.

The young, and even the middle aged, though intelligent in other respects, and even quick to discover and classify the moral qualities of the actions and events passing before them, are nevertheless at a loss to connect, as they could wish to do, the chain of these passing events with the series preceding them. Persuaded as they may be, themselves, of the connexion, they would like to put their finger upon every link in the chain, and show to by-standers that it is unbroken. The chasm they would have filled up is like that which the student in history would notice in reading, should he find all the leaves torn out between the death of John Huss and the appearance of Luther before the diet of Worms. His *principles* may tell him the connexion between the two events, but he wants the *history*, illustrating those principles, for his own further instruction, as well as for the satisfaction

of those around him who may doubt his conclusions.

At the outbreak of the persecution of the American abolitionists, a few years ago, very few among us thought of its being only a continuation, after a brief respite and with slight and incidental variations, of the persecution of the same principles of liberty and religion that were proscribed and persecuted by the same order and succession of men, visibly and tangibly, the same ecclesiastical bodies, and the same race of ecclesiastics, a century ago. They wanted the few missing leaves of the history, or they would have understood it all, at the first glance. The readers of history, two or three hundred years hence, will make no more distinction between the "General Association of Connecticut" that forbade their flocks to hear the preaching of Whitfield, in 1745, and the "General Association of Connecticut" that undertook to bar out the lecturing of S. S. Jocelyn and E. R. Tyler in the same manner, in 1836, than we now make between the Pope of Rome under whom Jerome of Prague suffered martyrdom, and the Pope of Rome under whom Cranmer suffered a similar fate, centuries afterwards. The personal identity of the two, we do not confound, but the moral affinity we cannot mistake.

No department, perhaps, of useful literature needs more unremitting, judicious, and persevering culture, than the history that shall keep the present generation constantly apprised, from time to time, of the connecting links between themselves and their fathers. As "the present" is constantly shifting, a new volume should be added, once in about fifteen years.—Well conducted Journals, religious and moral, as well as political, should be preserved for this purpose. With this modern facility, our histories might be made vastly more full, authentic and instructive than histories commonly have been. A thorough, philosophical history, religious, moral, political, literary and economic, of our own country, especially of the last fifty years, is a desideratum yet to be supplied. It is for the want of some such work that the present imperfect sketches, bearing on a particular class of topics, have been hastily prepared.

In this, we do not pass judgment on the men now at the head of ecclesiastical affairs, because some of them may be the lineal descendants and others of them the official successors of those who were des-

potic and aristocratic in their day;—nor because they may subscribe to the same or similar creeds, and be called by the same denominational names. But if we find certain theories subversive of Christian liberty to have obtained an hundred years ago, and to be substantially cherished still;—if we find the same or similar aristocratic organizations, arrangements, and ecclesiastical constitutions and usages that, in accordance with those despotic theories, were then framed to embody and express them, to be in current use now;—if we find the modern encroachment upon religious liberty to be defended by appeals to the "Constitutions" and the encroachments of that former age;—if we can trace an unbroken succession of those arrangements, usages and precedents during the whole period that has intervened;—if we can show that every successive struggle for increased Christian liberty has been stoutly contested, inch by inch, and never magnanimously yielded;—if every incidental amelioration has come from influences not in sympathy with them and which they could not counteract;—if every convenient opportunity is seized upon by them to regain whatever in the matter of arbitrary power had been wrested from them;—if every movement among the people towards independent investigation, free inquiry, and the just exercise of their Christian rights has been watched with a jealous eye, and, as far as possible, quieted down, diverted or suppressed;—if, on almost all occasions, their sympathies and influence have been found on the side of an aristocracy in the State as well as in the Church;—if all this may be affirmed of certain clerical and ecclesiastical bodies, self-perpetuated in regular succession for an hundred years; and if we find them now opposing the anti slavery movement with the same weapons they wielded against the "great religious awakening" of the last century;—if all this, and more to the same effect, may be safely affirmed, we insist that the men now at the head of ecclesiastical affairs in New England shall be identified with the men who stood in the same position a century ago. We go further, and apply to them the principle, adverted to, on a similar occasion, by the Savior, when he said that on the persecutors of that generation who imitated while they condemned the deeds of their fathers, who builded the tombs of the prophets and crucified their successors, that upon them rested the accumulated guilt of the entire

series of persecutions, all of which they had virtually acted over again and endorsed, notwithstanding their protestations to the contrary.

THE HISTORY RESUMED—REVIVED SPIRIT OF LIBERTY.

We paused, at the close of our last number, with the winding up scenes of the New England persecutions, about the middle of the last century. Bellamy, Hopkins, and the younger Edwards may stand as the representatives of a class of worthies who adorned, and in some degree moulded, the generation next succeeding the dog-day ascendancy of the Saybrook Platform, and by whom the yoke of priestly domination was in some measure held in check and rolled backward.

The moral, religious, and ecclesiastical features of that generation would constitute a most interesting topic of philosophical scrutiny, in tracing the moral causes and atmosphere of the American Revolution. If it be true, as we cannot doubt it, that the spirit of liberty so signally characteristic of that age was deep seated to a great extent, in the bosom of the church and ministry of that period in New England, it is most manifest that a marked and even wonderful change must have taken place in the church and ministry as they were at the outbreak of the "great awakening" in 1730-7, and they were found at the opening of the revolution in 1774-5, a lapse of say 38 years. A new generation was on the stage. But how changed! A clergy preaching, to a great extent, the fundamental doctrines of inalienable human rights, instead of the dogmas of irresponsible despotism! A brotherhood keenly sensitive and alive to the most distant approaches of aggression and jealous of their rights had succeeded to an ancestry that had laid their liberties at the feet of despotic and persecuting priesthood, a generation that could tolerate the sway of despotic power in some of its most degraded forms. At the head of their Yale College, instead of a President Clapp, forming the students to re-publish Locke's Essay on Toleration, behold! the prince-form of President Stiles, with a soul of fire, and a pen of steel dipped in electric fire, writing his history of the regicides who had passed sentence of death on the tyrant Charles, eulogising their characters, asserting the inherent sovereignty of the people, and proclaiming the

execution of royal criminals an act of obedience to God! Whose shall we find such College Presidents now?—Their re-appearance would startle us as much as Locke's Essay did the contemporaries of President Clapp. Of the warlike aspect of the spirit of liberty in 1774 we need not now speak. The subject of Peace was too little understood. We are tracing the indications of a revived spirit of liberty, between 1730 and 1774. To what causes shall we attribute the change? Who were the master spirits of that age? And in what school had they been trained? From whence were their principles of liberty derived? Read over again the Sermon of Edwards the younger against Slavery. Read also the Dialogue of Hopkins on Slavery, published just before the Declaration of Independence, and from which Jefferson evidently borrowed the best phrases and richest thoughts of that national document. Remember that Hopkins, Bellamy, and their co-adjutors were the very men who, in their early prime, years before, had grappled with the hierarchy wielding the Saybrook Platform, had burst its fetters asunder, treading them under their feet! Bear in mind that these men and the like of them, all over New England, ministers and laymen, had been educated in the school of the "great awakening," amid the irrepressible upheavings of a newly born *spiritual liberty* in the human bosom, that "Half way Covenant" churches could no longer smother, nor Saybrook hierarchies crush, nor penal enactments intimidate, nor banishments expatriate, nor prisons confine! Whoever would understand the atmosphere and the ethics of the Revolutionary period must study the religious and ecclesiastical as well as political history of New England, for half a century previous to the Declaration of Independence. Whoever masters the philosophy of that history will probably discover that the political revolution was the result of the previous religious revolution—that the struggle with ecclesiastical despotism paved the way for the struggle with political despotism—that the principles of liberty discovered in the first contest were transferred to the second—that there was an "American Revolution" because there had been a "Great Awakening"—that the revival of liberty grew out of the

"revival of religion"—that the British yoke was thrown off because New Englanders had partly learned to throw off the yoke of their clerical associations.—If English liberty lighted her torch at the altar of Puritanism—and its enemies concede the fact—why should not the revival of that same Puritanism in America produce similar effects?

AN INQUIRY.

But why, it may be asked, if such are facts, and the philosophy of the case, why do we find the ecclesiastical arrangements of the eighteenth century perpetuated and transmitted down to our times? If the influences that wrought out the American Revolution were first exerted against the Saybrook Platform, why does it still remain? If the power of the Associations was broken by Hopkins and Bellamy in 1758, how came it to pass that they were found in full vigor again in 1836, and just as effective as ever against freedom?

THE ANSWER.

The proper answer to these inquiries conveys some of the most important lessons we are intent on teaching by these sketches.

We answer, first, that a spiritual despotism is less easily overturned than a political one, notwithstanding the full completion of the latter enterprise demands the former.

An ecclesiastical despotism is more subtle, more concealed, more plausible, less formidable in appearance and insinuates itself more perfectly into all the ramifications of society. While it takes an equal hold upon the aspiring ambition of those who are to wield it, it takes a much stronger hold on the confidence and affections of those over whom it is to be exercised. In the very act of withdrawing (apparently at least) from the ensnaring allurements of the world, good men often allow themselves to fall into the position of all others the most favorable for the extension of clerical authority over them. Political despotisms hold out no very alluring fascinations for the meditative and retiring, and next to none at all for one-half of the human family—for women.—But here it is, always, that an ecclesiastical despotism entrenches itself. A large portion of the "devout women" are "stirred up" at the first intimation that all is not right with their ministers. The Protestant Reformation, it is said, enlisted comparatively few earnest advocates among the women. Women are constitutionally confiding, dependant, and averse

* This remarkable book is now out of print.—Its republication would be highly conducive to a better understanding of the principles and sentiments of that period; and few works present stronger attractions for a thinking mind. It deserved a place by the side of Carlyle's Cromwell.

to revolution. If it be not so, education, custom, and habit, have produced similar effects. Whatever may be the cause, the organized priesthoods in their deepest corruptions and most terrible persecutions, always count largely on the support of the female portion of the church.—Here it is, chiefly, that the Romish confessionals find its great strength. Nothing, scarcely, is more needed than a change in female education that shall furnish a corrective of this habit, whether it be natural or acquired. It deserves inquiry whether a part of the difficulty does not lie in the fact that the responsibilities of woman are not sufficiently recognized in the churches, and she therefore remains comparatively uninterested in its polity and submissive to its authorities, however despotic.

Be this as it may, we answer the inquiry, in the second place, that the Spiritual Despotisms of the last century were not eradicated, when for the time being, a temporary and partial mastery was obtained over them, because the ecclesiastical machinery was permitted to remain. As soon as the pressure was removed, the apprehension of danger subsided.—Had it been merely a civil despotism, its forms and implements would not have been spared nor permitted to survive the change of public sentiment. Men doubtless said, then, as they now do, that such arrangements were indeed liable to abuse, and as the abuses were done away they would not contend against mere forms.—They did not perceive, as they should have done, that such arrangements are, in themselves, an abuse, and that while they remain, there can be no permanent security against the recurrence of all forms of abuse. As soon as the weight of the Association was no longer felt, it was no longer feared. But the same iron arm was still there, ready to be wielded for the same purposes again, whenever opportunity should present itself, and the machinery should fall again into the hands of a similar class of men. While a majority of the ministers were friends of liberty, like Bellamy, Hopkins and Edwards, the churches had nothing to fear from the Associations. So they thought, and forgot that such authority was dangerous, even in the best hands, and that timely prudence should have prevented its transmission to the next generation of ministers, whose characters could not be foreseen.

We answer the inquiry, in the third place, by saying that the grand error of that age of revived spiritual life and liberty in the New England churches was the neglect to restore the holy order and discipline of Christ's house, by a separation, even from a minority, (if it were so,) of ungodly ministers and ungodly church members. Jesus Christ never gave his disciples leave to hold religious fellowship with his enemies, and he never will. It is at the peril of their liberties and of their union with him, that they do so, at any time, and especially in the presence of organized priesthoods, subversive of Christian equality and freedom.

GRADUAL DECLINE OF FREE PRINCIPLES.

In what proportion the true seed was intermingled with "the tares," at the most favored period of the eighteenth century, in the churches and ministry of New England, it would be difficult to form a correct estimate. One thing is certain: The puritan principle of purity in church membership was never again fully restored. The doctrine that "the tares and the wheat may both grow together" in the Church as well as in "the world" almost uniformly obtained, after the brief period in which the "Separatists" bore their testimony without compromise.—With that compromise the sun light of pure evangelical sentiment was intercepted as by a thick cloud. During the last part of that century and the early portion of the present, there were to be found among the descendants of the Puritans not a few masters in Israel who knew little or nothing, either theoretically or practically, of the Puritan faith. Of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, their hearers seldom if ever heard, and for the good reason that they did not even profess to know any thing of it experimentally, themselves.—The "half way covenant" policy gave them no particular trouble, though, they would not of course, object to receiving that anomalous class of semi-disciples into "full communion" if they desired it, and if no sensitive minds among the evangelical portion of their flocks demurred. With many who held evangelical sentiments and disliked the "half-way covenant" arrangement, it was doubtless thought good policy to let the usage run out in that way. Or if the "half-way" members, as in some of the churches, were never received into full standing, the custom of giving a full reception to all reputable new applicants, produced, in a

few years, very nearly the same results. At the beginning of the present century, and for some time afterwards, there were many churches of whom not one in ten, if questioned on the subject, in personal conversation, would profess to have ever known anything of a radical change, whatever forms of profession may have been officially gone through with, in the process of their introduction into the church. To the baptized children of believers, on arriving at adult years, no mission into the church, on application and in the absence of any special scandal, was almost a matter of course. Family prayer, except in the houses of the minister and perhaps the deacon, was seldom witnessed. The voice of a layman in exhortation or prayer in public, was seldom heard. Prayer meetings and conference meetings were almost wholly unknown among Congregationalists. The attempt to introduce them, years afterwards, was thought an innovation so much savoring the usages of Methodists and Baptists.

The demoralizing effects of the Revolutionary war are well known, and constituted another element of deterioration between the years 1775 and 1800. The community, too, were exposed, more less, to the poison of the infidelity connected with the French Revolution of 1793, and industriously circulated in the country. The New England clergy, whether evangelical or otherwise, were commendably vigilant in opposing the progress of those infidel sentiments. But, unhappily, the manner of doing it was not always the best, nor the principles upon which they planted themselves unmingled with grave errors. The warfare of the French infidels, against Romish priesthood, atheistical and blasphemous as it was, might claim nevertheless, to be a war against intolerable oppressions and indescribable corruptions. It was aimed at Christianity, doubtless, for the assailants made no distinction between the worst specimens of Romanism and Christianity, and had they been capable of doing so, there is no reason to think they would have been better pleased with the pure Christianity than with the counterfeit. The virulence with which some of their disciples as Thomas Paine, (who was not innocently ignorant of the distinction) assailed even the Bible itself, is sufficiently decisive of that matter. Nevertheless, the overthrow of the French monarchy and the French church, iden-

as they were with the French monarchy and justly and necessarily sharing its well-deserved fate, ought never to have been represented as the overthrow, either of Christianity or of Christian institutions. That it was thus represented by the protestant clergy of England and America, including the New England successors of the Puritans, is sufficiently indicative of their defective views, not only of Christian institutions but of civil and religious freedom. A *State Church* had been overthrown. And the Congregational ministry of New England, almost to a man, were still hearty adherents to the policy of Church and State Unions, at that time, and long afterwards. Nor were their sentiments on this subject a mere idle abstraction. They held their own position in the midst of such arrangements, to which they adhered as tenaciously (within the recollection of the writer) as to their bibles, branding with the taint or the suspicion of latent infidelity,* the man or the sect that should take ground against religious establishments by the government, and the support of ministers by a tax imposed by law upon the community at large. Is it too much to say that the sentiment, even to the present hour, is not entirely dislodged from the minds of some highly gifted men?

The memorable crisis of 1758, while it evolved the comparative ecclesiastical enfranchisement of such men as Bellamy and Hopkins, with their associates, disciples and successors, was equally decisive likewise, in riveting the fetters of the much larger class who failed to assert and resume their rights, at that juncture.—And hence, the double aspect of that eventful and decisive period. While, with one portion of the Church and ministry, the year 1758 was long remembered as the era of their restored ecclesiastical immunities, the same year, as already noticed, stands chronicled by the General Association of 1843, as the auspicious period of the confirmed supremacy of that body over the minor associations, consolations, ministers, and churches of Connecticut. And, without the same forces, very nearly a similar result, (according to the same authentic history) has been reached by the General Association of

Massachusetts, in connexion with the minor associations, though their authority has never been formally recognized, by the churches.

In the fact that the Saybrook Platform still survives, that its ancient power is in a great measure restored (as will be shown) we have striking illustration of the process, by which, evermore, the "deadly wound" of smitten and apparently expiring hierarchies is miraculously "healed" and "all the world wonders after the beast" exhibiting such recuperative powers. The grand secret lies in the fact, that a full, complete and perpetual SEPARATION, according to the divine mandate, is not effected between the children of the bond woman, and the children of the free. Hence, ultimately, the "true seed" nourishes its persecutor, receives from it a poisonous infusion in return, "partakes of her sins and receives of her plagues." Had Hopkins and Bellamy raised the standard of a general and complete secession and re-organization in 1758, there is a reason to think that by the blessing of God, the piety, the gospel order, and the Christian liberty of their successors might have been preserved, instead of being swallowed up, (as we now witness) by the flood of increasing worldliness, impurity, and usurpation.

Is it fancy, imagination, conjecture, or mere assumption that leads us to say this? Who that knows human nature or that has studied church history to any good purpose can avoid the conclusion? When have revolutions in favor of Christian liberty ever gone backward, except by the re-absorption of reformers into the corrupt body? Or when has so unnatural an amalgamation been permitted to become permanent without the gradual decline of the spirit of liberty and the sure though silent growth and expansion of ecclesiastical power?

FACTS BY WAY OF ILLUSTRATION.

Some few facts, sufficiently indicative of the process resulting in what we now witness are too well established to be questioned. And those who ponder them will need no further assurances that a timely and well defined separation between the adverse and uncongenial elements of the New England Churches, would have been productive of the most marked and salutary effects?

The general and almost intolerable unpopularity of the Saybrook Platform for a long time after the persecutions we have

recorded, no competent witness will dispute. Too many familiar anecdotes and quaint sayings have been preserved by tradition, to admit of a doubt on the subject. For half a century or more it was a by-word. Who has not heard of the itinerant brazier—the "tinker"—who called on the eccentric Pierpont Edwards, Esq., for employ? The witty lawyer told him he had nothing himself to be mended, but he believed his brother Jonathan, the minister, over the way, had an important job, which, could it be accomplished successfully, would be a very profitable one. But, said he, my brother is so fearful that it cannot be well done, that he will probably put you off, and pretend to know nothing about it. But stick to him closely, and you will probably get the job. It is a very large *platform*, continued he, constructed mostly of *brass*, but very much out of repair from rough service, and in a filthy position. The confiding tinker accordingly visited Doctor Edwards, produced abundant certificates of his skill, greatly to the annoyance of the studious minister, and was with great difficulty dismissed. The good people of New England, for many years afterwards, enjoyed and repented the jest. Every body knew the brazen impudence of the whole concern, its ill uses, its bruised condition and its bad odor.* Well had it been, if such men as Jonathan Edwards the younger, could have discovered themselves from the platforms designed and adapted to crush the free principles they cherished. As it was, they had to bear the double destiny of seeing their own work, to a great extent, impeded and overturned by the weight of the opposition thus embodied, and they themselves and their principles subjected to the odium at the same time, of sustaining the mischievous machinery. A race of ecclesiastical *tinkers*, whom they could not so easily shake off, more persevering and rapacious than the one that missed of getting the job, have been hammering upon the old platform ever since, till by means of patch-work compromises, and double linings of two fold constructions, they have brought it again into profitable use.

Who doubts that a full, formal, and thorough repudiation of the entire scheme—

* Since this article was penned, and before it was handed to the printer, the editor has been publicly charged with advocating infidel sentiments, because in a declaration drafted by him for a political convention it is said that the constitution and laws of a State should contain no religious test!—And this charge comes from an earnest advocate of emancipation from chattelhood.

* To the present day, and out of the limits of New England, the name of *Saybrook Platform* is in ill repute. Even when the object is to pour contempt upon a league of the friends of a more enlarged political freedom, it is thought convenient, as in a very recent instance, to compare the association to the "*Saybrook Platform*!"

of hierarchical usurpation, and separation from it, and its abolition. The hour when it was to be abolished, would have been the hour when it was to be abolished from the memory of the people. There remained in the New England of the present century, in the early part of the present century, only two living ministers who were distinguished from their clerical associates, not so much from their remarkable longevity and ancient costume, as from the fact that they had been "settled upon the Old Saybrook Platform"—an arrangement of a former age, and now supposed to be obsolete! These ministers, worthy men in their way, were the conservators of the old state of things, were decidedly anti-*evangelical* in their preaching, and hierarchical in their ecclesiastical polity, standing alone in these respects, among a generation of different and opposite professions. Who would have believed it? Another change has since succeeded! Within the last forty years, the Saybrook Platform (so we are told!) has been repaired, and is in full operation again, over most of the churches of Connecticut! The clergy wielding it, profess and preach, (very moderately and cautiously, to be sure, and with some strange distortions) the outlines of the *evangelical* doctrines, but they wield an anti-*evangelical* power over the brotherhood, suppress all aspirations for freedom, and resolutely oppose themselves to the reformatory movements of the age, identified, as they must needs be, with the progress of liberty, and the moral and religious activities of unanointed laymen.

Thus do we trace, historically as well as philosophically, the connexion between the ecclesiastical persecutors of the principal instruments of the "great awakening" in the eighteenth century, and their legitimate successors, equally intolerant towards the reformers and advocates of emancipation in the nineteenth. The "succession" is complete. The chain is unbroken. We can handle it from beginning to end, and examine it, link by link. The conservators of the Saybrook Platform in Connecticut, and the kindred spirits controlling the General Association of Massachusetts, have never been the hearty friends of popular freedom, either in the church or in the state. During the Revolutionary period, and for some time afterwards, they seem to have sunk into a minority and to have existed only

in a torpid state. Until within thirty years they were openly anti-*evangelical*. But in the opinion of those by the side of the Federalist and Universalist Ministers, and among the conservative Congresses have thrown the *evangelical* *theology* upon them, the policy has been changed. The *evangelical* doctrines in a vague or diluted form, are now professed, and made an element of the ecclesiastical polity. But the present position and policy of the "American Board" proves plainly enough, that the leading influences are far enough from being really *evangelical*. The Puritan theology along with Puritan liberty and Church Independency, are subverted, superseded, or thrown into the back ground. Gradually and unperceived, that portion of the New England ministry in favor of hierarchical arrangements, have strengthened their stakes, till they reign again, uncontrolled. The Saybrook Platform is claimed as the ecclesiastical constitution of the Connecticut churches, and pretensions scarcely less despotic are set up by the General Association of Massachusetts, and nobody, except a few "fanatical abolitionists," are heard (and those very faintly) to demur.

The position of the New England clergy towards the French Revolutionists, and the distinctive features of their opposition, have already been noticed. Well would it have been, if their anti-republican sympathies and affinities could have stopped here. Some excuse might be made for their opposition to a phase of republicanism in this country which seemed to have put on some of the skeptical aspects of the French democracy. But the evil lay back of this. As it was the aristocratic bearing and affinities of the French clergy that drew down upon them the vengeance of the French Revolutionists, so it was the same aristocratic bearing and affinities of the New England clergy that excited the jealousy of the friends of free institutions in this country. The very best of them were zealously attached to the Church-and-State arrangements that had grown up, through clerical management, under colonial legislation and which the Revolution itself had not displaced. This betrayed the ministry into an anti-republican position on almost all other political questions. So early as the debates concerning the character of the new Federal Constitution, it began to be apparent that the leading clergy were strongly committed to the party

disposed to engraft into the new government as little as possible of the republican element. Some of them openly vindicated a limited and hereditary monarchy, and, in the pulpit denounced republicanism as atheistic and anti-christian. The anti-*evangelical* portion of the clergy were peculiarly active in the contest, though it must be admitted that some among the *evangelical*, (whose subsequent course, in ecclesiastical matters, as well as on the anti-slavery question, marked them as the friends of human freedom) were, for a season, and during the panic concerning French infidelity and anarchy, almost equally zealous against the establishment of thoroughly republican institutions. The far famed "Essex Junto" was the centre of these influences; and the old Federal Party, characterize it as we may, with all of the moral worth it brought to the service of an aspiring and anti-republican aristocracy—conservative perhaps of both good and evil, a temporary bulwark, if you please, against irreligion and anarchy, but not less hostile to the equal and inalienable rights of the people—the Federal party, whatever it was in its day, was nothing more nor less than the political mouth piece and organ of the Congregational clergy of New England, re-echoing their teachings and attempting, at all points, to reduce those teachings to practice. In such statesmen as Timothy Pickering, and the elder John Adams (the latter of whom wrote a eulogy of the British Constitution) we have the embodiment of their theory of human rights. All men had rights—to be sure they had:—but those rights were to be defined; not by their original natures, but by their rank and station in society. A proper "balance" of these, which should duly adjust the claims of rulers and subjects, of clergy and laity, of masters and servants, of the rich and the poor, of the learned professions and of the common people—after the fashion of European governments, was the grand desideratum to be secured by a Constitution, and long and bitter were their complaints that the Federal Constitution and the new Constitutions of some of the States contained no provisions for the public support of an authorized body of religious teachers.—Worthy ministers are still living, who, since the opening of this present century, have published to the world their pamphlet sermons, laden with these complainings.

We do not recur to these facts for the

purpose of exciting odium against the Congregational clergy of New England, who differed little or nothing from their Presbyterian brethren in the Middle States, in this matter, except in the circumstance that they were in possession of the immunities of a State paid Clergy. Other sects were not in a similar position. In New England they commonly took opposite ground, and the Baptists were particularly zealous against religious establishments. We reproach no one;—but it is necessary that the true position of important ecclesiastical bodies should be understood.

The struggle, in Connecticut and Massachusetts, for a separation of the Church from the State, was a protracted and severe one. For years, the dread of this innovation prevented the attempt, in Connecticut, to substitute a republican Constitution for the Royal Charter of King Charles. Not until 1814 or 1816, if we remember the dates correctly, could the subject be successfully agitated, so common was the apprehension that there could be no churches and ministers without regular taxes and tithes for their support, according to law. You might as well attempt now, to break up our Common school system and resort to voluntary contributions for the support of education, [a kindred question, by the by, if religion has anything to do with education;—as will one day be found.] The Congregational clergy opposed the innovation, at every step, and at each onward stage of progress, the question was carried against them. Some time before this, a partial redress had been extended to dissenters from the "standing order." Persons conscientiously scrupulous of paying the minister's tax, might be released, on condition of lodging with the proper authorities a certificate affirming their adherence to some other specified Christian sect. Under this act, men of no religion, and open infidels, would certify that they were Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, and what not! The unpopularity of lodging a certificate restrained many for a long time, and the minister's support came from unwilling hands. The minority fell into consequent odium and contempt. But still they clung to the compulsory system, and opposed the new Constitution with all their influence. But the vote went against them. We cannot exactly recall dates; but it was, we think, some time between 1816 and 20 that the new Constitution took effect, and the

union of Church and State in Connecticut ceased. In Massachusetts, the resolution was still later; and went through a number of successive changes. One experiment was to decide the religion of each town or parish by a vote of all the legally qualified electors. If the majority were Congregationalists, then all must join to support a Congregational minister. If a majority were Baptists or any other sect, then the minister of that sect might claim the avails of the parish tax. Unitarianism had, by this time, divided many of the Congregational churches, and Universalists had become numerous. The contest was commonly between Universalists or Unitarians, or both combined, on the one hand, and the "orthodox" Congregationalists on the other. As the law gave the vote, not to church members, but to legal voters, the "orthodox" were frequently if not generally out voted, and were called upon to pay taxes to support Unitarian or Universalist preachers. Then, for the first time, the Orthodox ministers began to understand the state of the question, in practice, if not in theory. They were reaping the fruits of their own policy.—The Universalists and Unitarians on the other hand, were not very ready to relinquish their now advantages. They contested it to the very last, became the staunch conservatives of the Church and State polity, and gave it up (perhaps 15 or 20 years ago) with an ill grace. Some of their prominent ministers avow their preference for the policy still. In portions of Connecticut, orthodox deacons, if not ministers may be found, who mourn the absence of the good old law which obliged every man to do his part towards the support of "steady habits" and "good order."

Whoever, then, would understand the present position of the Congregational ministers in New England, must remember that the older part of them, still on the stage, were the zealous advocates, until within a few years, of a union of Church and State, that few of these have ever publicly recanted their former opinions; and that a large portion of the younger clergy, many of them the sons of former ministers, have been trained in the atmosphere of the same sentiments, and to the present day, in all their political activities, are particularly hostile to the influences through which the severance of Church and State was effected, never failing on all contested questions between "vested rights" so called, on

the one hand, and the original rights of human nature, on the other, to favor the aristocratic side. The questions concerning chartered monopolies, and restricted suffrage, (as recently in Rhode Island) furnish instances in point. The conservators of heavy abuses and despotic encroachments, in this country, have uniformly, for the last half century, counted largely upon the support of the prominent Congregational clergy of New England, and have seldom, if ever, counted in vain.

Nor have the Presbyterian and Episcopal clergy in general, especially of late, been less evidently identified with the aristocratic influences of the country.—Even Baptist ministers, (until recently identified with the democratic side of most pending questions,) are becoming, to a great extent, as conservative as their brethren, of other sects. Especially is this true of their College Presidents, and other recognized chiefs of the denomination.

Twenty years ago, the country was not a little agitated with the apprehension that the leading clergy of a number of sects, were conspiring together to re-unite Church and State. The Presbyterian and Congregational clergy were supposed to be at the bottom of the movement.—The attempt to stop the running of the mails on the Sabbath, was thought to be one of the incipient measures. This alarm was sounded chiefly by men unfriendly to the strict observance of the Sabbath, and to Missions, and they represented that these great National Societies were likely to become the centers of a dangerous ecclesiastical power. The source from whence this agitation originated, and the well known sentiments of the agitators, tended greatly to allay the suspicions of the Christian community in general, and with the decline of that excitement, and the rising popularity of these societies, the clerical power wielding them could not fail to have taken deep root. During all this time, there were not wanting pious Christians and ministers, including some of deep sagacity and uncommon penetration, friends of the Bible, of the Sabbath, and of Missions, who were not without their fears that the agitation, notwithstanding the quarter it came from, was not wholly without cause. The late NATHANIEL EMMONS, an experienced and eminent Congregational minister, of Massachusetts, was among those. His dread of the National Societies, his testimony concerning the tendency of

clerical associations, his deep conviction of the aspiring ambition of the prominent clergy of his times, (some of whom, still living, he was wont, in conversation, to name) are well known to his friends, and the general fact is sufficiently indicated in his writings. His worst fears respecting the national societies have been realized. Some of their most magnificent patrons and thousands of their self-denying contributors have lived to witness and deplore their apostacy, and feel the weight of their crushing power in the churches. In a review, after a lapse of twenty years, and in the light of events that have since transpired, it is not difficult to see that the apprehensions of that period were not without cause. During the agitation, indeed, it became manifest that the argument against the running of Sabbath mails, was, (very needlessly and gratuitously) made broad enough to cover the defence of an established religion, so that if the measure could have been carried, on that argument, a foundation would have been laid for a State Church. To the arguments against Sabbath mails furnished by several laymen on different grounds, leading clergymen demurred, as insufficient for their purposes. It became evident, in short, that the propagation of the sentiment that the State may properly decide religious questions, and define, superintend and enforce Christian institutions, was apparently a main object in view. That Ezra Stiles Ely, D.D., educated a Congregational minister, in Connecticut, and at the period alluded to, a Presbyterian pastor in Philadelphia, Scribe of the General Assembly, (and since a slaveholder) did contemplate something like a revived religious establishment there is good reason to believe. His evasive manner of meeting the charge, indicated the fact. And it is difficult to conceive that he should have cherished the hope, without some knowledge of the views of the influential ministers among whom he held a conspicuous standing. One significant fact is, that after the failure of the anti-sabbath mail enterprise, the zeal of the leading clergy in favor of the Sabbath greatly declined. Harmon Kingsbury, a layman, continued his efforts almost single handed, and had occasion to complain bitterly of the apathy and even opposition of the leading Presbyterian clergy. On one occasion, a few years since, he made a long journey to attend the sittings of the Presbyterian General Assembly, for the purpose of procuring some action on the subject. On his way thence, he was astonished to find that large numbers of influential ministers were traveling on the Sabbath, to attend the Assembly! When in session he alluded to the fact, and asked for some expression on the subject, but was as promptly and indignantly put down, as though he had asked for a condemnation of slaveholding. Subordinate ecclesiastical bodies, Synods, Presbyteries, and even Sabbath Conventions, have since, declined bearing testimony against the common practice of

wealthy church members holding stock in Sabbath breaking steamboats and rail cars. All this is in end keeping with their zeal for suppressing Sabbath mails by law, when urged by them, on the implied ground that the State ought to define and enforce Christian institutions.

A still more pregnant and eloquent fact, is that of the essential truce and alliance between the leading ecclesiastics of the country, and the very same men who were lately so loud in charging upon them the design of uniting Church and State. The first symptom of this truce was witnessed in the compromise of the Cherokee question, in connection with the release of the imprisoned missionaries. The same clergy who had demanded the suppression of the Sabbath mails, had espoused likewise, in opposition to the Sabbath breaking government, the cause of the injured Cherokee Indians. Jeremiah Everts, a layman, was the chief agitator of that subject, the clergy fell in with it, and it was a righteous cause. For a time, the contest was uncompromising. But when Georgia imprisoned the missionaries that had been sent among the Cherokees, and there seemed no prospect of their release, a proposition appeared in print, signed by a few prominent friends of the missionaries, the true interpretation of which was, that if the missionaries could be released, the advocacy of the rights of the Cherokees should be relinquished! The policy succeeded. Everts was dead. The leading clergy tacitly acquiesced. Georgia complied, and thenceforward, the poor Cherokees were deserted to their fate.

But the second and crowning feature of the truce took place, on the outbreak of the opposition to the anti slavery agitation in 1833-4. Leading clergymen and religious journals had led the way in that opposition, invoking public indignation against the abolitionists. They were vigorously seconded by the very same class of editors, politicians, and infidel declaimers that opposed the Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies, and that had denounced all evangelizing and benevolent and reformatory efforts, including the Sabbath movement, and the Temperance Societies, as part and parcel of the machinery for uniting Church and State!—What a confederacy was there here!—The N. Y. Courier and Enquirer, until then, the very center and organ of the infidel clamor against the clergy and "church and state," very suddenly, in one week, turned a short corner, and eulogized the leading clergy of the prominent sects, particularly the Presbyterian and Congregational, as the true friends of our republican institutions and the Federal Union—the uncompromising opponents of the "incendiary abolitionists!" From that time forward Pilate and Herod became fast friends! From that very week, the tone of the leading ecclesiastical as well as infidel presses has been completely changed. Not a lip, since that week, have we heard from the leading clergy and their editors about "our infidel govern-

ment"—our "Sabbath breaking government"—our "irreligious government" that refuses to provide for the support of religious teachers! Instead of this, the claims of Caesar are now exalted above the claims of God! Human laws can legalize and sanctify crime! The church and ministry must not reprove iniquity in the state! New Testament morality may be displaced from its supremacy in church discipline, to give way to the law of the state! Sins authorized by civil government are only "organic sins," and do not shut men out of the church or out of heaven! And God's explicit commands to execute judgment, and to choose "just men" for that purpose, are set aside by the alleged necessity of removing pecuniary burthens, and the Christian singularity of choosing "the least of two evils" for the purpose! On the other hand, infidelity (except the small fraction of it that, like the French Revolutionists, espouses the cause of the oppressed) has nothing to say against the clergy, has no fears of a "union of Church and State," and eclogises all the great national societies wielded by them, including the Colonization Society of course. In short, the predicted "Union" has, in a manner, been consummated, to the apparent satisfaction of both the parties concerned.—The ruling clergy and the "infidel state" are in unison! Much as may be said of infidel abolitionists, it is undeniable that nine tenths of all the rampant infidelity of the country is at one with the leading clergy, on the abolition question, and loudly trumpets their wisdom, their patriotism, and their prudence.

Here then, we are. The missing leaves of the history are supplied. The chain of narrative is completed. We see the "regular and unbroken succession" between the leading clergy of the present day, and those of a century ago. But oh! how fallen in the comparison! In the middle of the 18th century, they were merely the conservators of an ecclesiastical despotism allied to the state. Now, without any essential reform in this particular, they are the conservators of human chattelhood. Then, they stood as the guardians of good morals; now, they are known as corruptors. Once, they were the earnest, though unskilful opponents of infidelity; now, they are the delight of our leading infidels, and there is a substantial unity between them.

The period from 1758 to 1833, including seventy-five years, has been rapidly reviewed in this number. In our next we must trace the theological and metaphysical causes of the pending struggle.

Address of the Macedon Locks Convention

This document, in a pamphlet form, with two Letters of GEORGE SMITH, and comprising 16 columns printed, double column pages, is now for sale at 82,00 per hundred, ready cash. Address by letter (postage paid) SAMUEL W. GREEN, Office of the Albany Patriot, Albany, N. Y., by whom they will be promptly forwarded as directed.

List of Payments deferred till more is received.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES, VOL. V—No. 10.
Whole Number, 60.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. OCTOBER, 1817.

WILLIAM GODDALL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

ISSUED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.
TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the
members, 50 cents, always in advance, and
of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscri-
bers, and forward the money without expense to
publish her, shall have one copy for his ser-
vice.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall
also copies for his service.—Or, if procuring
eight subscribers, shall have four copies for his
service.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, sepa-
rately, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
per dozen, 50 50 Sixty papers, 50 00
Eighty papers for 100 One hundred papers,

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PRO-
GRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS
IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED,
AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE
ABANDONED.

NO. X.

*The Theological Connexion between
past Century and the present, revul-
sion still further, the continuity of the
struggle for Freedom.*

It was a great mistake that the good
people of Connecticut committed forty
and fifty years ago, when they congratu-
lated themselves upon the death and burial
of the "Old Saybrook Platform," and
related merry jokes over its supposed
sepulchre. They ought to have known
that the platform was only an instrument
of the Association of Ministers, a con-
venient scaffolding or elevation for them
to stand upon—that so long as the clerical
associations remained, the main thing
remained:—the seat of the obnoxious
despotism remained undisturbed, at liberty
to disinter and rebuild its old platform
whenever thought best, or build anything
new in its place.

An associated body of ministers, from
the second century to the nineteenth, has
been the essential thing, in the machinery
of spiritual despotism, whatever varying
phases it may have assumed, by whatever
forms and rules it may have been organ-
ized. Whether the complexities of Pres-
byterian, Episcopal, and Papal arrange-
ments do, not, on the whole, embarrass
the workings of spiritual despotism, and
multiply its energies, and afford to the mass
of the people incidental protection, by

their unavoidable rivalries, with the
checks and balances of power naturally
involved, quite sufficient to counterpoise
and neutralize all the additional power
and permanency gained by them to the
clergy, is becoming a grave question, both
with shrewd conservative ecclesiastics and
restive, impatient laymen. What form
of ecclesiastical polity, as administered
in America, most effectually brings the
laity under the control of the organized
priesthoods common to all modes, would
be a curious and an instructive problem to
grapple with. Much might be said, for
and against, almost all the current meth-
ods, invented and wielded, as they all are,
by the leading clergy. Leaving out of
the account all other points of comparison
or contrast between the sects, the simple
question of general and implicit submis-
sion, in matters of morality and religion,
to the clergy, in a comparative view, be-
comes a delicate and difficult one.

"What class of professing christians,
at all removed above the condition of
downright illiteracy and barbarism, with
books and periodical literature in their
hands, will go furthest, in stifling their
own moral and conscientious convictions,
on moral and religious subjects, in pure
deference to their ecclesiastical authori-
ties—to their clergy?"

The question, in this form, does indeed
throw out of the estimate, those portions
of Catholics who are unable to read, as
well as those portions among the wealthier
and politer circles who care nothing for
religion or morality in any shape. We
have left however, a body of citizens suf-
ficient for the comparison. If, among
these, there is any Episcopal or Romish
community in America, more thoroughly
servile, more completely under the thumb
of their clergy than the so-called Congre-
gational laity of New England, we ask to
be told in what religious conn. union—in
what State, County, or City, of this na-
tion, they are to be found? Point us to
the churches, in which, on the moral
questions of the day, the people who know
and care enough about such matters to
have any wishes of their own, are as
much held in check, over awed, and kept
quiet, against their own convictions, (as
expressed in private conversation,) as

they are. Professed abolitionists and
temperance men are especially interested
in this inquiry, and should be especially
included in it. The power of any Spir-
itual Despotism is signally manifest, and
mischievous, when it can control and
cripple even the intelligent, the conscien-
tious, and those in the church most dis-
posed to engage in the works of benevo-
lence and reformation. The importance
and the pertinency of this observation
will, perhaps, be appreciated, as we pro-
ceed with our history.

A few more connecting links between
the present and last preceding genera-
tions, must, however, be noticed.

THE THEOLOGY OF PROGRESS.—THE BIRTH AND FIRST BATTLES OF MODERN ABO- LITIONISM!

The marked and thorough evangelical
sentiments of the Edwardses, of Brainard,
of Bellamy, of Hopkins, and of Em-
mons, like a two edged flaming sword,
made them the terror and dread of mere
heartless formalists and decently reputa-
ble moralists, so called, on the one hand,
and of dreaming rhapsodists and self delu-
ded antinomians on the other. Their
theology laid the foundation of their ethics;
—their morality was a part of their re-
ligion;—the one was as unbending and
as uncompromising as was the other.—
They knew nothing of any higher good
than holiness, of any utility but virtue,
of any expediency beyond duty. Such,
at least, was the general impression made
by their writings, (more clearly and con-
sistently stated, perhaps, in those of Em-
mons) and the self sacrificing course of
the three latter, of whom we know most,
may be cited as the best comment upon
their teachings. Their practice was the
same "disinterested benevolence" that
lay at the foundation of their theological
system. Hopkins and Bellamy promptly
emancipated their slaves, as soon as their
attention was turned to the subject, at a
time when slaveholding was common and
popular with New England ministers, and
long before any "experiments of eman-
cipation" on any large scale, could guide
them. They had no occasion to wait for
"more light." They understood the
safety of adhering to first principles—of

being right, and leaving the event with God—without stopping to calculate consequences. All this was the burden of their sermons, to saints and sinners.—“Unconditional submission to God, immediate repentance, instantaneous regeneration,” a radical change of heart and life, obedience from the love of the right, irrespective (as the main motive) even of the rewards or punishments of eternity, whether forgiven or not forgiven, and without stopping to stipulate a bargain in the matter. This was their “new theology” so earnestly contested, in their day. The reaching of this, won for them the name of “new lights.” With them, it was also a new life, as well as a new light. It was the light and the life of HOLY LOVE. It was no “loveless light” or “lightless love” of which certain theologians now descant. The regenerated man, according to *their* theology (to say nothing of the entirely sanctified,) did not walk in darkness, not knowing whither he went! unable to distinguish a man from a brute, choosing the least of two moral evils, and not daring to do right without calculating the consequences and asking leave of the “Association!”

The Quaker poet, Whittier,* has aptly denominated “Samuel Hopkins, the anti-slavery theologian.” This he indeed was, in a more comprehensive sense than that brilliant writer seems to have understood. I do not claim that the theological system of Hopkins was faultless, or that Emmons, who supplied some of his defects and corrected some of his errors, has left none of his own to be pruned and amended by his successors. I admit that many may take the same anti-slavery position from philanthropic impulse and generous emotion that Hopkins and the younger Edwards did from the joint influence of these, superadded to deep, settled, intelligent, and abiding christian principle. I would not deny christian principle and christian character, in their degree, to many who lacked the athletic faith and philosophical acumen of these “giants.” But I do affirm the close, the inseparable connection between the stern, uncompromising and indomitable ethics of

“modern abolitionism,” of which the younger Edwards, Bellamy and Hopkins were the metaphysical as well as the practical fathers, and the equally uncompromising theology of the same men. Or, more properly, we have, in “immediate and unconditional abolitionism” nothing more nor less, than the application, in that particular direction, of “the general doctrine of ‘instantaneous regeneration—immediate repentance—unconditional submission,’ &c. &c., which formed the very bone and the marrow of the theology of these teachers.

Or, still farther—if we assume as sound and trust worthy, the “noble doctrine of disinterested benevolence” (as Whittier himself describes it) “the casting of self aside, and doing good irrespective of consequences, in this world or another; upon which Hopkins so strongly insisted, as the all essential condition of holiness”—the doctrine which “William E. Channing, the habitual hearer of Hopkins,” recognizes as having exerted a salutary influence over his own life—admit this principle to have been the all controlling element in the moral character and eternal purpose of the All Wise Creator himself, as well as the vital principle of spiritual life and light in all holy beings—admit the want of this principle, or rather, the presence of the opposite principle of selfishness to be the essence of all transgression—admit this, and you admit all that any theologians of the school of Hopkins could ask of you. Give them this as an axiom to begin with, and as a starting point, then accompany them in the application of this test, in disposing of all the various topics and problems that come up, of necessity, for consideration and decision, in any earnest attempt to master the depths and the heights of theological and ethical science, and see where you can demur at their conclusions, and where the process will land you!

The question is not merely whether you would be compelled to admit all the distinctive doctrines of “modern abolitionism”—a point too palpable for discussion; but, in addition to this, the question is, how you will help arriving at the main conclusions embodied in “the general creed” of Hopkins and his associates!—No man now living or that has lived, has ever adventured upon the experiment.—No one, admitting “disinterested benevolence” as the true premises, has ever yet been able to show, intelligibly *how* he could refute “the general creed” of those

men, however much he might “disprove” (as Whittier says Channing did) the propagation of it. Not Channing himself, with all his princely powers and polemical labors, ever attempted, on logical or philosophical grounds, any such refutation. And he failed, after all, of being an uncompromising abolitionist, because he could not admit so much of “the repulsive features of the theology of Hopkins” would have saved him from compromising the Right, through fear of the consequences that might ensue, of forbearing the stern rebuke of transgressors so necessary to the production of the pungent conviction and deep penitence their case demands.

I do not say that no man can be true to the slave without squaring, in his theology, with Hopkins, but I do say that no man with a clear view and correct apprehension of that theology can have any excuse for not being a stable and consistent abolitionist, and that a profession of attachment to that theology, from one who declines taking openly the stand of an “uncompromising abolitionist,” is an evidence of stupidity or something worse. More than this I am bold to affirm. The ethics, the metaphysics, the theology, the philosophy, that is to guide the present anti-slavery enterprise, between rocks and quicksands, a successful termination, if it is ever to be guided, must be mainly coincident with that of Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins and Emmons. Whoever would grapple to hold, in a day like this, of the fundamental principles of theology and ethics shall render him at once stable and progressive, that shall supply him with touch stone, a compass, and a chart, and take hold, in good earnest, of those sublime problems that occupied the minds of those men, and without counting it “weariness to the flesh.” The “clerical dandyism” or the literary effeminacy that cannot do this, might as well shrink from the battle. No man can ever get a precise idea of what is actually at issue in the present struggle who cannot learn what was at issue in the controversy of New England, “three quarters of a century ago.” The contest is essentially one. The abstract principle of all reformatory effort was the bone of contention, then, as the concrete and specific application of that principle is the chief bone of contention, now. Whoever would give reason for the “radical measures” of “modern abolitionists,” whoever would expose the sophistries and evasions of

* See a splendid sketch by J. G. W.—of the life and character of Samuel Hopkins, the anti-slavery theologian, in the National Era of July 5. Friend Whittier understands the theology of Hopkins quite as well as—from his point of observation—could have been expected. And yet he fails to see the identity of that theology with “modern abolitionism.” We have given, in quotation marks, a number of Friend Whittier’s expressions; connection with what we consider a clearer statement of the position of Hopkins, and the value of a polemic and metaphysical disquisition.

opponents, whoever would contend in arms with a shroud but time serving enemy and a worldly church, for the supremacy of the Right over the Expedient, in opposition to all the arts of de-
 jective compromise— whoever would put his feet on immutable first principles, and trust Heaven with the results, withdraw his weapons from the same theory that supplied “the anti-slavery theologian,” Hopkins. They must understand, as he understood, the *theology of slavery*, the *theology of the Right*, and of *inalienable rights*.

It be true as Whittier affirms, and which no one can question, that the dispute between the Edwardsons, Bellamy, and Hopkins, on the one hand, and the then dominant clergy of N. England on the other, had its origin in the great religious awakening in the middle of the past century, and it is true that the theory of “modern abolitionism”—*yes*, and the practice, too, of its origin then and there! With a slight change of technicalities, there is a single point in dispute between abolitionists and their theological opponents, and so far as principles are concerned, it did not come under discussion then, in the “half way covenant.” Doctors on one side, and the evangelical ministers (Edwards, Bellamy, and Hopkins,) on the other, and you have the perfect counterparts of the pro-slavery Doctors, on the one hand, now, and the modern abolitionists, on the other. So far as the philosophy, the theology, and the ethics of “modern abolition” are concerned, the battle was fought, and won, then. That “storm of theological controversy” of which Whittier speaks—those “large volumes of theological and metaphysical and physiological disquisition” under which “the press groaned”—that “loud controversy, the sound whereof went over the land, awakening responses from beyond the Atlantic”—what were they but, and what did they mean?—*Is it* indeed, that the “watchwords” of the contest, “its very terms and definitions have well nigh become obsolete and unintelligible”? Was it a mere “protracted sectarian war”? (not between rival sects,

From this expression of Whittier it would be inferred that the controversy between Hopkins and his associates on the one hand and the dominant theologians of New England and their adherents on the other, was a strife between rival sects—nothing could be further from the fact. It was a controversy concerning—not the outward forms and Shibboleths of the sects—but concerning the foundation principles of religion and morality—the character, designs and law of God, the nature and binding force of moral obligations. The parties to the contest were in the same sect, and almost in

but shaking all sects, as the anti-slavery war now does, and in which no “new sect” was founded or attempted? Was it indeed, upon mere technicalities—“upon names rather than things, on the manner of reaching conclusions quite as much as upon the conclusions themselves”—that “pamphlet encountered pamphlet, horned, beaked, and sharp of talon, grappling with each other, in mid air, like Milton’s angels”? And are we almost to congratulate ourselves upon the “efficiency and dandyism” that now, “endeavors in vain to recede to the skeleton abstractions before them the warm and vigorous life where-with they were once clothed”? Is it well (if the fact be so) that “his [Hopkins’] writings are now little known”? Or are we to anticipate, with gratification, the coming period when, in utter carelessness or contempt of his theological creed, men shall only honor him as the philanthropist and the friend of the slave?

Nay, verily! Sentimentalists may dream as they choose of a “Christianity” merely in “the affections,” and not in the “intellect”—of a spiritual “life” that is abiding, without “a belief.” True religion does indeed reside in the affections and it is a life. But true Christian “affections” flow from “the love of the truth,” and there is no spiritual “life” without belief—(call it creed if you please) a settled, fixed, determinate apprehension of the True and the Right. “The just shall live by faith”—the “evidence of things not seen.” And whoever would put on the whole armor and fight the battles of philanthropy and human progression, must make that glorious philosophy of benevolence in which Hopkins entrenched himself, his panoply and shield. It was upon no tournament of mere psychological chivalry, it was in no idle and bootless ring of mere metaphysical pugilism that those “giants” expended their strength, and wore out their lives. They were earnest, far seeing men, wielding their “sledge” to break the galling fetters of hoary error that crippled human souls! American Revolutions, Temperance Reforms, West India Emancipations, Political Economies, Political Sciences, Church Reformations, yea, subversions and revolutions yet future, preparing the

all sects, and in both hemispheres. Andrew Fuller, the English Baptist, followed closely in the wake of Hopkins and Bellamy. And no subsequent writer on religion and morals, of any note, not even Jonathan Dymond or Thomas Carlyle, has failed to give evidence of having been benefited by that controversy, directly or indirectly, and whether consciously or unconsciously to themselves.

way of the Lord, of which, in the detail, the bulk of our nineteenth century reformers have scarcely yet caught the glimpse, were wrapped up in those volumes, and, thank God, the generation is not quite extinct, with whom “the colossal thoughts entombed therein” are no “cold, lifeless abstractions” and to whom “the leaves of the elder and younger Edwards, Hopkins, Bellamy and Emerson” are not “Sybilline”! These know that genuine Christian affections derive their nutriment from substantial and well digested Christian doctrines—that the “life” of God in the soul has its laws, the knowledge and practical use of which are the conditions of its existence, and full development; and equally so, of the regenerating influences that Human Society, in all its ramifications and relations, now needs—that the theology of the Right and the ethics of Reformation must go hand in hand.

If it be not so, whence is it that (as Whittier himself attests) “the anti-slavery theologian, Hopkins,” preceded the Quakers and Granville Sharpe, in enunciating the uncompromising doctrines and putting into practical operation, the obnoxious measures of “modern abolition”? Whence is it that no abolitionist of the present century, not even Elizabeth Heyrick, or William Knibb, or William Lloyd Garrison have ever proposed any thing more truly “radical” than Hopkins, before the outbreak of the American Revolution, had taught and practiced? Whence is it that none of our moderns have either sought to rest short of the standard set up by Hopkins, or have attempted to overstep it (not excepting Channing and Garrison) without either falling below the mark aimed at, or overshooting it and running into self-contradiction and confusion? Whence is it that the pretendedly orthodox opponents of “modern abolition,” with all their professed veneration of Hopkins, and Bellamy, and Edwards are invariably driven into a plump contradiction of all the distinctive features of their creed, whenever they open their lips or move their pens on the subject of anti-slavery? And why is it, that, with so many active and deep-thinking abolitionists, a divergence from the well known landmarks of the abolitionism of 1833, and from their own cherished religious principles (in which they were educated, and from whence they drew their abolitionism) are found to go hand in hand—insomuch that a sneer against theological

orthodoxy is found to portend a speedy departure from orthodox, penal law abolitionism, or, on the other hand, a disposition, from any surrounding circumstances, or brilliant temptations, to shake off what are deemed the "strait jacket" restraints of uncompromising anti-slavery principles and measures—to run after more temporary expedients, and deride adherence to fixed principles, is almost sure to be followed (in the case of shrewd and sharp-sighted thinkers) with speedy aberrations into the convenient theology that exalts human sagacity above the authoritative demands of the scriptures, as expounded in the theological school of Hopkins?

The claim of Hopkins to the honor of being called "the anti-slavery theologian" will be best appreciated by those who understand (as few seem to do) the system that Hopkins taught, and its identity with the entire philosophy and metaphysics of the anti-slavery enterprise. It is indeed pleasing to see so many endeavoring (whether conscious or unconscious of the fact) to copy his example and imitate his philanthropy. It would be more encouraging, if a greater number of them had learned—from some source—(nay, from the source whence he drew it—the sacred pages) the deep and the sublime philosophy that made him what he was—the founder—the originator, more than any other man, since the demise of the Apostle John, of the entire theory and superstructure of the machinery by which that coming Millennium, of which he wrote so luminously, (and in which his whole being was absorbed,) must, if ever, be introduced.

No marvel that all the powers of Anti-Christ were stirred not only over all christendom, on both sides of the Atlantic, but in the dark caverns of despair beneath, when, "three quarters of a century ago," the superhuman controversy described by Whittier, the conflict of good and evil angels, in mid air, convulsed the moral elements of our world to its center;—the first direct, distinct challenge since the Lutheran age, (and far more distinct than that was) of the powers of darkness; the first alarm signal of that battle of the Great Day, now coming on apace, in which the thrones of oppression are to be cast down, that the Ancient of Days may take his rightful seat of authority over men.

The main combatants in that struggle understood what were the distinct points

at issue, (if modern "effeminacy and dandyism" cannot) and the occasion they had to go down into the profoundest depths of human nature and thence up to the sublimest heights of the Eternal purpose of God, in Christ Jesus, before the world began, for the divine philosophy of those laws by which man was made and is governed; in the light of which his relations were to be understood, his rights defined, his duties ascertained, the grand end of his being set before him, his character shaped, and his destiny settled. That superficial thinkers, to whose flesh, deep meditation is a weariness, might scarcely understand, then or now, the pertinency of all the topics then discussed, to the grand practical points at issue, we can easily comprehend. But the earnest minded among the yeomanry of New England then understood, as some of them now understand, the contests with which "effeminate clerical dandyism" dares not or will not grapple. "Familiar as household words throughout New England" were the points at issue as well as the names of the disputants. Among the common people, chiefly, the controversy was discussed, and disposed of—else why the inundation of the country with those weighty pamphlets? and whence the demand for the literature thus furnished? Had it been otherwise, New England had not been New England, then or now, and "modern abolitionists," (could there ever have been such a generation,) might as well have distributed their tracts to the whortle-berry berry bushes of New England as to its inhabitants. A people that could not be roused by such a controversy might as well give up their title to a standing among civilized and intelligent nations.

For why? What was the contest?—And what was the occasion that drew it forth? Glance your eye back to the landing at Plymouth. Recall to mind the sketches, in our preceding numbers, of the sad decline of the Puritan faith, of Puritan freedom, of Puritan godliness.—Fix your attention upon the churches of New England, at the outbreak of "the great religious awakening"—a membership of professedly "half-way" Christians, intermingled with, here and there, a remnant of the true seed—a hierarchy of "half-way covenant" doctors; brooding, like a nightmare over the whole, and watching (when not too merry and fat hearted to watch at all) to extinguish, forever, the last flickering flame of the

Puritan piety and faith—the prodest light of heaven for Burmah, for the Sandwich Islands; for South Carolina, for the whole world. Next witness the seed of that religious awakening—the legions of soul fiends with which it had to contend—the persecutions—the still more formidable sophistries, superstitions, perjuries, idolatries, ritualisms, corruptions, faith, religious delusions, theological errors, alternate or commingled Pelagianism and Antipelagianism, semi-athanasianism and fatalism—the remaining lumber of the dark ages, the accumulated rubbish of fifteen centuries of apostasy, that the Protestant reformation had not removed—which neither Luther nor Calvin had expected—which neither Fox, nor Wesley nor Whitefield had detected or shaken—that the elder Edwards himself, gentle as he was, had scarcely wrenched from their wrists, and with which, as with a giant wither, the ecclesiastical Philistines so long held him fast, if they could not put out his eyes. All these, and more, the threads of them, interwoven into the ecclesiastical structure, wielded by the ecclesiastical authorities, mingling with the true faith and poisoning the very life blood of "the Great Awakening" itself, then in progress, reducing the strength and diminishing the numbers of the faithful; unpitifully bound up, as they were, in the religious fraternity with their seductive and co-operating ecclesiastical and their ecclesiastical persecutors!—Is there not here a fitting field and an appropriate occasion for the controversial powers and philosophical acumen of "Samuel Hopkins, the anti-slavery theologian?"

Let those who think the controversy obscure and dark one, understand the depths and glooms of these subterranean labyrinths into which the light of divine truth was now, for the first time, commissioned to shine, while the darkness comprehended it not. If "the very terms and definitions" of that controversy "shall well nigh become obsolete and unintelligible" it must be to those who have not acquainted themselves with the subtleties and mystifications with which pure and unfilied religion was overshadowed and kept out of sight, in the ages gone by, with which, whoever would displace the must needs come in contact—he must be uninitiated in those cabalistic reasonings by which, with multitudes of religious teachers, either the true faith of the gospel, with its healing power, has been set aside, as incompatible with moral law.

the law itself made void by licentious perversions of that faith. To one or the other of these errors, in some of their multiplied forms, and to the false philosophy and metaphysics by which they were sustained, the polemical weapons of Hopkins and Bellamy were chiefly directed, and with great skill and signal effect. If we, in our day, are, in any good measure, escaped from the pestilential atmosphere that had so long been breathed by the nations, let us thank God for that loud "storm of theological controversy" that cleared up for us our purer sky. The effects of no controversy, perhaps, were ever more widely diffused. Whole communities, unknown to themselves, have been moulded by it. Select twenty names of the most celebrated theological and ethical writers in America, and as many more in England, of our own times, and then name one of them, if you can, of any sect, who (whether he knows it or not) has written just as he would have written, had that controversy never have taken place, or if Hopkins and Bellamy had never lived. It would be easy to name half that number, some of them now at the head of ecclesiastical affairs, who, not unconsciously to themselves (though most of their readers may not know it) have expended the greater part of their lives in piling up periodicals, pamphlets and volumes, for the sole purpose of evading or counteracting a single proposition of Emmons that might be expressed in forty syllables, and this, too, they have cautiously and sedulously done, without so much as once directly citing the proposition or naming the man! No man living, to-day, among our modern reformers, can conjecture what his own views might have been, on moral and religious subjects had it not been for the great controversy, commencing "three quarters of a century ago." Certain it is, that well nigh all the bold positions and startling maxims of the present race of radical reformers were first taken, first coined, in that controversy, and have come down to us, by both oral and written transmission, from those times. Nor need we deny or conceal the fact that new forms and phases of error, as well as new manifestations of the truth, have been the result. The brighter the truth shines, the more speedily will those who continue to hate it plunge into deeper errors; and twenty different errors will be devised, to get rid of one clearly enunciated and unwelcome truth.

In saying all this, we would not unduly magnify the men, whose peculiar position, under the Providence of God, enabled as well as moved them to do what so few, comparatively, have done. Great occasions make great men. And great results come, at times, from the simple enunciation of great truths from men who are not, themselves, superlatively great. The foregoing remarks run mainly to the point of illustrating the general truth insisted on, in the preceding number, that a chain of moral causes and effects runs from one generation to another, of which the living are too commonly unconscious, but which a proper understanding of their responsibilities requires them to study.—We wished therefore to trace, somewhat minutely, the moral causes, in the past century, which may account for the moral phenomena of the present.

Even a cursory glance at a few items of "the Hopkinsian" controversy (for the name of Hopkins was thus transferred to his associates) will be sufficient to illustrate and justify what we have said concerning its bearing on the moral questions which agitate the present age.

1. The nature of genuine religion or true holiness. No point could be more vital or more appropriate to the condition the church was in, at that time:—and it is the main question in controversy still! Men of all characters were in the church then; and so they are now. The worst abominations and oppressions, then, as now, were sanctified, in the popular mind, by their connexion with the church. By what standard should such pretensions of "half way" Christians, and professed Christians, essentially like them, be tried. Were men to be accounted in a state of salvation because they had been baptized in infancy? Because they had partaken of the Lord's Supper? In what did true sainthood consist? Was it—as some said [who claimed, in opposition to the mere ritualists; to belong to the evangelical party; because Christ had died for them, the elect, exclusively and in particular? Because *Christ's* righteousness had been imputed to them, so that they needed no personal, matter of fact righteousness of their own? Were men to be called Christians on a foundation like this? Or upon any other basis, consistent with manifest selfishness of heart and life?—"The anti-slavery theologian, Samuel Hopkins," said "No!" And he maintained "that all true virtue or real holiness consisted in disinterested benevo-

lence!" That, without this, acted out in the life, by the individual himself, no baptisms or sacraments, nay! moreover, no transports of extatic joy in the selfish prospect of obtaining heavenly happiness, by virtue of Christ's death, or imputed righteousness, could be of any avail!

This two edged sword of the Spirit, keener than a Damascus blade, most of the rival religionists and theologians of the times, especially to the dominant clergy, reposing, with their Saybrook Platform, on the basis of a worldly church, was not drawn in vain. Nor were the kindred ecclesiastical despotisms of the old world undisturbed. The demoniac shriek of rage and desperation from both hemispheres was instantly heard: "Art thou come to torment us before the time?" Sadducees and Pharisees conspired together. Pilate and Herod became friends. A Pelagianised Arminianism (as Wesley's biographer, Watson, has termed it) knowing no other regeneration than water baptism, and making little or nothing of the propitiatory sacrifice, very readily joined forces with the hyper predestinarianism and antinomian Calvinism just now described, in opposition to this "new light"! What could this babbling mean? What new and strange doctrines did he set forth! That men must be actively and positively righteous, *themselves*, benevolent, just, magnanimous, duty loving in order to be saved! Who ever heard of such fanaticism? exclaimed the Pelagianised Arminian ritualists. "Infidelity! Heresy! Treason to the Cross of Christ and his crucifixion!" shouted in chorus, the hyper Calvinistic monopolists of "Christ's righteousness"! And both agreed that such an ultra reformer "disturbed the peace of the Church"—a fact too palpable to be denied or questioned.

2. For, it followed, and this too, was openly announced, that sin was nothing but selfishness and selfishness was nothing but sin—that all *selfish religion*, springing from no higher motive than the hope of personal safety and happiness, whether in this world or any other, was nothing but a deceptive counterfeit, ensuring the displeasure instead of the approbation of God—that all selfish worship, selfish prayers and selfish strivings, were only an abomination to the Lord; that until men broke off their transgressions by righteousness it was in vain to ask for justifying mercy—that repentance and fruits meet for repentance must come first, and reliance on the atonement and

joy in free pardon or forgiveness afterwards; that it was all in vain to bring sacrifices and oblations, to burn incense and call solemn assemblies, to spread forth the hands and make many prayers—that all this was iniquity, even the solemn meeting, until disinterested benevolence, and works of justice, mercy, and the relief of the oppressed prepared the way for the blotting out of their iniquities!

[How “disorganizing—how uncharitable—how denunciatory—how unchristian”! Did they not, like their successors, deserve “the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures”?]]

3. A kindred point was, that Truth, Righteousness, Equity, and the Law of the Lord, were to be loved, prized, and sought after, for their own sakes—for their own divine excellency, beauty and loveliness, and not merely on account of the benefits they might secure and confer.

4. That there was a Right and a Wrong in the nature of things—that virtue did not consist in utility—that gain was not godliness—that expediency was not duty.

5. That the Right and the True were to be followed, without stopping to count the consequences—that duties are ours, and results are God's—that that which ought to be done, can be done, and must be done without hesitancy or compromise—that repentance of sin must be frank, free, magnanimous, disinterested, unpurchased, unconditional, without stipulation, without stopping to ask—“What good will it do?” “What profit shall we have?” “Will it be safe?” Will God forgive us, or will he punish us as we deserve, for our sins? It followed:

6. That God governs the world in Righteousness, and may be trusted to

connect desirable results with right actions—their no salutary effects are to be expected by any compromise of righteous measures.

7. That there is a heaven wide distinction between mere natural good and moral good—between natural evil and moral evil—a moral good is always to be preferred to mere natural good—that natural evil [pain, loss, disadvantage] is always to be chosen rather than moral evil or sin—that of two moral evils we have no right to choose either, and we can never, under the government of God, be under any necessity for so doing.

8. That there is nothing in the divine purposes, fore knowledge, predictions, or superintending providence over human affairs, that places men under any necessity of sinning, or furnishes any excuses for even predicted transgressions—as, for example, nothing in the curse of Canaan or of Ham that can palliate or excuse those who oppress their descendants, any more than Pharaoh himself was excused.

9. That the law of God—the law of the Right and the True, in the nature of things—the law of impartial, disinterested benevolence is the paramount law—the soul of all law—without which, and in divergence from which, there can be no law—that this law reigns supreme in all worlds, throughout all duration [Time or Eternity] authoritative over all beings in the universe, and controlling, without variation or shadow of turning, the councils of the Eternal and Changeless One, who foresaw the end from the beginning, and who never changes, because he will never compromise the Right—in whose own immutability all his chosen people, while standing as he stands, on the Right, shall forever be stable and abiding, as he is—untouched by changeable circumstances, because the law of their spiritual life, [the law of the Right and of the True:] by elevating them above circumstances, has secured them from the control of them, their pathway, through and above the clouds, shining brighter and brighter unto the perfect day; while the “ungodly are not so”—borne on the breeze of expediency and scattered as the chaff of the summer threshing floor.

10. That because God will not compromise the Right, the penalty of his law is a revelation of his essential glory, and can never be dishonored, and hence, “without the shedding of blood,” there cannot be—in the very nature of things—any “remission” of sin. That “to

magnify this law and make it honorable,” Christ died, “that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus”—providing *alike* for the *salvation of all who come to God through him*; and not for a select few only.

11. Another point of the controversy was the proposition,

That, as man was not to be saved by the imputed righteousness of Christ, without becoming actually righteous himself, in his own affections, exercises of heart, volitions and conduct, so no man was condemned by the imputed sinfulness of Adam, without becoming actually selfish and unholy himself, in his own free volitions, character and conduct—that the fathers had not, by eating sour grapes, set on edge the children's teeth—that the son shall not die for the iniquity of the fathers. And hence,

12. That impenitent sinners, [oppressors and others,] are not to be treated as a race of mere unfortunates, very much lamenting their sad condition, but [through the fault of divine Providence] unable to help themselves—as tho' they were born to an “inheritance” of sin, with a “curse entailed upon them” for which they are to be commiserated, and sympathized with, and petted, and called Christian brethren, instead of being solemnly warned, in the name of God, to repent and humble themselves in the dust! Still further—

13. That Human Society compels no man to sin—absolves no man *from* sin—that no connexion of man with his fellows, with his progenitors, with Adam, or any one else, can ever be his excuse at the divine bar, for his participation in a single transgression.

14. That all schemes for the removal of sins by covering them over, by keeping silent in respect to them, or by their future or gradual abandonment, are, from the influence of other considerations exclusive of the love of the Right, and of hearty repentance of sin, in self loathing by the transgressor, are conspiracies against the law of God, the gospel of Christ, and the salvation of perishing and guilty sinners.

15. That whatever is wrong in the abstract, is sinful in practice.

16. That there is no sin without a sinner—nor condemnation of transgression without a censure of the transgressor—that the guilt of any sin adheres to him who commits it—not simply to the sin itself—that men's characters are not be-

* The general sentiments of Bellamy and Hopkins were manifestly coincident with this sentiment, though some guarded expressions or immoderated phrases may have embodied certain disciples of the School of Utility, to claim them. It was reserved to Emma, or, perhaps forty years ago, to assail directly the Utilitarian scheme of Paley and Bishop Law, which he justly classifies with the demoralizing philosophy of Goodwin and Hume. See his Sermon entitled “Gain and Godliness” Vol. IV. Sermon XLII. See also the 10th, 11th and 13th Sermons in the same volume. These few discourses unfold “the Standard of Moral Obligation” more clearly than is done by any modern writer. Their circulation would constitute a standing answer to all the sophistries of the pro-slavery clergy of our time. American Board Reports, &c. Friend Whittier would find them neither “Sybil” nor difficult to be understood, notwithstanding their profundities. The style of Emerson is not less transparent than Channing's, though the “thoughts” maybe more “colossal.” We are glad to know that there are farmer's sons, mechanics' apprentices and young ladies, who do not find the study of Emerson “a weariness to the flesh”—though “clerical dandyism,” perhaps, may.

for than their conduct—the tree better than its fruits—that, either the tree is good and its fruits good, or the tree corrupt and its fruit corrupt—so that the tree may be known by its fruits.

17. That obedience in order to be genuine must be impartial, habitual, universal—not selecting *some* favorite duties and neglecting others—breaking off from *some* sins and practising others with greediness.

What competent witness will deny that these were among the chief, the prominent maxims, doctrines and watchwords of the hated and villified "*Hopkinsians*?" That these present the points mainly contested between them and their polemic and ecclesiastical opponents, from 1760 to 1833? Or who will fail to notice that the contest involved, essentially, so far as ethical principles are concerned, the very same points that have been contested between thorough abolitionists and their virulent opposers and seductive tempters, from 1833 to 1847?

For the better illustration and confirmation of this, let me explain that the "loud controversy" described by Whittier, "the sound whereof went over Christendom," did not die away as suddenly or as totally as he seems to have supposed. Far otherwise. The first alarm, the loud din, the roar and the crash of the first quarter of a century did indeed abate—the novelty had ceased—the busy world, the drowsy church attended to what they liked better or slept on. Meanwhile, the new heaven was every where diffused, though in various degrees of vigor and freshness—the stream of controversy grew less clamorous, because it had cut deeper channels, and afterwards was drained off into innumerable branches, till thousands who never heard the name of Hopkins, were embracing in some degree, his sentiments, or becoming educated in them. Yet in New England there was never a truce of four and twenty hours, from 1760 to 1833. Nor was the controversy stereotyped or stale. Scarcely a Sabbath passed in which some new phase or application of the "New Light" did not present itself, especially from the pulpit of Emmons, whose race was over and steadily onward, up to 1835, when he presided at the Anti Slavery Anniversary in New York city. Not a few of the maxims above quoted, the very shibboleths of "modern abolition," were, even then, fresh from his aged lips. The "loud controversy" being thus renewed

in a new field, the victor of an hundred battles, recognizing the wonted signal, rushed again into the ranks, to contest the same questions over again. Thus he understood. And to did the dominant clergy, in and out of New England, who stood abashed, overawed and even cowering, in the presence of the patriarch that day, and but their lips with a voice when they saw the crowd on which he had come to the throne, which he had never before visited in his life." This was in May, 1835.

FUNDAMENTAL FIRST PRINCIPLES NOT SECTARIAN.

"We have chosen," says Whittier, "to speak of Dr. Hopkins, as a philanthropist rather than as a theologian. Let those who prefer to contemplate the narrow sectarian rather than the universal man, dwell upon his controversial works, and extol the ingenuity and logical acumen with which he defended his own dogmas, and assailed those of others. We honor him not as the founder of a sect, but the friend of all mankind—the generous defender of the poor and oppressed."

But how are we to separate the philanthropist from the theologian? the lover of man from the teacher of the principles of love? The theology he taught was that of universal disinterested benevolence, as Whittier himself describes it. Of the "Hopkinsian" theology he says—

"It leading advocates were not mere heartless reasoners and closet speculators. They taught that sin was selfishness, and holiness self-denying benevolence, and they endeavored to practice accordingly. In the midst of slaveholders, and in an age of comparative darkness on the subject of human rights, Hopkins and the younger Edwards lifted up their voice for the slave. And twelve years ago, when Abolitionism was every where spoken against, and the whole land was convulsed with mobs to suppress it, the venerable Emmons, burthened with the weight of ninety years, made a journey to New York, to attend a meeting of the Anti Slavery Society. Let those who condemn the creed of these men see to it that they do not fall behind them in practical righteousness, and faithfulness to convictions of duty."

How should those who "condemn the creed" of "self denying benevolence," have any thing to do with the practice of it? How could Hopkins be "the narrow sectarian" in teaching that creed, and "the universal man" in reducing it to practice? Who shall "contemplate" with pleasure and approbation, the "universal man," and yet regard with disparaging thoughts the "narrow sectarianism" of teaching the theology of universal humanity—"the love of being in general," to quote one of the most obnoxious phrases of that school? Shall we "honor" him as "the friend of all mankind, the generous defender of the poor and oppressed," and then speak of the divine principle that guided and in-

* No fancy sketch. It was at the May anniversary. The city was crowded with clergymen, as usual. The writer witnessed the scene here described.

spired him to do this is being only "his own dogma"—and intimate that when "he defended" this dogma, and "assailed those of others," who undertook the defence of religious institutions and branded all self denial as rank fanaticism, he was, any the less making, good his claim to our admiration and gratitude.

Had he contented himself to act the "pious orthodoxy" and "put up no voice for the slave" on any narrower scale than that of insisting, as a religious teacher, a christian minister, on the divine claims of that "ology which demands the same 'self denying benevolence' of all men, as the condition; nay, the definition of their salvation, would he have deserved less commendation from the philanthropists and reformers of our times?—Would he have saved himself from the imputation of having been at once "a universal man" and a "narrow sectarian," then? Doubtless he would in the eyes of most of his contemporaries and successors, who hated his self denying doctrines that condemned them, and obliged them either to shut their eyes against the "new light" or relinquish their religious hopes!

Great relief, indeed, would it have been to the "half way covenant" Doctors of 1760, and their legitimate successors (under the Associations, the Saybrook Platform and other kindred organizations of 1836,) if Hopkins and the younger Edwards and Emmons could have contented themselves with individual acts of philanthropy, liberating their own slaves (if they had any,) and tamely beseeching their clerical brethren to liberate theirs, without elaborating a theology that consigns incorrigible slaveholders and their apologists to perdition—without denouncing slaveholders and man stealers, (vide Edwards' Sermon, and the note formerly inserted in the Pres. Confession of Faith)—without insisting on the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and the doctrine of immediate and unconditional repentance—without unfolding and propagating a THEOLOGY, I say again, in which all this was obviously involved; a theology too demonstratively elucidated by the "strong linked chain of argument" and "metaphysical disquisition" to be creditably grappled with, much less overthrown. Much coveted quiet to the churches, for the last "three quarters of a century," might have been thus secured, without doubt. "The storm of theological controversy," at the beginning of that period, and of moral controversy now, might

have been spared. But whether the religion of supreme selfishness, both Calvinistic and Arminian, then in the ascendant in both hemispheres, would ever have been disturbed or its genuineness questioned, whether the inherent sinfulness of all selfishness,* including slaveholding, would, to the present hour, have been an item in the "creed" of "philanthropists" directing their measures—whether the theology of gradual repentance of sin, including the sin of oppression, would ever have been jostled rudely upon its venerable "platforms"—whether we should have had any fourth of July or first of August celebrations, any national declaration of "self evident truths and inalienable rights" (pirated from the ponderous volumes of theological and metaphysical and psychological disquisition—mere abstract "dogmas" of a "narrow sectarianism"—the reader will understand!) is altogether another question!—It may have been, we admit, that some body else, either with or without that "storm of theological controversy," might have caught a glimpse of those self evident truths, and spread them out in print, before the eye of Jefferson, in season to have been adopted by him, and copied into the famous declaration, if Samuel Hopkins had never lived, or if he had contented himself with being a "philanthropist" on the easier plan of not troubling himself about the "dogmas" of a universe including theology—to be the chart and compass of philanthropists and reformers in all coming time. But this we do say, that, in matter of fact, Hopkins has done that work, because in addition to being a philanthropist, he was also, emphatically a theologian—teaching the theology of an universal philanthropy.

Why? The question of popular sovereignty to-day, (for it is still an open question, it seems,) the question whether man, as man, has a share in the social responsibilities of social humanity, under God's moral government, accountable to him for the right use of that prerogative, is a question to be determined by the sound-

* It will hardly be credible, in some circles, that even within the memory of the writer of these sketches, the "dogma" of the Hopkinsian "sect" that selfish religious affections are all spurious and worthless, was an unheard of novelty in some of our largest and most devout denominations—that popular pulpits resounded with fulminations against it—that titled theologians (Extra Sales Bly a specimen of them) drew their pens against it in their "Reviews of Hopkinsianism"—and that the complaints of "disturbing the peace of the churches," and "breaking up revivals of religion" were as loud then as they ever have been of the abolition excitement. Yet all this was "as familiar as household words in New England," thirty and forty years ago, and even later, in some of the large cities.

ness or unsoundness of the metaphysical theology of Hopkins, just there, where it undertook to harmonize human freedom with divine superintendency, and where claimed for man a power of self direction coincident with his Maker's power, at the same time, of controlling him, which no uninspired philosopher or theologian, Pagan or Christian, Stoic or Epicurean Calvinistic or Arminian, before him, had ever claimed. If Hopkins was right, there, precisely at the point, in which, (as Whittier has noticed) he "broke down some of the barriers between Arminianism and Calvinism," in other words, between free will and necessity; or rather, elevated his earnest render to an eminence from which he could not help seeing that the two, instead of being incompatible with each other, are mutually conjoined, and cannot be separated—if Hopkins, I say, was correct in this, then, but not otherwise could man, either individually or socially be intrusted with self government, either personal or political, in safety to himself, to his fellows, or to the integrity and efficacy of the divine government over human affairs and human destiny. Let me explain:—

(To be Concluded.)

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, OLD SCHOOL AND NEW, THE OBERLIN EVANGELIST &c.

The two General Assemblies have held their sessions at Philadelphia, at the same time, and have taken action on slavery.

The Old School re-affirms its former testimonies, some of which are against slavery, and some in its favor! The New School likewise re-affirms the old testimonies from 1787 to 1818 inclusive, feels "bound to bear its testimony against slavery" but bears equally emphatic testimony against withdrawing church fellowship from slave holders! It also directs the synod of Cincinnati to restore Mr. Graham, who had been suspended for defending slavery by the Bible! If any body can tell which of the two bodies is most inconsistent with itself, or furthest from Christian truth, on this subject we leave to them the task of doing so. One thing is quite apparent. The New School did not feel the position of the Old School on this subject to be any bar to Christian fellowship with them, for they invited them, (slave holders and all) to join with themselves in celebrating the Lord's Supper, which the old School Assembly, for some cause, saw fit to decline. On this refusal, the editor of the Oberlin Evangelist remarks as follows.

We are not greatly surprised at this result, but we are grieved exceedingly and ashamed for the Christian name. It is well however that the Old School body did not even attempt to give any reason for their unchristian and strange course—for to say that because they never had done such a thing, therefore

they never ought to, is just no reason at all. It is throwing themselves upon their dignity and their conservatism, and off from their Christianity. In their more private relations—as brother pastors and brethren or Christians—they would cheerfully commune; but their dignity as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church would be compromised by such humiliation, and the testimony they are called to bear against slavery would be weakened; therefore the sympathies of Christian brotherhood must be choked down and the honor of the Christian name be offered up on the altar of denominational glory.

There is something to be done yet for the evangelization of Christendom!

How long ere the church by her union and love will shame the nation out of the spirit of war?

Now we readily concede that it was altogether fitting and proper that two such ecclesiastical bodies should fraternize with each other; but that Christianity or Christian unity suffers much by the schism between them, we do not so readily perceive. We should like to know whether the Editor of the Oberlin Evangelist could conscientiously take a seat at the communion table of the two Presbyterian General Assemblies, with their slave-holders should they unite on such an occasion. And if so, what ground of complaint, or principle, he could have against the Brooklyn Report of the American Board? If the Choctaw and Cherokee converts ought to be taught better than to hold Christian fellowship with slave holders, ought not the Editor of the Oberlin Evangelist to know better? And if he does, what is it to him whether or no the two General Assemblies, (both of which contain slave holders) can agree to commune with each other?

Another thing. We should like to know whether it accords with the high tone of Christian attainment taught at Oberlin, to hold religious fellowship and communion with slave holders? If it does, we shall not be very sanguine in our expectations of their doing much for the elevation of the Standard of holiness, after all.

In the worst systems of error a wise man may discover stray fragments or resemblances of important but neglected truths.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator, Sept. and Oct. 1847.

W. S. Bush, Galesburg, Ill.	1.00	J. Horton, Stockbridge, Mass.	1.00
L. Noble, Honeoye, N. Y.	1.00	A. Kingsbury, Cozueville, N. Y.	50
G. Arnold, do	50	W. Cotton, Wampsville, N. Y.	1.00
E. N. Barlett, Marshall, (Mich.)	1.00	A. Woods, Hamilton, N. Y.	1.00
A. Tappan, N. York	1.00	S. Spooner, Wampsville, N. Y.	50
F. Stone, Jr., Brookfield, (Mass.)	1.00	A. Hill, do	50
J. I. Boyd, Cincinnati	50	L. Chappell, Hamilton, N. Y.	1.00
M. G. Lee, do	50	Mrs. Sanford, Utes, N. Y.	50
W. Hyde, Almond, N. Y.	1.00	J. Cunningham, do	2.00
A. E. Halbert, Center Almond, N. Y.	50	S. Wells, Peterboro, N. H.	50
A. G. Atwater, Azusa, N. Y.	1.00	I. Nye, Sandwich, Mass.	1.00
E. Skinner, do	50	E. Felt, do	50
T. Beebe, Westmoreland, N. Y.	1.00	J. F. Clark, do	1.50
Mrs. Nye, Utes, N. Y.	50	C. W. Green, Farmington, Mich.	1.00
G. W. Pitts, Honeoye, N. Y.	2.00	G. W. Dean, Syracuse, N. Y.	1.00
G. D. Cleveland, Phila.	2.00	J. Brown, N. Haven, Conn.	1.00
W. Gilbert, Wolf Creek, (Mich.)	1.00	R. Chapin, Havana, N. Y.	2.00
B. Woodman, Hamilton, N. Y.	50	G. Pitts, Honeoye, N. Y.	3.00
W. W. Chapin, Sherburne, N. Y.	1.00	Rec'd in 3 months, \$30.50	
H. Lewis, Lenox, N. Y.	50	(Not sufficient to pay the expenses.)	
W. Clark, do	1.00		

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

SERIES, Vol. V—No. 11.
Whole Number, 67.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. NOVEMBER, 1847.

WILLIAM GODDELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix. 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PRINTED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring twelve subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Any particular number will be sold, separately from the rest, (if desired,) as follows, viz:
Six, per dozen, 80 30 | Sixty papers, - 22 00
Twenty papers for 100 | One hundred papers, 20 00

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

AVAILABILITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

NO. X.

[CONCLUDED.]

Hyper Calvinism, of the narrow Tripartite phase, as Whippley has named it, could never consent to "turn loose" God's universe, with a charter of freedom, so corrupt and depraved a being as man, to prey upon his fellows and destroy himself. Nor could it conceive of God, by his all controlling Providence, could execute his eternal purposes, and fulfil his final designs, if everything were to be thrown into the chaos of chance and contingency, by admitting the freedom of human action. Pelagianized Arminianism, on the other hand, denied too many of the obvious truths affirmed by Calvinism, to make any very effective defence of human freedom against hyper Calvinistic arguments, even if it had possessed enough of spiritual life and power to have desired, very earnestly, to do so. Its ecclesiastical affinities, too, were all on the side of hierarchism, and it added nothing more than the "wild dangerous freedom" evolved by evangelical revivalism. Wesley, who was no Pelagian, and who, under the flag of Arminianism, came nearer to Calvinism on some points than he was aware of, was an earnest, progressive, original man, and evolved a theology of his own, sufficiently advanced of his times to discover the slavery of human chattelhood, though it was his own ecclesiastical fetters untouched,

ed, permitting him to forge new ones for his successors, and never displaced his educational reverence for hereditary monarchy and his dread of democratic equality and freedom. To Hopkins it was reserved, with his Puritan education and in the midst of the Great Awakening, to dig deeper into human nature and rise higher into the atmosphere of the divine purposes, than any uninspired theologian before him had done. Where others found nothing but discord, his ear heard, and his touch brought forth harmony.—What others had pictured as irreconcilable antagonisms, he (and especially his coadjutor and successor, Emmons) led forth, triumphantly into day light as twin brothers, inseparable as the far famed Siamese! Human depravity, with Hopkins, detracted nothing from human responsibility, and nothing, consequently, from human rights! The divine and eternal purposes, and divine agency, so far from displacing or disproving absolute human freedom, was nothing more nor less than the divine fiat that decreed before hand, that same freedom, the living breath and divine energy that eventually secured it! The All Perfect Providence that he revered, could accomplish all its high purposes and reach all its ultimate ends, not permitting a sparrow to fall to the ground unpredestined, nor the hairs of one human head to exceed or fail of their appointed number, nor a human soul to exist an instant (under any infernal or even celestial influences) without the unremitted and active exercise of perfect moral freedom! In such a theology, (as in no other) the doctrine of "inalienable human rights" assumed, as it needs must, a prominent place, identifying the immutability of the divine law and purposes with the *inalienable rights* to be secured by the *one* and exercised under the *other*. Call the "dogma" a "sectarian" one, if you please. The entire nation has adopted it, in theory, and proclaimed it "self-evident." American abolitionism, by the by, has been shaped on the "model" of "inalienable rights," as British abolitionism was not, because "Hopkinsianism," as men call it, gave rise and shape to the abolitionism of America, (as it did to American theories of government,) while

Wesleyanism and Quakerism mainly moulded the abolitionism of Britain.

Casting ourselves, then, for a verdict upon that posterity who will trace the moral connexion between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries much more impartially and accurately than the present generation can do, we are bold to affirm of Hopkins, that the moral fact of his having borne testimony against chattel Slavery, and of his having persuaded the Church of which he was pastor, to abandon the practice of it, was a small affair, standing by itself, in comparison with the all comprehensive principles that impelled it; in comparison, with that deep, comprehensive, world-blessing, and time enduring manifestation of philanthropy conjoined with piety, which lives and will for ever live in his THEOLOGY, leading men down into the profoundest depths of humanity & up to the sublimest of the approachable heights of the God-head, for the full and clearly written chart of their conjoined RIGHTS AND DUTIES—a chart that inscribes HUMAN LIBERTY upon the scroll of the DIVINE PURPOSES, that demands the abolition of *all* oppression as well as chattel Slavery, that dothrones all despotisms, ecclesiastical and political, in the name of Him who claims to be Supreme Monarch of all, and whose law is perfect freedom. By his *theology*, he will assist in emancipating the nations, till the last fetter shall be removed!

"Not as the founder of a sect" does Whittier "honor Samuel Hopkins." And pray, what sect was he ever the founder of? or when did he ever attempt to found a sect? Was his promulgation of the theology of equal, impartial, disinterested benevolence, as the universal law of all worlds, of all beings, of God himself—his inculcation of the "love of universal being"—his identification of virtue or holiness with benevolence, and of sin with selfishness—was his intrepid and successful application of this foundation principle to the solution of the most profound problems of theology, ethics, social relations, duties and rights, the work of a "narrow sectarian?" A new sort of sectarianism, to be sure! If ever the time arrives, which Whittier trusts is now at hand (and we believe it) "when sick-

tracted and divided Christendom shall unite in a new Evangelical union," pray how can it be conceived of, or defined, but by supposing a general recurrence to these great and fundamental principles of morality and religion? On what broader, on what more comprehensive, on what other basis could it be formed? This very object, Hopkins had in view. He anticipated its not far distant realization; and, so far from dogmatizing, he modestly said of his theological labors—(or words to this effect)—"I seem to myself to have been only striking a few blows, and that, not by way of felling the forests, and casting up the king's highway; but only as a pilgrim, passing through the wilderness, with a compass in my pocket, and an axe on my shoulder, and now and then marking a tree, after the manner of new explorers, to tell whereabouts, as it seems to me, the road must come." Does this sound like a dogmatical sect maker? The opposers of his doctrines nick-named their advocates "New-Lights," or "Hopkinsians," by way of reproach; but when most numerous, most distinct from the rest of the religious world, and when most persecuted, they never attempted founding a new sect. Like abolitionists, they were found in most sects, Baptist and Pseudo-Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and even Episcopal, and, for aught I know, Friends, for more points of affinity than one might be pointed out between the theology of Hopkins and Fox. If obnoxious to the charge of *sectarianism*, it was not on the ground of their world wide theology, nor because they crammed it down men's throats, but because they continued, too modestly, in their respective sects; which, especially considering the moral and spiritual condition of those sects, I admit they ought not to have done. It neutralized their efforts, crippled their powers, and finally diluted or corrupted their testimony. They ought to have separated and re-organized, not on party shibboleths, but on a platform commensurate with their principles, not requiring uniformity, except in fundamentals, the repudiation of a selfish religion, and the intelligent advocacy and practice of "disinterested benevolence." As for Hopkins, in his isolated position at Newport, out of the jurisdiction both of the Connecticut and the Massachusetts ecclesiastical bodies, when there were scarcely any other Congregational Churches in

the State, and throwing himself, as he must have done, upon the principles of Congregational Church Independency, his connexion with any sect must have been very slight. Nor do we recollect to mind a scrap of his writings devoted to the discussion or defence of the peculiarities of any sect. Had he confined the application of his comprehensive principles to one topic, to the abolition of Slavery, or any thing else, he might well have been denominated "a narrow sectarian." The charge becomes preposterous and "sectarian" itself, when it is based on no other foundation than the fact that he refused to do so, applying to all topics the same principle that he applied to Slavery.

THE THEORY FIRST PUT IN PRACTICE—MATTER OF FACT ORIGIN OF "MODERN ABOLITION" AND ITS "MEASURES."

It is admitted, on all hands, that the broad distinction between *modern* abolitionism, and the *old fashioned*, which our present dominant clergy prefer, lies in such particulars as these, viz: Modern Abolitionism insists on the inherent sinfulness of slave holding, the duty of its immediate and unconditional abolition, the duty of the Church to purge herself from the pollution by the discipline and exclusion of incorrigible slave holders, the propriety of treating slavery like all other sins and slave holding like all other sinners, the consequent propriety and duty of publicly agitating the subject. Old Fashioned Abolitionism, as it calls itself, on the other hand, insists that the mere holding of the relation is not sinful, that the sin lies in the abuse of the relation, that the abolition of slavery may properly be postponed on account of existing circumstances, and be made contingent, conditional, gradual, and future: that, if slavery be a sin at all, it is only a social sin, an organic sin, implicating the community or the government rather than the individual, and is not therefore to be treated as personal sins should be; that the practice of mere slave holding is not to be made a Church test, and should not exclude an applicant for church membership, or be made the ground of discipline or expulsion; and, finally, that the subject ought not to be made a topic of exciting public agitation, but should be left rather to the care of political economists, and finally superseded by the gradual introduction of modifications, ameliorations, preparations, isolated emancipations, colonizations, &c., or, as is some-

times said, by letting the system alone, die a natural death, working, in time, its own unprofitableness, its own cure, &c. &c.

Now it is well known that from the commencement of the present agitation the anti-slavery writings of the young Edwards and of Hopkins have been circulated by "modern abolitionists" as pressive and explanatory of their views and measures—that these documents, like with the kindred writings of Wesley, have been among the most offensive to "old fashioned" abolitionists—that neither more radical, severe, or denunciatory have been written by any writers now living. This fact, often alleged by modern abolitionists, has never been questioned. It has any one, among the opposers of the present agitation, however reverential their general professions and ecclesiastical position, towards those venerable others, ever attempted to show or even intimate that there was any essential difference between their anti-slavery doctrines and measures, and those of the noxious "modern abolitionists."

This fact, constitutes one link, in the chain of connexion we are tracing, between the persecutions of the past century and of the present, which should be daily kept in mind.

Another link, and a strong one, is supplied in the foregoing sketch of the "ology" of the "Great Awakening" and the "storm of theological controversy" that grew out of it. That controversy was one, in which all the theological, ethical principles, positions, and maxims now so distinctly characteristic of "modern abolitionism," and so odious and abominable, in the eyes of our leading ecclesiastics, were not only affirmed, in addition to the persecuting ecclesiastical measures of those times, but were systematically laboriously wrought into a theological system, very marked and peculiar in its ethical features—the target, on that count, for almost "three quarters of a century," for ecclesiastical obloquy, sacerdotal derision, with no other allusion to the present hour, but the changes incident to the particular application of the same principle, by the agents of chattel slavery. What was derided as Hopkinsianism, is now decried as the fanaticism of abolitionists.

Had we nothing to refer to, but bare theology, metaphysics and ethics, Samuel Hopkins and his associates elicited, in that "storm of theologic-

troveray—three quarters of a century ago—we should be warranted in tracing origin of “modern abolition” to that troveray, and to the “Great Awakening” of which that contest, on the part of Hopkins and his condutors, was the extent and the defender. If neither Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins, nor Emmons, ever thought of applying their theological, metaphysical and ethical principles to the subject of slavery—it would have been true that those principles, a matter of fact, are the same with that lie at the basis of the modern slavery enterprise. It would also be that the assertion of those principles, that Awakening, and in that controversy, were the providential means of placing, to the full extent of their successful propagation, the *contrary* principles of theology, metaphysics, and ethics, then and now, lie at the basis of all slavery expositions of scripture and moral reasonings in favor of gradualism and against uncompromising abolitionism. Whoever studies such documents as those of Dr. Hedge, in the *Bible Repository*, of the American Board, expositions of Moses Stuart, the editorials and correspondence of the *N. Y. Review*, &c. &c., keeping in mind, (if he understands them,) the theological, metaphysical, and ethical principles that Hopkins and his associates were intent to overthrow and displace, will understand what we mean. He will recognize them the same principles always obtruded in opposition to the theology of Hopkins, he will see clearly that during the broken and undisturbed reign of those principles, as they now reign in the free States, (where, for the most obvious reasons, the “Hopkinsian” doctrine never permitted to enter,) the propagation of “modern abolition” would be impossible. Allow to slave-holders their apologists, to-day, the *premises* Hopkins wrested, “three quarters of a century ago,” out of the hands of the Northern Doctors—so far as the verdict of the better and more intelligent portion of the northern community were concerned.

The bitter enmity of Southern Christianity to Abolitionism is well known. In the Presbyterian Church, at the South, this led to a jealousy of Congregationalists, in which communion with Bellamy, Edwards and Emmons were refused. This jealousy was extended to portions of the Presbyterian Church composed of New England emigrants, and at the opening of the present slavery contest, this led to the split in the Presbyterian Church. Quakerism itself was never as dreaded at the South, as Hopkinsianism, because it was not thought to be equally stern, uncompromising, denunciatory, radical and uncompromising.

and, and it would be as hard a task to organize a radical anti-slavery society in Massachusetts as in Georgia. The theology of Hopkins was, in fact, the strongest conceivable moral engine to be wielded against slavery, whether he ever intended such a use of it or not.

But when we add to this, the fact that Edwards the younger, as well as Hopkins and Emmons, did actually bring their theology and ethics to that service, by writing against slavery, in the use of their distinguishing doctrines, and in the very manner and phraseology that is now distinctively characteristic of “modern abolition,” the matter is out beyond cavil.

But there is another link to the chain. They not only marked out the measures of modern abolition, as well as their principles and maxims, but actually put them in practical operation, before the dawn of the American Revolution, before the Quakers or any body else, had come up to that standard. We have the record and the acknowledgment from Friend Whittier.

Hopkins was “dismissed from the society in Great Barrington, in 1788, and was installed at Newport, R. I., the next year.”

“The demoralizing effects of slave-holding,” (continues Whittier,) “every where forced themselves upon his attention, for the evil had struck its roots deep in the community, and there were few families into which it had not penetrated. The right to deal in slaves, and the use of them as articles of property, was questioned by no one; men of all professions, clergymen and church members, consulted only their interest or convenience as to their purchase or sale. The magnitude of the evil at first appalled him, he felt it to be his duty to condemn it; but for a time even his strong spirit faltered and turned pale in contemplation of the consequences to be apprehended in an attack upon it. Slavery and Slave trading were at that time the principal source of wealth to thousands; his own church and congregation were personally interested in the traffic; all were implicated in the guilt. He stood alone, as it were, in its condemnation, with here and there an executioner, all Christendom maintained the rightfulness of slavery. No movement had yet been made in England, against the slave trade; the decision of *Crauford Sharpe's Somerset case* had not yet taken place. The Quakers, even, had not, at that time redeemed themselves from the opprobrium. Under these circumstances, after a thorough examination of the subject, he resolved, in the strength of the Lord, to take his stand openly on the side of humanity. He prepared a sermon for the purpose, and, for the first time from a pulpit of New England was heard an emphatic testimony against the *sin of slavery*. In contrast with the selfish and disinterested benevolence which formed, on his mind, the essential element of Christian holiness, he held up the act of reducing human beings to the condition of brutes, to minister to the convenience, the luxury, and the lusts of the owner. He had expected bitter complaint and opposition from his hearers, but was agreeably surprised to find that in most cases his sermon only excited astonishment in their minds; that they themselves had never looked upon it in the light in which he presented it, steadily and faithfully pursuing the matter, he had the satisfaction to carry with him his church, and obtain from it, in the midst of a slave holding and slave trading community, a resolution every way worthy of note, in this day of cowardly compromise with evil, up to the part of our leading ecclesiastical bodies:—*Resolved: That the slave trade and the slavery of the Africans, as it has existed among us, is a*

gross violation of the righteousness and benevolence which are so much calculated in the Gospel, and therefore we will not tolerate it in this Church.

The distinctive principles and measures of “modern abolitionism” are here clearly embodied. The sinfulness of slavery, the duty of a public condemnation of it, especially by ministers, the appropriateness of the subject for solemn preaching on the Sabbath, and in the church whose members were guilty of the practice. There was no palliation, no excuse, no calculation of consequences—no postponement of emancipation on any pretences—no scheme of compromise or gradualism—no hushing up the agitation, lest it should disturb the peace of the church or hinder the revival of religion, or turn away men’s attention from “Christ and him crucified”—or secularize the Church or ministry, or bring the Church into collision with the civil authorities that had legalized the practice—no Jesuitical cant about “organic sin”—or the difficulty of uprooting a practice so deeply interwoven in the usages and institutions of society—no plea that the Bible tolerated slavery—that Christ had never condemned it—that the Apostles had welcomed slave holders into the Churches—that Paul had sent back a run away slave to his master—no pretense that the slaves were not prepared—that they could not take care of themselves, that they were better off in slavery; or that a system wrong in the abstract might be tolerated in practice—or that the slave question ought not to be made a church test—or that the unity of the Christian brotherhood and the individual rights of the members would be violated by the procedure!

No! The utmost verge of “radical abolitionism,” even to the “Church question,” as it is now termed, was at once reached, by the Church at Newport, at that early day. And why? Because the THEOLOGY taught by “Samuel Hopkins, the anti-slavery theologian”—the theology of modern abolitionism, the theology of uncompromising righteousness, was understood in that Church—had been honestly received there—had impressed the consciences, transformed the hearts, and moulded the characters of its minister and members. The same theology—the same religion, if it prevailed in all the Churches of this country, to-day, would, of necessity, produce the same effects. The Presbyterian, Congregational and other Churches of this country, to-day, do not take the ground of the

Hopkins Church in Newport, nearly eighty years ago—because it is said they “need more light!” Yes! They need the *same theology, the same religion*, that Samuel Hopkins and his Church embraced, exemplified, lived in, died in, and entered Heaven with! This is the “light” they want—the “light” that “shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not.”

The Church of Newport appears to have acted for itself, as an independent body, an equal brotherhood, in this matter. Well for them; no Saybrook Platform or Clerical Association held dominion over the soil of Roger Williams!—Here it was that the stern orthodoxy of Samuel Hopkins could act out itself, and radical abolition, its legitimate offspring, was cradled in the same nest.

The sentimentalism—the romance—the impulsive upheaving, the conscientious convictions, the generous efforts, the sincere testimony, of abolitionism—may have been found elsewhere; but the ethics, the theology, the philosophy, the metaphysics of abolitionism, had their origin, as has been described. Not that Hopkins or his associates invented any new system, but that they discovered, (as their co-temporaries and their immediate predecessors, and the Protestant Reformers had not clearly done) that comprehensive, systematic theology of unselfish, impartial, disinterested, universal benevolence, which, existed from the beginning, but which had been obscured by the Great Anti Christian apostacy commencing in the second century and not even yet terminated. The abolitionism of Hopkins was no mental or moral idiosyncrasy, no unaccountable appetency to one exclusive department of activity or effort;—it was no narrow and capricious application of an idea in only one favorite direction.—It was the healthful development, as the occasion offered itself, of well considered and established Christian principles, (sectarian dogmas men may call them) and *because they were* Christian principles, and to be reverently obeyed and honored here, and every where else, in disposing of the claims not only of the Africans, but of all other men, of all other beings, in all worlds, including the claims of God, the Universal Father, of Jesus Christ, of the Holy Spirit, each of whom was to be regarded, in the language of their theology, “according to their real nature, importance, worth, and just rights, in the

scale of universal being.” In a word, it was consistent, stable, abiding, well balanced, uncompromising, well proportioned abolitionism, in distinction from all one-sided, one idea or rather half idea, fluctuating, unstable, advantage-calculating, and consequently compromising, and expediency seeking sorts of Abolitionism. At Newport the true foundation was laid in 1700, from which the entire superstructure has been reared. Just so far as that example and those principles have been followed, just so far and no further has the anti-slavery enterprise, either in England or America, been conducted on the true basis. All the subsequent history of the enterprise proves this.

Hopkins had himself been, at one time, before his removal to Newport, a Slave holder, and his repentance seems to have been deep and thorough.

“Dr. Hopkins”—says Whittier—“did not confine his attention solely to slavery in his own Church and Congregation. He entered into correspondence with the early abolitionists of Europe, as well as his own country. He labored with his brethren in the ministry to bring them to his own view of the great wrong of holding men as slaves. In a visit to his early friend, Dr. Bellamy, at Bethlem, who was the owner of a slave, he pressed the subject, kindly, but earnestly, on his attention.”

The result was such as might have been predicted, from such an interview between such men. As soon as Bellamy discovered that his slave, (who had the management of his farm) was really desirous of freedom, he gave it to him, instantly, on the spot.

Hopkins devised early measures for the education of competent and pious colored men to send to Africa as missionaries, but his plan never contemplated the removal of the negroes from this country, to get rid of them, or as a condition of their freedom, or because they could not be elevated to the condition of men and Christian brethren, in this country.

In 1776, some months previous to the Declaration of Independance, he published his celebrated “Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans, showing it to be the duty and interest of the Americans, to emancipate all their slaves.” “This was republished in 1785 by the New York Abolition Society, and widely circulated.” The sermon of Jonathan Edwards, the younger, was published and circulated by the same Society, about the same time. No publications of modern abolitionists have been more radical and uncompromising. Their republication and circulation in the early part of the present agitation produced quite as much excitement and elicited as much angry opposition, on the part

of leading ecclesiastics, as any thing that has ever been published. Many copies sent to them were returned through the mails, and not a few of them accompanied with expressions of indignation and disgust, in 1833-4—and 5.

It was no fault of Hopkins and Edwards that their writings did not persuade the majority of those engaged in the anti-slavery movements of their own time from 1700, and onward, to adopt the own uncompromising principles and measures. What *was* done, however defective, was mainly in consequence of the writings and the hold they obtained upon the consciences of men. *Gradualism* was the prevalent doctrine of the time, not only in respect to slavery in particular, but in respect to all other sins. The instantaneous regeneration or immediate repentance so much insisted on in the theology of Hopkins (a more sectarian dogma, some modern abolitionists still think it to be) was no where else distinctly recognized, as belonging legitimately and essentially to the scheme of human recovery from sin. The work *could* not be done at once, according to hyper Calvinism:—and, according to Pelagianism or Arminianism, it need not be! One or the other of these ideas, in some shape, was incorporated into the varied phraseology or creeds, of almost if not quite, all the sects, however their technicalities might differ. Some talked then as some still do, of waiting God’s time, and of sitting passively for the reception of regenerating grace before they could acceptably perform any commanded duty. Exhibit to them any glaring abomination, in their own midst, and they would tell you, as many still do, that “God will remove it, in his own time. We must be patient, and not exhibit any fretfulness or undue anxiety about having sinful practices abolished in our own day.” (So our Prof. Pond, and Prof. Uphams even, with all their attainments in the “interior life” are teaching their spiritual pupils still!) The disciples of Fox, among the rest,—not a few of them little suspecting themselves of any latent affinities to the fatalism of Hyper-Calvinism, could get themselves, then, as now, very much into the same “quiet and stillness,” in connexion with much of the same dreamy mysticism, content to enjoy this “spiritual life” within, without being disturbed or disturbing others with any stirring warfare with surrounding sins; as much afraid of rebuking sin as of opening their lips in au-

dible playor, unless at those rare and favored intervals in which they were almost irresistibly moved to the duty, by the special influences of the Spirit. John Woolman and Benjamin Lay must have been sorely tried with the lothargy of all such Quakers, and lacked, themselves, probably, the theological armor necessary for probing the sore to the bottom. Accordingly, Quaker Abolitionism, to this day, is claimed by gradualists, as commonly exhibiting itself in the mild, the unrebuking, the calculating, the gradual stamp. Their movements in this country and until recently in England, give countenance, at least, to the claim. Another class, to whom the radical abolitionism of Hopkins and Edwards was addressed, entertained so much of the Pelagian notion of comparative human innocency, of the venial nature of transgression, of the gradual and spontaneous process of human amendment, or (with that generation of New England Pelagians) the mysterious efficacy of the sacraments, that they could see little but fanaticism, extravagance, and unchristian denunciation, in their terrible rebukes.

In a word, "the storm of theological controversy" that astounded Christendom, "three quarters of a century ago" had it, in 1785, and during the remainder of the past century, sufficiently cleared the moral, religious and theological "no-man's-land" of Christendom from the clummy damp and density of the middle ages, to permit the sunlight of "radical abolition" to penetrate through it, and reach the human conscience, with full force. From 1789, to 1785, was but 16 years. It needed nearly half a century more, before the theology of Hopkins (with its "sectarian dogmas") could so far diffuse itself among the masses, (though in the diluted form, in which a newly propagated and rapidly diffusing doctrine commonly takes its lodgement*) as to permit the propagation of radical abolition to any extent.

The abolitionism of Hopkins and Edwards was appreciable at that time, only in a few leading minds, well trained to

Just as the diffusion of radical abolition now, is by contact with the half-hearted who embrace it—just as primitive Christianity was corrupted by its rapid spread among Pagans—just as the high-toned theology of Hopkins was lowered down among its professed disciples in wide circles, many of its original ideas, taking on others in their stead, and some grave errors, as with the New Haven School, such as the Utility System of Paley was introduced. At the same time, a community are, by process, carried ahead of their former position and cannot easily get back again, if they try never

metaphysical disquisition. Not because it was obscure or obscurely expressed, but because the human intellect, and especially the mis-educated moral sense, were obscured by the religious delusions and theological nonsense that had then scarcely begun to be dissipated, but which, for a long time past, however unenlightened, instinctively shun the light, hide themselves in silence, and, now a days, never adventure forth except when, in the person of some morally demented D. D., they are driven to defend his position by such arguments as they may be able to furnish! When it is remembered, that, out of the limited circle illuminated by the theology of Hopkins and his fellow laborers, there were no better notions of religion and of moral obligation in the Churches than we now get from our Doctors Wisner, Fodge, Fuller, Wayland, Stowe, Beecher, &c., (some of whom could hardly have helped deriving some instruction from the school of Hopkins,) who can wonder that a *gradual* abolition of slavery, in New England and especially the middle states, was all that the writings of Hopkins and Edwards could produce?

For the same reason, the anti slavery movements in England had to drag along as they could, in the atmosphere of vague definitions, indefinite proposals, fluctuating expedients, procrastinations and gradualism—the creatures of sentimentalisms and impulses, rather than of fixed and abiding Christian principles. Of all the older British abolitionists, GRANVILLE SHARPE, co-temporary with Hopkins, and of similar theological views, if we may judge from his "Law of Retribution," and other writings, was the only one who seems to have thought of planting his feet upon the Rock and the Truth in the abstract, of following them wherever they lead, and trusting implicitly in God, the Supreme Sovereign, to shape the results as best pleased him, in the absolute disposal of all human destinies. This item of his theological creed (as much a "sectarian dogma" in him as in Hopkins) enabled him to insist, successfully at last, (in opposition to York, Talbot, Blackstone, and Mansfield) that there neither was nor could be any legal slavery in England, because nothing in opposition to God's will could be binding law! This, in essence, was one of the grand points at that moment, in debate, in that "loud controversy the sound whereof went over Christendom, awaking responses"—aye, and

glorious ones too, "from beyond the Atlantic!" This is that same "sectarian dogma" of the Divine Sovereignty which, were it welcomed by certain miseducated abolitionists of Massachusetts, to-day, would save them from the servility of conceding that pro-slavery enactments can constitute binding law, and from the wretched and wicked conservatism of maintaining, as some of them do, that the uniformity and certainty even of bad laws, are less injurious and hazardous to the community, than would be the confusion incident on the denial of the legality of such wicked laws! [Vide Phillips' Review of Spooner.] GRANVILLE SHARPE remonstrated with tears, and remonstrated in vain, with Clarkson and Wilberforce, against their one-idea gradualism of assailing only the slave trade, leaving slavery itself untouched. The utter failure of their policy we now understand, and it were well if we could understand too, the cause, and avoid similar failures, by embracing and obeying a theology competent to guide us.

The changes of theological sentiment, and the removal of antiquated religious errors in England, during the last eighty years, may not have been as marked as in this country. Nevertheless the work, though comparatively noiseless has been steadily in progress. Perhaps fewer new errors may have been introduced than with us; and especially among the professedly progressive portion of the Church. Andrew Fuller and Robert Hall have almost revolutionized the theology of English dissenters. Such antinomian writings as Harvey's Theoron and Aspasio, and Marshall's Gospel Mystery of Sanctification have fallen into merited disrepute. And we hear of no "little devil" theologies springing up among their moderns. Another thing was favorable to the introduction of radical abolition on English soil. They were farther removed from the contaminating presence of slavery.—It did not control all things in their very midst. After all—if "immediate abolition" was first advocated there, a little in advance of the second raising of the same standard here, we are not certain that the principles of abolition have been as comprehensively, as accurately, and as extensively propagated there, as here,—that the discussions have been as deep, as thorough, as philosophical, as with us. We should think not, and that ideas of utility and appeals to the more feelings and sensibilities, had been more promi-

ment there than here. The "inalienable rights of man" are not so well understood, nor so much taken into the account with them as with us, because the theology of Hopkins has been more distinctly unquainted here than there, and has produced great political results. Whether it was Elizabeth Herrick, as some claim, or William Knibb the Baptist Missionary, that first raised the flag of immediate emancipation, in England, we are not certain. Its theological affinities and foundations are no secrets. The chain of theological cause and effect, between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is not difficult to understand. And this reveals the identity of the persecutions and struggles of that former age with those of the present.

No. XI.

OF THE SECOND STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIAN FREEDOM IN AMERICA WITH THE ORGANIZED CLERICAL CASTE—PREMONITORY SYMPTOMS—RELATIVE POSITION AND CONDITION OF THE PARTIES.

To most persons, the bitter hostility of the leading American Clergy, particularly those of New England, and their Presbyterian brethren in the middle States, so closely connected with them, against the present agitation of the subject of slavery, has been accounted a problem of difficult solution. The readers of the preceding numbers will be at no great loss for the moral causes of so remarkable a development.

THE OLD CONTROVERSY RENEWED.

It will be found, on examination, to be little more or less than the renewal, in a different form, and on new specific occasions, of the contest between the organized clerical caste and the rising spirit of Christian Freedom an hundred years ago. It was not in the atmosphere of a revived evangelical Christianity, that such a caste, evolved and nurtured by the previous decline of true godliness, could be expected to thrive. All its powers were accordingly put forth to crush or to cripple it, and hence "the loud storm of theological controversy" that ensued—a controversy turning, not so much indeed, directly either upon the obnoxious measures of the revivalists, or upon the claims and prerogatives of the hierarchy, as upon those deep questions of theology and of essential Christian virtue or holiness upon which all minor questions were well understood to hinge. If the religion taught by such men as Hopkins were to gain ground among the

people, the hierarchy must decline of course, because individual responsibility and Christian intelligence and activity, resuming their proper place, would leave little or no scope for extended and organized sacerdotal supervision.

The evangelists of the new faith, especially Bellamy and Hopkins, had set the dangerous example, in 1758, of rebelling against the supremacy of the Saybrook Platform, and of resuming a portion at least of the previously recognized rights of Christian Freeman. Thenceforward the conservators of ecclesiastical domination, though gradually shorn of their power to persecute the new faith by aid of the civil authorities, never ceased, for three fourths of a century, to regard it with a jealous eye, and left no means or opportunities unimproved to circumvent, dilute, neutralize, or cripple it, by every indirection in their power. In 1769, the same year that Hopkins, (after having been in the ministry 26 years,) removed to Newport, Emmons was licensed by an Association in Connecticut, yet not without opposition, on account of his views of theology, and the publication of a protest against his being licensed, which rendered him thence forward, to use his own language, "a speckled bird." "Its effect on his mind," says his biographer, "was as lasting as life." He resolved to be an independent man, to think for himself and speak out his convictions, without being trammelled by ecclesiastical bodies. His early flexibility, commanding talents, exalted worth, and growing influence, soon raised him above the power of the dominant hierarchy to harm him, but to the day of his death, in 1840, at the age of ninety-five years, they never ceased to fear him, to dread the propagation of his distinctive principles, and to discountenance and embarrass, whenever they could, the younger and less distinguished ministers by whom his sentiments, or the kindred views of Hopkins, were imbibed.

The writer of these sketches can attest that for at least twenty years previous to the commencement of the present anti-

* That Emmons was always right in his peculiar views, our argument does not oblige us to affirm. His habit of untrammelled investigation, and fearless avowal of his sentiments, was enough, of itself, to make him the pioneer of religious liberty and the dread of ambitious ecclesiastics, as, de from the general tendencies of his philosophy. The man who learns the people to reason and think for themselves, and who sets the dangerous example of daring to differ from the authorized ecclesiastical standards, will always find himself at war with the Spiritual Despotisms of his time. Such a man, even if he falls into grave errors, will not have lived in vain.

slavery struggle, say from 1812 to 1832, the reputation or the suspicion of being a Hopkinsian or an Emmonite, as the terms were then used, was as fatal to the prospects or the promotion of a young minister, wherever the influences of the ecclesiastical bodies, the Theological Seminaries, or the Great Benevolent Societies, could reach him, (and where could they not?) as the reputation or the suspicion of ultra abolitionism now is, with the same great bodies. The terms of reproach and opprobrium, in requisition, were similar, and in many instances, the same. They were accounted "abstract-ionists"—"ultraists"—"radicals"—"impracticables." At an earlier period they had been branded as "fanatics"—"disorganizers," and "new lights."

Though with less public excitement than in the present controversy, yet with equal tact and management, the ultraists were thrust into corners and kept in the back ground. It was enough for Dr. Woods, or before his day, Dr. Morse, (of whom the present Editor of the N. Y. Observer is the well trained son and "true chip") to intimate of individuals that could not be managed, that they were "not prudent" and their rank among their brethren and in the Churches was determined! The Association was thus controlled, and the Association controlled the Churches. Whenever Church difficulties arose, growing out of these discordant elements, and we have still in memory some remarkable cases—the influence of the ecclesiastical bodies could always be calculated upon, to crush or hold in check the propagators or adherents of the "radical" faith, or learn them lessons of "prudence" for the future. "Hopkinsianism" lived in the New England Churches as abolitionism now does, by the dignified sufferance of the "powers that be," corrupting by smiles and embraces or overawing by frowns and threats and penalties, as the circumstances required, or rendered "expedient"! The worst possible position in which the Truth could be placed! Then, as now, a faithful minister of "radical" orthodoxy could obtain little or no support from the opposite party, and the radicals must give way, dismiss their minister and unite in a more "prudent" man, for the sake of "peace." On the other hand, there were seldom any concessions to a radical minority, though the ministers were never so obnoxious to them, or abusive towards them. Then, as now, the concessions were all on one

side, and it would be "disorganizing" to needs. The deteriorating process had near by reached its last stages, when the present anti-slavery excitement commenced.

What little there was left of the religion of Hopkins and Emmons that was not merely technical and nominal, was ready to welcome "modern abolitionism" of course, became absorbed in the movement, and bore, thenceforward, the very same reproaches and approbrious epithets from the very same quarter, only under a new pretext, and a new name. The aged Emmons, descending peacefully towards his grave, and the youthful Torrey, (about that time married to a grand daughter of Emmons, and just entered upon the ministry) rushing forward, unconsciously, to the martyrdom before him, may be mentioned as specimens of no inconsiderable number of men to whom the reproach of "ultraism"—"radicalism"—and "disorganization" were not new, when poured upon them for their abolitionism.—They had borne the same reproaches before, for holding the same theology, the same ethics, and the same metaphysical doctrines in the abstract, and applying them to religion and morals in general, aside from the application of them to the slave question in particular. When Joseph Tracy, the clerical editor of the Vermont Chronicle (afterwards of the Boston Recorder and the N. Y. Observer) first charged upon the abolitionists, in 1833, the sin of propagating, in their theory of inalienable rights, and of human equality, "the Jacobinism of the first French Revolution"—he only applied, in a new direction, the very same charge, and in precisely the same language, that, twenty years before, a certain class of New England Statesmen, of the Ames and Pickering school, were wont to urge vehemently, in our own hearing, against the distinctive theology of Hopkins, whom they justly regarded as the metaphysical father of the "ultra" democracy they so much hated, and from the prevalence of which, like Joseph Tracy, they affected to anticipate "oceans of blood!"

COMPARISON OF THEOLOGIES.

"Hopkinsianism"—says Whittier—"as a distinct and living school of philosophy, theology, and metaphysics, no longer exists!" Then, the philosophical, theological, and metaphysical foundations of your American Revolutions, Declaration of Independence, and Modern Abolitionism have given way! Replace them who can! But to what "living school of philosophy, theology, and metaphysics" will you apply for assistance? To Princeton, with her theology of human chattelhood? To Andover, with her philosophy of "organic sins?" To New Haven, with her "divine supremacy of the lesser devil of the two?" To Oberlin, with her metaphysics of a "lightless love" that must be tolerated in the Church while it cannot distinguish a man from a brute? To Paley and Bentham, with their "theology of beef steak?" To Carlyle, with his "divine-right of Kings?" To Brownson, with his Democracy of Romanism? To O'Connell with his Abolitionism of Ditto, and his anti-democracy besides? To Theodore Parker, with his theology of "the transient of Christianity" and the "permanent" of Parkerism, changing with the moon? Are these, and the like of them the "living oracles left us," while the "philosophy, theology, and metaphysics" of Hopkins "no longer exist," "or survive only in memory?" So one might think, that witnesses the pranks played before high heaven by the sham statesmen and theologasters of the times! Not much to the discredit of Hopkins could it be that he had no "living school of philosophy, theology, and metaphysics" to take rank with these, and assist them in radiating a darkness that may be felt!—Sad evidence indeed have we, that, so far as the apprehensions of our popular philosophers, theologians, and metaphysicians are concerned, the "colossal thoughts" of Hopkins "are entombed!"

THE WANT OF A THEOLOGY.

Our "Athens"—as she calls herself—our Boston, makes good her claim, by rearing a literati who "spend their time in nothing else but telling or hearing some new thing," unable to listen long enough without "mocking," to any thing solid, to learn its true import—the cradle of all novelties, the resting place of nothing:—

* See Article 23 of the Oberlin Quarterly, Aug. 1846, on "Light and Love," in connexion with Art. 32, Nov. 1846, on "come-outism and come-quieters," both by Prof. Thome. The friends of Liberty have confided much in Oberlin, but if those articles are to be understood as indicative of the philosophy and metaphysics taught there, we might as well look to any of the other schools of the prophets for just ideas of human rights as to Oberlin. If "the bulwarks of American Slavery" at this late day, almost eighty years after he stand taken by the Hopkins Church at Newport, are to be regarded as Christian Churches, and on the ground, at the same time, "at they want more light, it is high time to ask what were the metaphysics of the apostle John concerning this connection between 'light and love.'" See first Epistle of John, chapter I: 5-6 and III: 7.

where all reforms may be projected, but none of them wisely guided: the charnel house of theology and chaos of metaphysics—the wholesale ware room and Exchange of all beliefs and disbeliefs blundered ludicrously together—where pseudo orthodoxy panders to the vices, and semi-atheism turns reformer:—where terrible denunciations of divine judgments come from lips that laugh at them, to be condemned as "infidel" by those who profess to believe in them! Where all forms of moral death live, and all aspirations after spiritual life seem ready to die: where priesthoods are preaching down the inspiration of the Bible, and scoffers are setting up pretensions to a divine inspiration of their own—where aristocratic conservatism, in its hereditary hatred of democracy feeds the fires of disorganization, and anarchy is setting up new despotisms at her leisure: where the cry of no Church, and no State begins already to give audible portent of a new Church, and State combined! High time were it that a "living" theology, of some sort, inhabited the city of the Pilgrims, on whose altars are so visibly inscribed—"To the unknown God."

No marvel that in a Commonwealth that glories in such a metropolis, "the leaves of the elder and younger Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins and Emmons" are accounted "Sybilline." Were it not so, we should be led to suspect the philosophy, the theology, and the metaphysics contained in them. When Bedlam nominates and installs her own keepers, we expect to see her sane men, if she have any, taking the cells of the lunatics. Before New England could have descended to her present level, the volumes of her theological "giants" must, of necessity, have been "entombed."

NEW FORMS OF THINGS.

A resurrection may, perhaps, be in reservation of which "clerical dandyism" has never dreamed. There may be, perhaps, even now, more living disciples, if not oracles, of the faith of Hopkins, than Friend Whittier seems to have supposed. If he hears little or nothing of "Hopkinsianism" now, it may be because the elements of that philosophy have taken a new form, and because its adherents are bearing quietly their allotted and wonted persecutions, under a new name. Of one thing we were not unobservant at the time. The old hue and cry against Hopkinsianism, with our leading ecclesiastics, ceased, precisely then, when their louder

clamor against "modern abolitionism" commenced. The practical form of the long hated heresy, and under circumstances portending a popular agitation in which it would be more widely diffused and permanently embodied, could not have failed to fill them with the alarm and rage they exhibited on that occasion. The mad dog cry against Hopkins and Emmons had grown stale. New names, less known to the public, were now prominent in this movement, and the old persecution could very conveniently be renewed in a new form. As for those professed Hopkinsians who could not honor their principles, on a call like this, no further theological difficulty was to be expected from them. And so the event proved! Witness the course of Dr. Gardiner Spring, of New York.*

A THEOLOGICAL SECRET.

On no point of the connection between the past generation and the present are we more confident of having attained clear perceptions than on this. The reigning hierarchy of New England and New York, (with whom the clamor against "modern abolitionism" commenced,) after a protracted struggle of three quarters of a century to put down the radical theology and ethics of Hopkins, so dangerous to hierarchal power, could ill afford to see that same uncompromising system of religion and morals reusitate itself, at the very moment when, after a long train of well adapted expedients, they had got it, as they thought, fairly under their feet, when one after another of its champions had been quietly laid aside, seduced, overawed, or driven to obscure posts, and little or nothing seemed wanting but the long anticipated demise of the Patriarch Emmons, to clear the field, and take full possession of their long disputed inheritance, the claim to which they had nourished and perpetuated with so much assiduity and care.

* This gentleman, nephew (by marriage) of Emmons, was once virulently opposed for his Hopkinsian "ultraism" by the dominant Clergy of New York. The excitement had indeed subsided, but the belligerent parties looked at each other askance, up to the time it was ascertained that Spring, notwithstanding the prompt espousal of the anti-slavery cause by Emmons, and after a fresh pursuit of Hopkins against Slavery, had committed himself strongly against the movement. That was sufficient! A full recantation could not have produced a more perfect reconciliation. No further trouble was to be apprehended from his Hopkinsianism. The practical part of it was what was most feared. But he never troubled them, so far as I could learn, by his theory or practice afterwards. His preaching underwent a marked change, though without any direct abandonment of his creed. His ecclesiastical course was thenceforward smooth and easy.

GOOD CAUSE FOR THE ALARM.

No other form of reuscitation could have equally alarmed them. They knew, too well, the potency of the old watch-word "inalienable human rights." Just there was the very point of the Hopkinsian philosophy, (too rigid in its morals and too elevated in its theory to be a favorite with the self indulgent masses,) that, whenever presented, in a practical shape, had always taken a powerful hold on the public mind. Had it not electrified the nation, in 1776? Had it not been borne by our swift ships to foreign lands? Had not all "the horrors of the First French Revolution" and "the horrors of St. Domingo," to boot, with all the advantages taken of those horrors, and all the rhetorical changes that had been rung upon them, failed fully to make the due impression of the perilous nature and tendencies of the doctrine? True, the Spirit of '76—thanks to ecclesiastical management—had greatly declined—but how readily might it be again roused, and who could tell whether Saybrook Platforms, now so rickety, would ever be able to hold the heretics in check? There was not a moment to be lost. Another agitation of "inalienable rights" and the power of the clerical caste might be broken for ever.

They thought of all this, though the people did not. They saw laymen, obscure laymen, unanointed and unbidden, coming forward, and beginning to be looked up to, as leaders, mechanics, some of them, and without public education! These circumstances were noticed among them, and talked of, openly, by the less guarded among them, as matters of ominous import and disastrous bearing! In the Temperance Reformation and in the Anti Masonic movement, (and Emmons was an Anti Mason,) great mortifications had arisen, already, from the same cause. By artful and timely management, the Temperance movement had been recovered, measurably into clerical and conservative keeping, and kept, for a time, within "prudent bounds." After all, the prescribed boundaries had been broken over. "Te-totalism" springing up among the laity, in defiance of official proscription and prohibition to the contrary, with all the great names and rich funds embodied in the organized Temperance Societies arrayed against it; and only propagated by a few obscure laymen, without clerical endorsement and without

funds, had triumphed, after all, against them, had given to the Great American Temperance Society, the pet of the dominant clergy, proscribing, as it did, in its proscriptive and conservative course, due notice that its services in the cause, were no longer needed, and had given it, in the name of the active temperance men of the country, leave to retire, the which it was preparing, as decently as possible, to do; while one State Society after another, the Pennsylvania Society first—that of New York, with Delavan at its head, afterwards, either convinced of their error, or bending to the breeze, were declaring in favor of the more "radical" movement. This was too much, even for ecclesiastical meekness to bear firmly, especially when they saw the same system of operations, and to a great extent, the same men, preparing to agitate likewise the slave question! Where were these agitations to end? And what was to become of the broad distinction between the clergy and the laity, if matters were permitted to go on at this rate?*

* The further of complaint, with the "General Association" of Massachusetts and Connecticut, in their Resolutions and Pastoral Addresses, so late as 1836 or 7, ran very much in this channel! And "Rev. Joseph Tracy," notwithstanding the pressing need of his editorial labors, and having been transferred, by clerical advice and arrangement, from Vermont to Boston, and from thence to New York, had to quit his post in the N. Y. Observer, and suspend his direct assaults on "modern abolitionism" to write a book—a history of the "Great Awakening," with such a version of the story as should best exhibit the awful disorders of itinerant and lay preaching, and warn the churches and ministers against the recurrence of similar disorders!

(To be Concluded.)

The first work of the reformer is, to be thoroughly reformed himself.

Payments and Donations for the Christian Investigator. November, 1847.

D. Bailey, Darien Center, \$1.00	A. Ingersoll, Lellogville, (O.) 50
Wm. Hawks, Mount Morris, 50	S. Booth, Davenport, 50
W. Woodruff, Silver Lake, 50	S. M. Booth, N. Haven, Conn., 50
T. Sims, Bouckville, 1.00	F. D. Parish, Sandusky City, (O.) 1.00
A. Hutchinson, Gaines, 50	J. Alberty, Lockport, 1.00
R. Anderson, do. 50	P. B. Ripley, Buffalo, 50
H. Wright, Middleport, 50	S. W. Richmond, N. H. Newbury, (O.) 50
L. Pratt, N. Ridgeway, 1.50	S. H. Addington, Buffalo, 1.00
J. Alberty, Lockport, 50	J. B. Lee, Worcester, (Mass.) 1.00
L. Street, Barre Center, 50	J. Lightbody, N. York Mills, 50
O. Babbitt, Northville, Mich., 50	J. C. Roberts, do. 50
W. D. Babbitt, Livonia, 25	O. A. Merrill, Austinburg, (O.) 1.00
I. Jones, Bush, 50	Dea. Shaw, Baring, (Me.) 1.00
T. Hopkins, Scottsburg, 50	D. H. Frost, Stockbridge, 2.00
A. Blue, N. Gage, 2.00	R. Dixon, Livonia, 50
J. N. Robinson, Honeyoye, 50	J. B. Waring, Cleveland, (O.) 1.00
B. J. Campbell, Litchfield, 1.00	
D. H. Frost, Stockbridge, 1.00	
C. Treadwell, Union Springs, 1.00	
J. Andrews, Perry, 5.00	
"A Friend," 1.00	
	\$33.34

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

New Series, Vol. V—No. 12.
Whole Number. 68.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO. N. Y. DECEMBER, 1847.

WILLIAM COODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The streets shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix. 26.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

FOR TRACT DISTRIBUTION.

Copies of any particular number will be sold, adapted to the soil, (if desired,) as follows, viz: Paper, per dozen, \$0.50 Sixty papers, \$2.00 Twenty-eight papers for 100 One hundred papers, \$2.00.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

ITS REALITY—ITS DEFINITION—RISE, PROGRESS AND REMEDIES. THE FORMS IN WHICH IT IS NATURALLY EMBODIED, AND WHICH SHOULD THEREFORE BE ABANDONED.

No. XI.

[Concluded.]

THE TOPIC MOST DREADED.

Almost any other subject of agitation could have been less formidable to the organized clergy, than the subject of slavery. It touched them on too many tender points. Their ecclesiastical connexions with Southern slave-holders were not to be overlooked. But this was not all. Not a few of them were the sons or grandsons of slave holding ministers of the past century in New England, and they were mostly the successors of such men. Not farther South than New Jersey, there were clerical slaveholders, still. Nor could they fail to remember, some of them at least, that it was on this same topic of Slavery that some of their hardest battles with "Hopkinsianism" in by gone days, with Hopkins himself, the younger Edwards and Bellamy and their associates, had been fought, especially from 1780 and onward, when fresh editions of their "ultrasms" on the subject had been published and scattered wide among the people, "disturbing the peace of the churches" and bringing a slave holding ministry, in N. York and New England, into discredit; an agitation which had run to the beginning of the present century, and could not quite be allayed until the formation of the Colonization Society, in 1816, (only 16 years before the organization of the N. England Anti Slavery Society, in 1832) and the erasure of the

note against "man stealing" in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, two years afterwards; nor even then was quiet restored without a spirited renewal of the controversy; an occasion of the Missouri Compromise, in 1820—20, much to the alarm of certain ecclesiastics, at that time. Surely, they had suffered enough, as a clerical body, and in more ways than one from the previous agitations of the subject. It had gone far towards establishing the ultra doctrine of immediatism in religion and morals, that had troubled the hierarchy so much, ever since 1703—nay, ever since 1740, in the time of the Great Awakening. The "Storm of Theological Controversy", so far as the force of argument was concerned, had gone confessedly against them, just as the Anti slavery controversy now has.—One point after another had been yielded of necessity. It was becoming too late to plead for the theory of gradualism in general, and "in the abstract." If it could not be retained in the concrete, on such a startling proposition as slave emancipation, all was lost, and ultra Hopkinsianism, with its terribly repulsive and uncompromising theology, would have the benefit of the argument and the advantage of the triumph. It was no time for Princeton, nor Andover, nor yet New Haven to be idle. "The bewildering cry of immediate emancipation" (to quote the language of Leonard Bacon in 1833) was a sound of terror and dread to all the conservative theologians in the land. Only waive that point, said Leonard Bacon, and the clergy are all with you, to a man. Here, there was a point of theology involved, that could by no means be yielded. True it was, open opposition to the general Hopkinsian doctrine of "immediate and unconditional submission to God and repentance for sin" (in distinction from the old theory of gradualism and stipulation) had measurably given way. "Revivals of Religion" in imitation of the "Great Awakening" (now no longer to be reproached) were in high repute; for in no other way could the churches be kept from running out; and the use of the phrase "immediate and unconditional repentance" (so long the pivot of the controversy,) had come into use in a vague

way at least, for without this, it was too late, now, to get up any special interest on the subject of religion. A striking parallel to the state of the Anti slavery controversy, now, when the old cry of gradualism is seldom heard, and immediatism is tacitly admitted to be the true theory, even by the most bitter opponents of anti slavery measures and anti slavery men, not excepting Leonard Bacon himself: Then, as now, there was a way, however, of making all this concession unmeaning, so far as any practical issue is concerned. Just about that time, if we mistake not, or not long previous or afterwards, a most subtle and elaborate effort was made, in the Christian Spectator, by the New Haven theologians, (assuming now, to be par excellence, the "New School" in opposition to the "Old") to contrive a new style, as Bunyan would call it, by means of which the impenitent sinner could step out of the strait way marked out by Hopkins and Emmons, avoiding the sharp points of immediate, unqualified, and unconditional submission. It was a great curiosity to be sure, which few people could claim distinctly to understand; but the matters of temporary neutrality, stipulation, balancings of profit and loss, and bargain driving, were too prominent to be misunderstood. This new theory of regeneration, was much lauded, at the time, as the true solution of the problem contested for so many years. With this theory, the demand of immediate and unconditional repentance for the sin of slavery, directly and harshly came in contact. If the demand were admitted, the theory must be set aside, the ingenuity of the New Haven theologians would all be lost, there would be no method of salvation left but the old fashioned uncompromising way, so much in disrepute, and how could revivals be promoted in fashionable assemblies, and the lovers of pleasures gathered into the Churches, then?—As a mere theory, an abstraction, a sentimentalism for the feelings to exercise themselves upon, immediate and unconditional submission might indeed have answered a very good purpose in its place. It might have amused the speculative; it might have charmed the imaginative; it might have edified the orthodox. But in

the nobler, prouder, matter of fact, practical, every day dress presented by the extravagant abolitionists, it would never do! People would take it all in earnest and be repulsed. The antiquated figure of Emmons, with his three cornered hat, nay, the ghosts of Hopkins, Bellamy, and the younger Edwards, gliding into the theological school at N. Haven at twilight, could not have more thoroughly frightened them.

THE RIVAL THEOLOGIES AT ONE, AGAIN.

No better reception could "modern abolitionism" expect, at any of the Theological Seminaries of the land, not one of which had been permitted to be contaminated with the uncompromising metaphysics of Hopkinsian immediateism, in an undiluted or unsophisticated form. Princeton was the impregnable castle of Old School passivity, piously waiting God's time to leave off sinning, lest the Westminster Assembly's Catechism (venerable but much abused document) should suffer the loss of some of the warts and wens that disfigured it. Andover, a patchwork of compromises and conventionalisms, like the image that Nebuchadnezzar saw, part iron and part clay, or, as some thought, of wood, hay and stubble, in dread of nothing so much as investigation, metaphysics, and abstractions, which it held to be the trinity in unity of all evil, understood her position well enough, when she saw the spectral figure of Emmons presiding at the Anti-slavery Anniversary, if she did not before. Lane, the Western duplicate of New Haven, with a double dread of Emmonsism and ultraism at its head—these, the principal schools of so called orthodox theology, may be taken as specimens of all the rest. In not one of them was there any thing like the stern unbending theology and ethics of Hopkins, of the younger Edwards, of Bellamy, and of Emmons. Nor was there one of them that had not been guarded against the antique "radicalism" with as much care as they have ever since been against the "modern". Not one of them was there in which an Edwards, a Bellamy, a Hopkins, or an Emmons could have held a Presidency or a Professorship, had they then been on the stage of action, and in their manly vigor, any more than could, now, the same number of the most obnoxious abolitionists in the land. Reverenced and even idolized they may have been, as were the old prophets in the times of the Savior,

but their principles in their uncompromising ethical application, especially in any unpopular bearing, were hated, nevertheless.

Of this, the writer of these sketches has no good evidence as he has that the modern pioneers of dreaded and vilified abolitionism have been feared and hated by the same men. Nor does he fear that any one competent, and in a position to judge of the matter, will adventure to dispute the justness of this description. He is not writing of things which he does not know, as well as he can know the moral affinities and repellancies, the likes and the dislikes, the co-operation and opposition, of any of the different classes of men, ministers, and prominent laymen among whom, for twenty years past, he has had occasion to move. The Anti-slavery enterprise was not the only one, nor the first, in which he has been permitted to labor, to travel, and to form acquaintances with the ministers of New England and the middle States. He had occasion to learn the ethics, the theology, and the tactics, of prominent men in the church and ministry before he learned them from their course concerning slavery. He has never seen nor experienced more opposition to the ethics he cherishes, in the anti-slavery cause than in the Temperance cause, and in the effort for suppressing that iniquitous system of lottery gambling, once so popular, and by which meeting houses were built, and colleges and professorships were endowed, by general clerical sanction, twenty years ago. He can, in memory, go fifteen years back of this, and recall, as distinctly, as the scenes of the past twelve months, the course of the same men and the like of them, in the same ecclesiastical connexions, in respect to the then contested questions of theology, ethics, and ecclesiastical polity. In the course of Divine Providence, he was placed near some of the central points of those struggles, and he neither forgets the names, the countenances, the sayings, or the doings with which he was familiar, then, in times when the preaching of the general doctrine of "immediate and unconditional repentance and submission to God"—"disturbed the peace of the Churches", and called for the interference of councils and ecclesiastical bodies, as the more particular doctrine of immediate and unconditional repentance for the sin of Slavery has since done.

GRADUAL CORRUPTIONS OF THE OLD DOCTRINES.

As is needful, nevertheless, along with all this testimony concerning the high uncompromising ethics of the old Hopkinsian Theology, the manifest parent of Modern Abolitionism in its most unpopular and uncompromising form, to make the just discrimination between that doctrine in its purity and the diluted and corrupted form in which, in later times, it was often exhibited without a change of the name. The immediate disciples of Whelpley, (author of the "Triangle") in the middle States, and in Connecticut very soon learned to cast into the shade, the more uncompromising features of the system, or altogether set them aside. It was popular to discard some of the absurdities of hyper Calvinism, and equally so, to engrain the poison of the Utilitarian Philosophy in its stead. Barnes, Skinner, Cox, Beman, &c. may have called themselves, at one time, as they were often called by their opponents, Hopkinsians. The same term came to be applied to Pres. Dwight, (a very respectable writer) and to his rapidly degenerating successors, and, by Old School Presbyterians to New England and Congregational ministers in general; as slaveholders call all northern men abolitionists. All this was vague, indiscriminating, and wide of the mark. The Edwardses, Bellamy, Hopkins, and Emmons had little more in common with most of these, than with the religious community in general. "New School" as now understood, or, as sometimes called "New Haven Theology" no longer claims to be Hopkinsian. "It has its living oracles" in abundance, but of quite another stamp. The "leaves" of these, are not "Sybilline" nor unpopular in a pliant and pleasure loving age. If no School, ancient or modern, has the philosophy of moral compromise been carried to a greater extent than in this High professions of "modern abolitionism" have indeed come from this School but lean performances—a profusion of gorgeous flowers, but, (for the most part) shrivelled, blighted fruit. So true is that the morals of a Church and Minister can never rise permanently higher than its Theology. The history of "New School" for the last thirteen years has been sadly rich with illustrations of this momentous but forgotten truth.

DISCREPANCY—DOUBTLESS ELES' NTS.

Of those, chiefly in portions of New England, who were far enough from running into the "New School" of New Haven or of the Middle States, there are other admissions to be made. We must distinguish between Hopkinsism and Hopkinsians, just as we do between abolitionism and abolitionists, between Christianity and Christians. Elements utterly foreign and indeed hostile to Hopkinsianism became incorporated with the manifestations of it, and identified with it, in the popular mind, and in the minds of Hopkinsians themselves. This was partly owing to the remaining incongruities of their earlier writers, particularly of the elder Edwards, but more, directly and indirectly, to the influences exerted upon them, by their unfortunate ecclesiastical and denominational connexions. The distinguishing doctrines they had imbibed and taught were at utter variance with any of the teachings, usages and arrangements of the Congregational and Presbyterian sects, otherwise there had been no foundation for controversy or persecution. And in the very nature of the case, there could be no such thing as continual co-operation and conformity with those sects, and subjection to them, on the part of the minority (vital as were some of the points at issue between them,) without a sacrifice of consistency, not to say of integrity, and the gradual and imperceptible reception of impressions, influences, and sentiments altogether in bad keeping with the principles they had avowed. It fared with the Hopkinsians who continued in their old sects, just as it did with the Puritans, who continued in the Church of England. Their position was at war with their principles. They held one thing in the abstract, and conformed to the opposite in practice. The result was, in process of time, that some of their abstract principles were forgotten and their opposites imbibed.

Nothing could be more certain than that the principles of the "Great Awakening" and their manifest effects, in the first instance, were adverse to all the claims of a clerical caste, and equally so to the anti-evangelical ritualisms of the times, the inactivity, silence, and servile subordination of the laity and the narrow arrangements of sect. Drawing definitely, as those broad principles did, the wide distinction between true and false religion, they threw minor distinctions into the

shade and brought Baptists and Pseudo-Baptists, (laymen at least) who entered into the spirit of the new teachings much nearer together in sentiment and feeling than they could be, with those of the same sects with themselves who held opposite views concerning spiritual religion. Bellamy's "True Religion delineated" presents a basis upon which all true Christians, of all sects, might consistently unite, and from which the ritualists and formalists and bigots of all sects would be as instinctively repelled. Could there have been such a thing at an early period, and while the testimony of the Old Separatists remained unimpaired, as the separation and re-organization of all the sound materials in the churches irrespective of sect, the discrepancies of which we are now to take notice, might have been prevented from obtaining a place.

One of these discrepancies was the gradual return of the laity to the same torpid state of inactivity and silence from which, during the Great Awakening, the living portion of the Church had temporarily emerged. And this was connected with that grand discrepancy between the theology and the ecclesiastical polity of most of the teachers of the new faith, which led them, as it did the elder Edwards, to consider lay preaching and exhortation disorderly; and to draw a broad, unscriptural distinction between the clergy and laity, ill comporting with the high tone of Congregational Church Independency which most of them taught. By remaining in their old ecclesiastical connexions the ministers whose doctrines were accounted so disorganizing and fanatical, were under a constant temptation to do all in their power to discountenance and repress every manifestation among the laity which should be obnoxious to their clerical brethren of a less radical theology, and thus take away the standing reproach of "disorder and disorganization." In later times therefore, the Hopkinsian ministers became rather distinguished for their conservatism in respect to the activity of laymen, in religious meetings and revivals of religion. The paragraphs of Edwards on the subject served them as a text from which, in various ways they lectured the people of their charge against "confusion and disorder." The Churches came under the influence of those teachings and a spiritual death was the result. The stiffness

of death reigned in the very places most plentifully supplied with the didactic theology of spiritual activity and life. It was of little use to illustrate human activity in connexion with dependence, and then repress human action and effort.—Nor could Congregational Independency preserve the breath of life, amid all the clear illustrations of its divine origin, and the danger of departing from it, so long as little or nothing was left, in the congregation for the equal brotherhood *to do*! As nothing but the trammels of sect, and fraternity, in the sect, with anti-evangelical members and ministers, could have led the evangelical ministers, commonly known as Hopkinsians, into discrepancies like these, so nothing but the narrow spirit of sect, inducing an entire mistake in respect to the position proper to be occupied, could be expected to result from them. It is lamentable to see men like Emmons falling, to some extent, under the influence of these discrepancies, intent, earnestly, on throwing up some bulwark against the encroachments of ecclesiastical power but never fostering, as he might have done, the lay activity in religious meetings, that alone, could constitute such a barrier; solicitous to guard against the inroads of religious error and therefore fearful of any co-operation and intercourse between Christians of *different sects*, forgetful that the errors he was chiefly intent on displacing had obtained a marked supremacy in his own sect (the Congregational) and unacquainted, probably, with the fact that what he regarded as the essence of true religion, (apart from mere incidentals and rituals) was to be found quite as plentifully in a number of other sects as in the one in which he was accounted a "speckled bird" and a disturber as long as he lived.

Affinity with political as well as ecclesiastical conservatism, was another discrepancy arising from the same causes, as was, likewise, the growing tendency to a more dry discussion of the sublimest problems of a spiritual theology as tho' they were only the objects of intellectual attention, upon which the metaphysical perceptions or sentimental musings of men were to exert themselves, comparatively forgetful of their high practical bearing, in solving important practical questions of duty in the natural relations of life. From all these causes, in connexion with an ecclesiastical affinity with the elements of spiritual death, there in the ascendant, in all the high places of

New England, it came to pass that the slave question, once so prominent a topic with the teachers of the school of Hopkins and the younger Edwards, was almost wholly forgotten, or permitted to be smothered by the gradualism, absorbed in the vagueness and misled by the duplicity of the Colonization scheme, until the cheat was detected, and the mask torn off by other hands.

THE OLD MISTAKE OVER AGAIN.

In a word, the problem of preserving a spiritual religion in the bosom of a corrupt church, in fellowship with baptized worldlings, and under the supervision of an ambitious clerical caste, was coming rapidly to the uniform solution of all previous experiments of that kind, from the age of Novatian in the second century, to the present time. There was nothing in the theology of Hopkins, any more than there was in that of the Apostle John,—that could preserve its disciples from the inevitable effects of those evil communications that corrupt good manners. The sure operation of moral cause and effect was not to be suspended, nor the spiritual laws of our moral natures violated with impunity, nor the warning voice of God to come out of corrupt Churches to be disregarded, (under the delusive idea of reformation) without suffering the threatened penalty, in the nineteenth century; any more than in the preceding ones.—Partaking of the sins of anti-christian churches, even christians could not escape, wholly, their plagues.

EMMONS VS. THE HIERARCHY.

A seed nevertheless remained, and a testimony was preserved. The warning voice of Emmons against ecclesiastical encroachment, however beclouded by his position and neutralized by discrepancies, continued steady and waxed louder and louder to the last. The longer he lived, and the nearer he approached to the coming catastrophe of a second New England persecution against divine truth, the more clear were his views and the more earnestly did he lift up his voice. It is not too much to say that the renewal and the increased emphasis of these warnings, almost at the very instant in which the flag of immediate and unconditional abolition was again raised, was among the causes that increased the excitement and alarm of the clerical bodies at that crisis. They were not inattentive when he uttered his memorable notes of warning against associations of ministers, such, in substance

as the following, which appear now, in his volumes :

"Associationism leads to Connexionism—Connexionism leads to Presbyterianism—Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy—Episcopacy leads to Roman-Catholicism—and Roman Catholicism is an ultimate fact." Emmons, volume I, page 135.

"The question now is—what can we do, and what ought we to do? in order to obstruct and check the growth and spread of heresy, arbitrary power, among our churches and aspiring ecclesiastics."

"If they" [the National Societies] "persist in their claims, and succeed in their measures, I see nothing to prevent their establishing a national religion, and exercising an ecclesiastical dominion as arbitrary and as dangerous as any that now exists in the Christian world." Emmons, volume I, page 83.

"Congregationalists often complain of Presbyterians, Episcopallians and Baptists, on account of their Church Government, but they have no reason to complain, for they act upon precisely the same principles, when they concentrate and increase their ecclesiastical power by union with Associations,--Connexions, and ecclesiastical councils." * * *

"Christ has given no power to Churches which they may give away." Emmons, volume V, page 453.

"These human hierarchies, which have been the source of immense evils in the Christian world, ought to be destroyed, and they undoubtedly will be destroyed, in the time of the Millennium. They are the bulwarks of error, delusion, and every species of moral corruption, and must be purged out of the Christian Church, before the church can become universally pure and flourishing. We have long been praying for the downfall of unchristian power and tyranny in the Church of Rome, and we ought to pray for the downfall of every degree of that unchristian power in every other church in the world."—Ib. page 455.

The almost prophetic forebodings of Emmons, indistinct as they were, and intermingled, to some extent, with mistaken apprehensions in respect to the proportions and manner in which the opposite elements of despotism and of freedom, in the different sects, were distributed; were nevertheless the sagacious anticipations of a far seeing mind, and an acute observer of the moral causes then at work in the community in which he lived. What he saw dimly in the future, we can contemplate more closely in the past and the present. In the retrospect, it is easy to see that, aside from the agitation of the slave question, and in addition to the fraternity of northern ecclesiastics with slave holders, there were elements of discord between the free spirit of active, evangelical religion, in the churches, what little there was left of it, and the spirit of ecclesiastical domination that had gradually recovered from its former repulse, and intrenched itself anew. That those elements could long be kept quiet, could not be rationally supposed. Some other occasion, had it not been for the anti-slavery movement would have presented itself. Other occasions there indeed were, in the other reformatory movements. The very utterance of such sentiments as those just quoted from Emmons, and coming from so venerable a patriarch, was enough, of itself, to have occasioned an open rupture, had there been any considerable number of ministers and earnest laymen prepared then to respond to it. As it was, the agi-

itation of the slave question, at such a crisis, was more than sufficient to blow the smoking mass into a flame.

SECOND AMERICAN PERSECUTION—THE CRISIS MATURED.

We have intimated, already, that other christian and reformatory movements, besides the agitation of the slave question, and even in the absence of it, might have occasioned an open rupture between the elements and implements of Spiritual Despotism in this country, on the one hand, and the living spirit and active developments of christian progression, on the other. This, we are persuaded, would have been the case, even had there been no slave system in the country to be assailed; that is, admitting that in the absence of that overshadowing despotism, the hierarchies of the country circle have attained to any thing like their present rank growth. Even if they had not, there would have been less of servility in the church to submit to them, without a contest.

The Temperance movement already alluded to, excited little less opposition than did the anti-slavery movement, in the ranks of the hierarchy, though it was more prudently managed. Their southern ecclesiastical connexions were not directly disturbed by that agitation, nor by the activities of itinerant evangelists, for the promotion of religious revivals; but opposition to both these were very strongly marked, long before the anti-slavery agitation commenced.

REVIVALS—ITINERATING EVANGELISTS.

We have no occasion to defend or to approve of all the revivals, or revival measures of the itinerating evangelists of that period. Let it be granted that sometimes those evangelists were uncourteous and even abusive towards the pastors, and in many cases, without adequate cause. The very fact that the pastors acted together, as an organized body, by themselves, apart from the laity, and commonly from the evangelists likewise, placed them in a position that could hardly fail to excite mutual jealousies and aversion between them. Add to this that the organized pastors laid claim, as will be shown, to the right of controlling both the churches and the evangelists in their movements, and it is evident that continued peace between them would have to be preserved, if at all, at the expense of absolute submission on the one hand, and unlimited domination on the other. The

the High Authority that had ordained them had ordained Evangelists likewise, and had no where intimated that the latter were to be held in subjection to the former, or to organized bodies of them; by more than that the former should, in the manner, be subjected to the latter.—No wrongs could not result in a right. And the intolerant bearings of certain evangelists towards certain pastors could not justify the attempt of the organized pastors to control the churches in such manner as to take away their right of enjoying the labors of an evangelist, without having first obtained, of the pastor.

The extensive revivals commencing in central and western New York in 1826-7 and afterwards extending into some parts of New England, were the occasion of such contention among the churches and ministers, between the date just mentioned and the beginning of the anti-slavery excitement in 1832-3.

It was during this period that Charles G. Finney, now Professor at Oberlin, became so prominent in the prosecution of what was then commonly called "new measures" including protracted meetings, separate seats for anxious inquirers, &c. A large number of itinerating evangelists were engaged in the work, and a great excitement and much opposition was the result. It must be admitted on the one hand, that the Churches and Ministry in general, even such among them as should be called Christians, (as at the beginning of the Great Awakening of the last century,) were in a very dark, cold and lapsed state, and consequently in the worst position to judge correctly of the spirit or the measures of the revivalists, while a still greater number gave no manifestations of spiritual vitality at all. On the other hand, the violence of denunciation,—(whether we call it a virtue or a blemish) on the part of most of the evangelists, far exceeded any thing that has since been so much censured (and by some of the same evangelists) in the advocates of emancipation. Whether the pro-slavery position of leading clergymen, and their efforts to sustain slavery by the Bible should be accounted a venial offence, in the comparison with the opposition of the same men to the new revival measures, we need not stop now to inquire. Suffice it to say that the organized pastors, to a great extent, and especially the leading men among them, were almost as zealous to put down the fanaticism of the revivalists as they ever have been since to put

down the fanaticism of the abolitionists. The leading religious journals were all against them, which led to the establishment of the N. Y. Evangelist, in 1820 or '21, in defence of the revival measures, and in opposition to the N. Y. Observer and kindred publications. It was not until some time after, that the Christian Spectator, a quarterly Magazine, the organ of the New Haven Doctors, though far removed in location, and in spirit, from the warm atmosphere of the N. Y. revivals, surprised the religious community (and none more than the majority of its patrons) by undertaking a defence of the evangelists and their measures. This seems to have been a ruse, and in the end, a very successful one, for the wider propagation of their New Theology, including the utilitarianism they had just then introduced into their theory of regeneration and experimental religion. The bait took. The leading revivalists or many of them, till then somewhat unsettled or unsystematized in their theology, though distinct enough from the ultra "Old School" of Princeton, drank down greedily so plausible a scheme, and coming from so high a literary source, especially as it was now made to fraternize with their favorite measures. To this cause, in our view, the subsequent deterioration of the revivals and the untrustworthiness, on moral questions, of prominent New School ministers in general, including the revivalists & their measures are to be attributed. The philosophy of utility, begetting the policy of expediency, never yet produced stable and uncompromising reformers and it never will. Nor is the spirit of the martyrs to be nurtured in the maxims of that cold, calculating school. The revivals began to decline, in spirit and in power, from the moment the new philosophy began to be introduced. Their Samsons were slow to recover from the loss of their locks, and when they did, it seemed to be, in many instances, with the loss of their eyes. What has become of Beman, and Duffield, and Kirk? And what, on great reformatory questions, in which the reformation of the Church is involved, is the position of others that might be named? And how is it, that those who have published their convictions of the sad fact that the majority of new converts in our revivals apostatize in the very act of joining a dead church, are even yet unwilling that a separation between the living and the dead should take place?

Of the character of the revivals from

1820 to 1830 it is a difficult task to speak with much confidence and accuracy, now Judging from what remains of their fruits, we must suppose them to have been of a very mixed description—far less pure than their friends supposed at the time—probably less so than those of former periods, yet more so than most of those that have been witnessed since. Their theological character was too indistinct. They needed more thorough instruction in proportion to the excitement. Much of the religion produced was more showy and noisy than solid. Not a little of it was unsubstantial and vain because *purely selfish*, produced by a sense of danger rather than of guilt, and resulting in a confidence of safety, and an anticipation of felicity, rather than in a hungering and thirsting after righteousness—the love of the Right and of the True for their own sakes.—This defect was seen and pointed out, at the time, not only by enemies of revivals, but by friends who were mistaken for enemies, and whose faulty position and incongruous ecclesiastical affinities led to that mistake. What little there was left of the theology of Hopkins was in no posture to be heard, at such a crisis, by the revivalists, nor to effect anything itself. Its high standard of religion ill-comported with its fraternity with organized spiritual death. It had inhibited, too, as before noticed, from its ecclesiastical associates, that dread of lay preaching, lay exhortation, and lay activity in revivals that was wholly at variance with its own philosophy, and that constituted the strong tower of the hierarchy intent on its destruction. "Hopkinsianism" was now become, in some regions of country, a Samson not only without its locks and its eyes, but grinding in the prison house of the Philistines or making sport for them in their temples. So much comes of religious fraternity with worldliness to preserve "the peace of the Church!"—
"How were the mighty fallen!"

What the reigning hierarchy—the deadly enemy of the religion of Hopkins, and of revivals—disliked in the itinerating evangelists and their measures it is easy to see. The Revivalists, with all their defects, were too uncompromising towards specific sins, and preached "immediate repentance" too much, to promote peace and quiet in the churches. Whatever the Doctors may have perceived, intellectually, (and in the light shed on such subjects by the Edwardses, the Bellamy's, the Hopkinses and the Emmons'es) they had

The truth is, the natural tendency of religious excitement, whether spiritual or genuine, to rouse the activities of the masses, to loose their tongues, to set them at work in the churches, to the mention of the cherished anachories of the clerical caste, to bring forward both ministers and laymen according to their natural or acquired gifts, and not according to artificial and hierarchical arrangements—this—from age to age, is the grand difficulty between ecclesiastical bodies and revivals between pastors and itinerating evangelists. The more pure and more thorough and intelligent and abiding the revival, the more grievously does it conflict with the claims of the organized clergy. A brief gust of excitement, filling up the waning ranks of their churches, and then dying away, leaving all as dead as before, and sending the evangelists to another field out of the way of the pastor, is a desideratum very extensively desired. But a deep, thorough, discriminating, abiding revival of true religion is less easily managed for the benefit of the caste. In the very first place, it may expose the unsoundness of half the Church, to the scrutiny of every body else, if not of themselves, and what shall be done with them? Especially if the true seed, including the new converts, shall have learned the first elements of church order, of christian responsibility, of the “difference between the righteous and the wicked!” Elements of a “division” of course, and what becomes of the Parsonage? Allow such a revival to

Of the revivals from 1833 to 1838 immediately preceding, as they did and running into the period of the Anti-slavery excitement, (and whatever may have been their value, their blemishes, or their defects,) it is but the part of historical verity to say that there was more connexion between them and the Anti-slavery movement, (with all its value and blemishes) than the mere matter of chronological proximity and contact. Although the very first notes of the Antislavery alarm did not come from the Itinerating Revivalists* yet a very large portion of those

At this, the reigning hierarchies, in the middle states, and in New England, and even at the South, understood, and then as they made of their information, will appear as we proceed.

That the Antislavery movement was not the only element of discord in the churches, nor the only mark of ecclesiastical proscription, is evident from the bitter persecution of John R. McDowell, the martyr of the Seventh Commandment—the pioneer of "Moral Reform."—

the historical facts of the case. "Thy testimony is the more remarkable as coming from one who admits no one to be a true abolitionist who secedes from the "Old organization" which is now chiefly in anti-evangelical hands. Hear him.

"In fact, nearly all the laboring Abolitionists were originally of evangelical tenets. (Mr. Garrison among the number,) and not a few of the very best, still remain them.. We fear the Anti-Slavery Cause would have had to wait a long time before it reached its present point of progress, had it depended for help on those who had renounced the doctrines of Total Depravity and the Atonement."

was a variation of the experiment. The Revivalists were to be identified as "New School."—McDowall was decidedly a disciple of the "Old,"—not contaminated with the heresies of Hopkins, Linnens, but orthodox, according to standard of Princeton. Of no other way or disorder was he charged, but arose out of his faithful labors for degraded females of the commercial metropolis, and the suppression of vice. In the course of his investigations, he discovered that reputable members of the churches, and even elders, in good repute and liberality in supporting religious institutions, were in the habit of buying dwelling houses owned by them at enormous prices to be used for the most infamous purposes of debauchery and prostitution. At these facts he hinted in his Journal, after having found that public remonstrances were of no avail. The N. York Observer came out with a declaration that McDowall's Journal ought to be indicted as a nuisance. Its publication suppressed by law.—No measure was actually attempted and the Journal was thus indicted by a Grand Jury of the city, of which an elder of a church was foreman. This attempt upon the liberty of the press was previous to any similar attempt to suppress *Anti-Masonic* publications.—It was thought by many, that the N. Y. Observer had misinterpreted the views of its leading patrons, and would suffer a loss of patronage. The event proved otherwise. Immediately after, a general clerical effort was made all over the country to promote its circulation, and three thousand new subscribers were the fruits. Of this, a gentleman connected with the establishment made his boasts (in the hearing of the writer of these sketches,) affirming that the proposition to suppress McDowall's Journal was the cause of the movement, and of its success.

All this was not done, however, without strong professions of zeal for the cause in which McDowall was engaged, and of regard for the man. By those who finally proved his worst enemies he was at first taken by the hand, and encouraged to go forward. Many traps were set for his feet, and all arts used to "manage" him. He was alternately patronized and proscribed—threatened and flattered—but proved a faithful man, still.—Of course he could not escape persecution from the leading clergy who felt reproved

by his example. He underwent a mock trial, and was deposed from the ministry by the 3d Presbytery of New York ("New School") in April, 1839. He appealed to the Synod (Old School,) and the sentence was reversed. The Presbytery appealed to the General Assembly, but the Great Master above called his servant home, not long after, but not without marked manifestations of His gracious presence, in the midst of which he solemnly renounced Presbyterianism, clerical caste, and human creeds, declaring himself to be "a Minister of Jesus Christ" independent of the Presbytery, and appealing to His final tribunal, from all "ecclesiastical courts." The religious community was extensively agitated and divided in respect to the manner and treatment of this devoted man, and the thoughts of many hearts were revealed.

Before this time however, the persecution of abolitionists had commenced, and McDowall, though not extensively known as an abolitionist, had become interested in the movement, and had discovered and exposed in his lectures, the debasing and demoralizing effects of the Colonization scheme, upon both the white and the colored population of the city. By an instinct not to be misled, and that needed no visible cord of connection, the mobs that assaulted prominent abolitionists in 1835, in the city of N. Y. York, were equally intent to wreak their vengeance on McDowall, could they have found him.—They surrounded his publication office with threats and imprecations.

ANTI MASONRY—SECRET SOCIETIES.

The history of the Masonic institution, and of the anti-masonic movement, if we had time to go into it, would reveal still further the declining condition of the Church, and the willingness of ecclesiastical bodies to shelter iniquity in it, so long as the public sentiment would permit it to remain undisturbed. A large number of Clergymen were adhering masons, and few instances of ecclesiastical action against the Institution are on record, especially among Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Some Baptist Churches, and a few Baptist associations bore their testimony. Why so many of the members of Clerical bodies (in many respects analogous to Lodges,) should also become members of Secret Societies, and what is the mutual tie of affinity existing between them, are matters for future inquiry. In Clerical bodies, as in Secret

Societies, the few seek, by indirect and unperceived influences, the control of the many. The monopoly of special immunities and privileges are common to both. And so is in most cases, the obligation, either expressed or implied, that the members shall *stand by each other*, in all controversies with those out of the caste. In the clerical associations no oath of secrecy is imposed, that we know of, but in respect to their "interlocutory" proceedings, often resorted to, generally held apart by themselves, and almost always potential, a general silence is known to be preserved. Associations as well as Presbyteries, without formal proceedings on record, or any publication of their doings, have come to an "understanding" to exclude anti-slavery agents—the "understanding" has taken effect, for months, and even years, before the fact of the arrangement has leaked out, though zealous abolitionists were of their number and submitted to what they did not approve. Many close observers have come to the conclusion that, somehow, the Churches (as well as the Legislative and Judicial bodies, in the State) have been much under the control of the Lodges, and that *Clerical Associations* are exactly adapted, with a membership in both bodies, to be the mediums of influence between them. Some think the great apostacy now so manifest, took place during the anti-masonic excitement—that the Church and Ministry then came under the yoke of Satan, and have never recovered themselves. One thing we know, an adhering mason, or one who did not earnestly "renounce and denounce" the institution, is seldom if ever worth any thing as a reformer, since. Masonic machinery was doubtless employed, in planning and conducting the pro-slavery riots of 1835 in the city of New York, and some of the clergy were certainly busy in fomenting them.

Christian Investigator.

ROSEY. DECEMBER, 1847.

CHURCH ORDINATION.

An aged minister in this State, writes us as follows:—

"I think the Christian Investigator better adapted to overthrow aristocracy and establish gospel independence in the Churches than any thing I have ever met with. If it can be consistent and not too much of a repetition, I would be glad to have you make out as plain and brief a defence as possible, of the right of gospel churches to ordain their own officers without the aid of any other officers."

IN ANSWER to our Correspondent we would observe that our readers already have our views, at some length, on the subject, and the case seems almost too plain to be argued. Very little has been said, except by Episcopalians, since the discussion between Potts and Walworth, on the other side of the question. Non-episcopalians, who practice clerical ordination seem disposed to continue the usage in silence, rather than defend it by argument. This common explanation of it is that although the right of ordination lies in the churches, there is a propriety, decorum, or comity, in calling in neighboring ministers for consultation and also for the purpose of making a more public and formal announcement of the ordination or choice of the Church. With this explanation many are satisfied, but the general impression received, nevertheless is, that the presence and co-operation of ministers is necessary, in order to a valid ordination. In Massachusetts, where the above explanation has been often repeated by Congregational Ministers at ordinations, the civil courts have nevertheless decided that the usage of having a council of ministers and delegates is a custom broken as to constitute a law, and therefore it is necessary to the legal validity of ordinations and dismissals of pastors, that such councils should be held and give their concurrence. This fact shows the importance of maintaining usages in accordance with correct principles. Rights must be exercised, in order to be preserved.

In defence of the right of the churches to choose, elect, appoint or ordain, their own officers, nothing new can be said or need be, at the present time. The following may serve as an outline of the argument.

1. It pertains to all organized associations of men to appoint their own officers, and there seems to be no good reason why associations for religious purposes should be considered an exception. If men are to be as free in the exercise of their religion as they are in other things, they must have the right of choosing the officers of their religious associations, as well as of their other associations. But it is manifest, and is commonly admitted that if the people are to be free, in any thing, they are to be free in matters of religion.

2. The Pastors of Churches are, officially teachers of religion. To say that men should not choose their own teachers

of religion, but that others should choose for them; is the same in effect, as to say, that men should not choose their own religion, but should be directed in the matter by others.

If the people may not choose their religious teachers without the concurrence and sanction of other religious teachers, then they may not choose their religion, without such concurrence and sanction. No religious rights can be more sacred, than the right of choosing our own religious teachers. They who have not this right, have no religious rights.

3. God requires all men to hear and obey the truth, and to cease from hearing the instruction that causeth to err, from the word of knowledge. He commands them to beware of false prophets, judging the tree by its fruits. The fidelity and integrity of the christian cannot be preserved without a strict and personal obedience to these high commands. Men are under a natural and moral obligation to judge for themselves what religious teachers they ought to hear and sustain, and they have no moral right to commit the decision into other hands, any more than the decision of the question whether they shall believe one system of religion or another. Men's characters are formed and their eternal destinies settled, to a great extent, by the choice they make of religious teachers. This responsibility they cannot throw off. In a word, men have a right to choose their own religious teacher, because they are morally bound to do so.

4. Christians and Christian Churches are emphatically bound by these moral obligations which bind all men. The liberty and the purity of the churches require for their guaranty, the vigilant and careful selection of their own religious teachers. To relinquish this, is to betray their trust.

5. It is undeniable that the New Testament Churches elected their own Pastors and Deacons, and that this practice was transmitted to the next succeeding generation.

6. It is idle to attempt any distinction between choosing and ordaining; and absurd to say that while the people may choose; the ministers must ordain.—This gives the ministers a veto, upon the choice of the people, and prevents their choosing at all!

MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND.—The following, from the London Nonconformist will

show that there are Christians in England who begin to understand something Church order:

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

Every Sunday evening *Primitivism* will be open at King's Arms-yard, Snow-hill, will be open as a place of religious meeting.

The church assembling there, professes to follow the apostolic form, and its main objects are, to develop in its members the beauty and the strength of the Christian character, and to demonstrate the simple directions of Primitive Christianity, perfectly followed, unaltered by any of the various forms of priesthood, whether Papal, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, Wesleyan, or Baptist, are essential for the realization of all the exalted objects for which they were appointed.

Worship to begin at half past six o'clock.

THEOLOGICALS AND REFORMERS.

The theologian who knows little or nothing of reformatory effort is twin brother to the reformer who knows little or nothing of the Christian theology.

There can be no trust worthy scheme of reformation that is not founded on correct system of ethics or morals; and there can be no correct system of ethics that does not repose upon the basis of well defined system of theology.

The theologian who is not also a moral reformer, may happen to be verbally correct in his theology;—the reformer who is not also a theologian, may happen to be correct in his measures;—the former from education, the latter from association or instinct; but the chances are as nine to one hundred, that both of them will make shipwreck of what they most value.

The theologians who are not active reformers are preparing, in their own persons, or in the next generation of the successors, to throw away a theology, however correct, that has been turned to practical account. The reformers who are not intelligent theologians are preparing themselves, for interminable jangle, chagrin and defeat.

The world needs reforming because men have departed from the true and the right. Theology and ethics constitute together (for they are inseparable) the science of the true and the right.

He that looks for the world's reformation without the light of theological science, is looking for the repair of the most delicate yet disjointed piece of mechanism without a torch, in the darkness of midnight.

When our theologians shall have become successful reformers they will have demonstrated the soundness of their theology. When our reformers shall have shown the consistency of their scheme with the foundation principles of theology they will have proved their measures to be trust worthy.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. VI—No. 1.
Whole Number, 60.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JANUARY, 1849.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure *four* subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

Its Hoofity—Its Definition—Rites, Progress and Remedies. The Forms in which it is naturally embodied, and which should therefore be abandoned.

No. XII.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY—PERSECUTION IN AMERICA.

THE COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

The American Colonization Society, organized in 1816, may be regarded as a sort of feeler put out by the organized proprietors in advance, to see how far they could go; and what the religious community would bear. However simple minded some may have been in suggesting it, in the first place, and others in supporting it, afterwards, it bears marks of having been laboriously shaped with more than Jesuitical subtlety and skill. Its double face on the slave question, its adaptation to perpetuate the slave system and yet absorb the sympathies and drain off the contributions of the friends of the enslaved, superseding all other endeavors to aid them, was only one part of the policy. It was equally adapted and doubtless designed, to divide the Churches first and the National Government afterwards, into a scheme for building up a religious establishment, a State Church, on the African Coast.*

It was decidedly anti-evangelical in all its prominent features, teaching gradualism, postponement, compromise, the substitution of expedients in the room of abstract right, and the removal of the oppressed instead of repentance for the sin of oppression. It justified prejudice and caste. It went so far as to deny that even the grace of God could overcome prejudice against color, or elevate a colored man in this professedly Christian land, or cause the "two races" to live peacefully and on terms of equality together in the same country.

The theological and ethical features of such a scheme it were not difficult to characterize. Yet such was the blinding effect of their ecclesiastical connexions that evangelical Christians, even those who taught and received the theology of Hopkins, were ensnared in the trap set not less for them than for the colored people, and they were thus led on in the dark! Even Emmons, who, many years before the Anti-Masonic excitement, detected the iniquity of the Masonic Institution and "openly denounced it as dangerous to the country, as unfriendly to religion, and as an imprecation upon the world" and notwithstanding his jealousy of the National Societies in general, never seems to have suspected the Colonization Society in particular, (though shaped and conducted by men in whose religious character he could have had very little confidence) until in the autumn of 1832, Mr. Garrison and others dragged its pretensions into day light and exposed them, by extracts from their own documents. Until then, it had never engaged his careful attention. But a few hours' reading of their own publications sufficed to show Emmons what objects they had in view. By his theological tests, of disinterested benevolence, abstract right, and immediate and unconditional adherence to the right, the cheat was detected at a glance. He joined in the earnest condemnation of the whole scheme.

THE RUPTURE AND THE FIRST OUTBREAK.

Thenceforward the die was cast, and hostilities commenced. The "aspiring ecclesiastics" received it as a challenge, when their favorite institution was thus openly assailed. Their complaints of the assault made upon them were loud and bitter, and they rushed to the contest with the malignity and desperation of detected and doomed men. They had been touched in the citadel of their power. Their all was at stake. The overthrow of the Colonization Society they foresaw would portend mischief to all their kindred "National Societies" that Emmons had, in a general way, cautioned the Churches to watch with jealousy, and which they knew, had been formed more or less, on the same model, and were adapted, however plausible

their pretensions, for similar ends. They understood, if abolitionists then did not, that in the light of this same uncompromising ethics, the derelictions of the American Board, &c., &c. would come, ultimately, under review.

Thus unexpectedly disturbed, at the very moment of their supposed triumph, (after a conflict of "three-quarters of a century") over the theology of immediateism—thus unceremoniously routed from the nest of ecclesiastical supremacy into which, after such costly and pains-taking arrangements and preparations, for so long a time in progress, they supposed themselves to be quietly settling down, their wonted equanimity and dignity were sadly disturbed. It was almost enough, surely, to discompose the serenity of a saint, amid all his soft dissuaves against "excessive agitation and excitement!" A St. Chrysostom, a Cyprian, a Cyril, an Ignatius, or even a Basil, or an Augustine, under such provocations, might have been roused.

No marvel that the choice epithets of "incendiaries, fanatics, disorganizers, traitors, infidels, Jacobins, cut throats," &c. &c. &c., were profusely poured forth from the lips and the pens of distinguished and reputable Christian orators, editors, and Doctors of Divinity against their brethren, of the same ecclesiastical communions, whom they would nevertheless charge with "schism" and "rending the seamless garment of Christ" if they should think of relieving the Church by separating themselves from it. No time was to be lost. No pains were to be spared. The pulpit—the press—the associations—the Colonization Society's meetings—all, and at once, were in requisition, and in operation. The Old Saybrook Platform, it seems, too, underwent a special survey, and was pronounced competent to do fresh service in the old cause.

Joseph Tracy's Vermont Chronicle, first, (early in 1833) the Boston Recorder; N. Y. Observer, Christian Advocate and Journal, and Baptist Register, afterwards—led on the attack. "Jacobinism of the first French Revolution—disorganization—treason to the constitution; abuse of Washington; dissolution of the Union; insurrection of the slaves. (Incendiarism, amalgamation;)" were the charges.—"Bible not opposed to slavery; Christ did not condemn it—apostles did not shut it out of the church—Paul returned Onesimus—

clergy as being a Missionary body. (though it never found means for directly employing missionaries) and the entire control of the Colonial Government by the Managers of the Society in this country, and it is easy to see the result, if nothing had occurred to interrupt the movement. The dignity above mentioned said explicitly that our squeamish notions about the support of the religious teachers by the State must be overcome, and no other clergyman present (and many were there) demurred or dissented.

*NOTE.—The writer was present at a Colonization Meeting while a titled dignitary of the church openly avowed his convictions that no adequate religious instructions could be provided for the Colonists, except through the action of the Colonial Government. At that very meeting likewise, measures were proposed for soliciting the aid of the United States Government towards building up the new empire in Africa. Take this in connexion with the standing claims of the So-

Moses regulated the system—Abraham was a slaveholder—curses of Canaan and Ham—dangers of immediate emancipation—horrors of St. Domingo—can't take care of themselves—shall be overrun with them—blessed effects of Colonization"—&c. &c. &c. Such were the arguments. After about twelve months religious labor of this sort, the secular presses, particularly those conducted by prominent church members or ministers, began to chime in—the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser, the N. Y. Journal of Commerce—lastly, the papers till then accounted inside—the N. Y. Courier & Enquirer, &c. &c. were brought into the ranks, and then by the united efforts of all—especially by the clerical orators of the Colonization Society, in 1834-5, the mobs were roused—the houses of abolitionists assaulted—their furniture dragged out, and burned in the streets of New York—inoffensive colored citizens of Philadelphia bruised and killed, their houses of worship pelted and injured.

THE NEXT CAMPAIGN.

Was not this enough? No! The insatiable spirit of persecution was not satisfied with demonstrations of this sort, for a year or two, all over the land! What could be done next? Grave theological Quarterlies must come to the rescue. "Biblical Repertories" must demonstrate the rightfulness of slavery. "Literary and Theological Reviews" must arraign the "radicals" as "justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." For why? The mobs had failed to suppress them, and the time had gone by for the clerical and honorable orators of colonization meetings to bring the populace up to the work afresh. Light was beginning to be diffused, and the spirit of liberty, so long lying dormant, was beginning to be revived. The legislative suppression of abolitionism was proposed—pamphlets elaborated by the joint efforts of clergymen and lawyers were sent forth urging the measure. Simultaneously, with this, the demand on the legislatures of the northern States, for penal laws against abolitionists, comes from the Governors and legislatures of slave holding States—are favorably received, and commended in Executive messages and speeches, come under grave legislative consideration, with the general impression that the measures of suppression will be adopted, and not a word of remonstrance comes from any christian pulpit, or from any religious press in the land, not committed to "modern abolition" and falling under the proscription threatened.

What more could our "aspiring ecclesiastics" do, to overthrow civil and religious freedom? What did they do, in New England—in Connecticut, an hundred years before, and

on a similar occasion? Precisely what they did again, now! The measure of legislative prohibition, they well knew, could not be carried and put in execution without the concurrent action of the "ecclesiastical bodies" directing the consciences of the people. With that action, perhaps, it might again do it, as it had done before. Here then, was appropriate work for General Associations and for Saybrook Platforms. Let us see how that work was entered upon, and performed.—There were anti-slavery agents at work in Connecticut. They were Congregational Ministers of Connecticut, in good and regular standing. What could be done to silence them, on the part of the ecclesiastical bodies, preparatory to the pending legislative prohibition? They were deserving (so said one of the prominent Theological Quarterlymen)* of "the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures" and to this sentiment not a single pulpit or religious press in the land (not distinctly abolitionist) had demurred.—From all quarters there came up the general re-echo to the persecuting sentiment!

If the reader has duly considered, and bears in mind the series of events, and the chain of moral causes and effects, already exhibited, from the middle of the past century, up to the period now under review, he will be under no loss to understand the record that follows.

ACTION OF THE ASSOCIATIONS.

The general Association of Connecticut, in June, 1836, convened at Norfolk, adopted the Resolutions that follow, and they were soon after adopted by the General Association of Massachusetts—clerical bodies, both of them, as the reader will bear in mind, without any lay delegation from the Churches.—In Connecticut, the General Association holds the powers described in the Saybrook Platform—vague, indefinite, and almost unlimited, as the reader of the preceding numbers has already seen. In Mass., the churches have never formally recognized the Associations as having any connexion with the churches at all. And yet, the language of the Resolutions shows how quietly "ecclesiastical" authority is exercised by them—mere lyceums for "mutual improvement" as we are sometimes told!

1. Resolved, That while this General Association appreciate and would maintain, at all hazards, the unrestricted liberty of speech and

* We quote, here, from the Literary and Theological Review; edited by Leonard Woods, junior, son of Prof. Woods of Andover, and himself, afterwards, a Professor of Bowdoin College, if we mistake not. This Quarterly was then just commenced, with the main object of opposing "New School" views as held at New Haven. Yet, so far from disapproving the sentiment there quoted, the New Haven party, as our records will show, were forward to join in the "ecclesiastical" proscription and had nothing to say against the "civil penalties" threatened. &c. &c. were the rival theologues of the church for a union in persecution!

the press, and while they fully recognize their own and every man's duty to prove all things, and their own and every man's responsibility to God, in relation to the reception of the truth; they do not admit an obligation on the community to hear or to read all that associations or individuals may volunteer to speak or print, or an obligation on the pastors of the Churches to admit into their pulpits all those preachers or speakers who may desire to address the people, or, in any other ways, directly or indirectly, to facilitate the promulgation in the community of sentiments which are in their view, of erroneous or questionable character."

2. "Resolved, That the operations of itinerant agents and lecturers attempting to enlighten the Churches, in respect to particular points of Christian doctrine and of Christian morals, and to control the religious sentiment of the community on topics which fall most appropriately within the sphere of pastoral instruction, and pastoral discretion, as to time and manner, without the advice and consent of the PASTORS and REGULAR ECCLESIASTICAL BODIES, are an unauthorized interference with the RIGHTS, duties, and discretion of the STATED MINISTRY, dangerous to the influence of the PASTORAL OFFICE, and fatal to the peace and good order of the churches."

3. "Resolved, That the EXISTENCE in the Churches of an order of ITINERATING EVANGELISTS, devoted especially to the business of excitement, and to the promotion of revivals, cannot be reconciled with the RESPECT and INFLUENCE which are indispensable to the usefulness and stability of the stated ministry, to the harmony of ecclesiastical action in the churches, to the steady and accumulating influence of the gospel and its institutions, and to purity in doctrine and discretion in action."

4. "Resolved, That, regarding the present as a critical period, in relation to the peace, purity, and liberty of our churches, and the efficiency of the pastoral office, we do recommend to ministers and to churches to discountenance such innovations as have been referred to, in these resolutions, and we consider ourselves BOUND to SUSTAIN EACH OTHER and the churches, in standing against all these invasions of OUR ECCLESIASTICAL ORDER."

Let the reader compare the arguments, the sentiments and the spirit of these resolutions, with those adopted by the New Haven Association and the Council at Guilford, in 1741, and with the Act of the Connecticut Legislature, in May, 1842; also, with the Resolution of the General Association of Connecticut against Whitefield, in 1745, as recorded in the Christian Investigator for July. It will be found that the demand, in 1836 was urged in stronger language than in 1741. What the Guilford Council, at that period only condemned as "disorderly" the General Association of 1836 declare to be an interference with "THE RIGHTS" of the pastors! The ministers of Connecticut were only "advised" against admitting Whitefield into their pulpits, but the members of the General Associations of both Connecticut and Mass. "BOUND" themselves and those they assumed to represent, in 1836, with almost the solemnities of a

Masonic oath, to "sustain each other," and might almost as well have added, "right or wrong!"

The *occasions*, too, of action, if they know how to tell their own story, were obviously similar. Itinerant evangelists occasioned the trouble then; itinerant evangelists and agents occasion the same trouble now. If Whitefield and Finley and Tennant had lived in 1830 they would have been included again under the same ban of proscription, along with the anti-slavery agents, and the "revivalists" now, as effectually as they were before. Attempts at legislative action, in the same direction, were making, at both periods, alike, except that anti-slavery agents only were included in the more recent attempt.—Had that measure succeeded, the legislative suppression of evangelists might possibly have been attempted next, had it been needed. So far as the "General Associations" were concerned, they were both placed on the same footing.* If the "Rights" of the Pastors were invaded, they had a claim for protection, of course! And civil government is for the protection of rights!

In connexion with these Resolutions, a Pastoral Address was set forth by the General Association of Massachusetts, and, if we remember correctly, by the General Association of Connecticut, likewise. From this document we are enabled to present the following extracts, which were made in the 'Friend of Man' for August 11, 1830, from the New Haven Religious Intelligencer.

"The local church, with its officers, and its means of instruction and edification, is God's organization for promoting within its own boundaries the kingdom which is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost; and the local church, when completely organized, and arrayed for action, must rely upon itself, under

God, to perform the work entrusted to it.—The great principle of the communion and association of churches with their pastor for mutual watchfulness, defense and edification, is that by means of which the influence of particular churches is to be concentrated and augmented and wielded over a wide community for the promotion of morals and of piety, for the illumination of the public mind by Christian truth, and for the sanctification of public sentiment. These are cardinal principles of our ecclesiastical order; and while these principles allow every church the power of employing special efforts, at fit seasons, for the advancement of religion, and while they permit pastors and churches to aid each other in such special efforts, every encroachment on these principles, every thing which tends to set aside the pastoral office, or to rob it of its spiritual honors, and its legitimate influence; every thing which would divert the churches from their reliance on God's institutions, honored by his blessing through successive ages, to hazardous and reckless human experiments for the promotion of religion; every thing which would set up over the churches, any power other than that of their own consciences, enlightened by mutual consultation, and by the regular administration of the word of God, is to be avoided as fraught with boundless perils."

They say further, that they "have wopt" over the "present low state" of their Zion, and among the causes of the decline, they "give a prominent place to that system of blind excitement, of rashly adventurous experiment, and of an unadvised innovation, which has of late been so developed in many portions of our country, and which is beginning to touch upon them with its agitating influences."

In the course of the discussion, the question was agitated, says the Religious Intelligencer.

"What is the duty of a man who is in advance of the age in which he lives, and thinks he has discovered light, on moral subjects, to which the rest of the community are blinded? It was answered by one, in substance, that he should spread his light before the regular ecclesiastical bodies, and before the pastors of the churches, individually—and if both shut their eyes against it, then he is at liberty, accountable only to God, and his own conscience, to go into the streets, and markets and other places of public resort, and wherever he can gain attention, display his new light to his fellow men.

had stood higher, up to that time than it ever has since.)—Our friend reminds us, further, that prominent Hopkinsians were active in building and endowing Andover Theological Seminary, which, on that account, came under the ban of conservative and clerical opposition and objection, for some time. An Andover student was looked upon as a dangerous fanatic, and the churches were taught to be wary of them, especially when they advertised, without license or ordination, to hold prayer meetings at private houses. In one case, a student did this once or twice, on invitation of a pious lady, whose dwelling was on the route between his father's residence and the seminary. The Parish Pastor got wind of it, and the whole town was thrown into a ferment. Nearly all the churches in the County Association were alarmed. A remonstrance was made by some of them to the Faculty at Andover; Dr. Woods apologized; the matter was hushed up, and the students learned to get "beyond" of some "Intercession," before they held prayer meetings. All this in our own day, and under the "Cambridge Platform"—so much more liberal than the Saybrook—articles, which were in full operation had been formed. A jealousy of Andover and denial of prayer meetings was by no means confined, as our friend informs us, to the Unitarian or Arminian clergy. Professedly orthodox and Calvinistic ministers were, to a great extent, almost ally watchful against fanatical incursions upon the monopoly of the clergy, which seemed to include praying, as well as preaching; (and why not the one as well as the other?) But Andover has long since outgrown the reproach of being tainted with any of the Hopkinsian fanaticism. One other item may give an idea of what was held to be the prerogative of a Congregational Pastor in Massachusetts, a few years ago.—Our friend's father was one of these Pastors, and his clerical brethren were much annoyed with his forbearance in admitting a Baptist Exhorter, without molestation, to hold meetings in the outskirts of his parish:

"Another gave a different turn to the question. When a man who thinks he has got new light, is wiser, in his own estimation, not only than seven men, but than seven thousand men, 'who can render a reason,' there is no remedy in his case, but to let him go forward, and break his head against a stone wall. When a man, who, as he thinks, is so far in advance of his age, that he is entitled to commence reformer, finds the General Association of Connecticut, for example, and the individual pastors in each state, so dull that they can not apprehend his new wisdom, or so destitute of benevolence that they are not willing to have him make it known to their congregations, he ought to pause and ask himself whether he is indeed so much wiser, and more holy, and benevolent, than all these brethren united. This would save a great deal of denunciation and agitation.

"Another speaker granted, that cases may arise when a man might lawfully, and at whatever sacrifice of ecclesiastical order, carry on his purposes of reform. If he can not find an entrance for his light, he may make one with a sledge hammer. But then this is revolution—a desperate remedy, for a desperate disease. It is not a thing of common occurrence—a procedure to be adopted on every light occasion. The case of Luther is in point. But that is not the present condition of things. Every man, whatever he may think of himself, is not a Luther raised up by heaven to accomplish a reformation such as the world witnesses only once or twice in many thousand years. Besides, the ministry of the present day, are not stupid, and ignorant, and licentious monks, who are indifferent or hostile to the light."

Dr. Boucher of Lane Seminary, and Rev. E. N. Kirk of Albany (Presbyterians) took a prominent part in the introduction of these resolutions into the Congregational associations of New England.

The New England Spectator reports the following as a part of the discussion of these Resolutions in the General Association of Massachusetts.

Dr. Humphrey had his doubts respecting the first resolution. There appeared to be a sort of sarcasm about it, which he did not like. He moved to strike out this resolution.

Objections were made, as then, the resolutions would not be those of the General Association of Connecticut.

Mr. Holly thought that these resolutions might have owed their existence to local circumstances in that state. One of their ministers had recently been dismissed from his people to act as agent in that state for the Anti-Slavery Society.

Dr. Beecher spoke with feeling on the subject of getting ISMS into the church, over the heads of ministers. There is ultraism not simply on the subject of Slavery. Agents to promote moral reform are also claiming a right to be heard. Revivalists, too, are going about, seeking whom they may devour. Get two or three of these reformers into a church, and the minister and oil must yield to their wishes, or they are opposed to revivals, reform, &c. He criticizes the whole matter by this proposition, contained in the first resolution. He hoped it would not be stricken out.

Dr. Humphrey's motion was rejected.

Mr. Lovell thought the resolution would exclude such men as Mr. Nettleton. Even Dr. Beecher would let in every evangelist who comes in, under the inspection, and with the approbation of the pastor.

Resolutions passed with only two dissenting votes, although some did not vote; the two negatives afterwards were withdrawn as a wish was expressed that the vote might be unanimous.

* Further light is shed on this, and other connected points, by some items of information with which we have been furnished, (since writing the foregoing sketches,) by an active and prominent abolitionist, now well known throughout this State, and formerly of Massachusetts. Our informant was as conspicuous in the Evangelical struggle in Massachusetts, twenty or thirty years ago, as he has been in the Anti-Slavery struggle, since. He tells us that the old Congregational clergy of Massachusetts, at that period, were as much troubled with prayer meetings and conferences at which unlicensed and unordained laymen took a part, as they and their successors have been with anti-slavery lectures and conventions, since. He mentions the names of some who were then his associates in holding neighborhood prayer meetings as they have since been in anti-slavery labors. He well remembers the excitement got up in the community against these evening prayer meetings, in consequence of the opposition of the ministers, who felt their clerical prerogatives invaded by such proceedings. Many a time, he says, they were made to understand this. And on some occasions the sympathy of the ungodly rabble with their clerical teachers was manifested in much the same way that it has since been in respect to anti-slavery meetings. Sometimes, for example, on coming out of the prayer meeting, they would find their horses' tails seized, or harness cut, or wheels taken off, or something of that kind. Here we have the early branding of the mob that after this assaulted female anti-slavery prayer meetings, in Boston and elsewhere. (The burning of Dr. Beecher's church and the Tract Depository under it, in the winter of 1829-30 was attributed, by many, at the time, to similar causes. We were on the spot, and could not help inferring as much, from the significant shrugs, winks, gratulations and smirks of the "gentlemen of property and standing" who gathered round the ruins the next morning. The Doctor's reputation for "fanaticism"

NATURE AND EFFECTS OF THESE CLAIMS.

There is no room to mistake the nature and extent of the powers here claimed by the ASSOCIATION for its members and the pastors they represented, nor the occasion of their asserting the claim. They claimed for the pastors the right of saying what and when the churches might hear or not hear, and, by consequence, what they might do or not do. They claimed for them, the monopoly of moral and religious instruction. They denied the right of any one, to agitate the religious community, with any moral or religious discussions without the leave of the pastors.— This right they attempted as an association of pastors, to exercise, in the action here recorded. Nay:—they *did* exercise it, and, for the most part, the lecturers and evangelists were silenced, and the agitation suppressed.* The aggrieved party demurred, to be sure, blustered, talked largely of their rights, and made a stir for a time; but with few exceptions, settled down quietly at last, under the interdiction! The evangelists and the clerical lecturers either retired from the field, or were careful to enter no parish without leave of the pastor. In Connecticut, the last remaining clerical Anti Slavery lecturer found by experiment, that he could gain the consent of very few congregational pastors in the State, after the action of the Association was published, though he was a regularly inducted minister of the same sect, himself. The Congregational Parishes covered the entire area of the State, and therefore, in obedience to the sixteen ministers composing the General Association assembled at Norfolk, he retired, at an early day, and has seldom ever lectured any where on the subject since. Of the eight anti slavery lecturers previously employed in that State, not one of them remained on the ground. Of these, five were Congregational ministers, two were Baptist ministers, and one was a Layman. The latter only, continued to labor as a lecturer, and he chose another field. A large and influential minority of the Congregational churches expressed, strongly, their disapprobation of the action at Norfolk and to the present hour, continue to express the same views. And yet they submit to the decision of the association. They submit to having their churches closed against the lecturers, and many of them will hardly adventure to attend an anti slavery lecture even in a school house, for fear of

*NOTE.—It may be said that the Association did not, itself, by a direct act of its own, exclude lecturers and Evangelists from the churches. True. But it claimed the right of the Pastors to do this, and limited the importance of the measure. Each member of the association was a Pastor and the body was a representation of all the Pastors. Its action was designed to control the action of the local pastors, and had, for the most part, that effect, as it did, in Whitefield's time, according to the testimony of Trumbull. Few pastors would venture to resist the wishes of the General Association, if they suffered never so much from them in sentiment.

giving offence to their Pastor. Lay lecturing, since that time, though still carried on by one or two individuals, has accordingly flagged for want of the support and even the attendance of those who profess to be in favor of it and the Congregational Churches present an almost insuperable obstacle to the diffusion of antislavery information in that state. The portion of the population best informed on the subject is, the members of the Congregational Churches. In Massachusetts, the effect of this clerical action has been similar, though perhaps not to so great an extent, because, from various causes, the clerical body presents a less compact and united phalanx, in that state. The Presbyterianism of the middle States with all its imposing array of Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies connecting it with the slave States, has never proved half as efficient in curbing and suppressing the rising spirit of liberty in the churches and ministry as have the Associations of so called Congregational Ministers in New England.

THE ACTORS AND THE OCCASION.

The power claimed and expressed by the Associations of Congregational Pastors in New England, at the present moment, is here illustrated and ascertained. And it deserves notice that now, as in the times of Whitefield, it is the Association of Pastors, rather than the Consociation of Churches, consisting of Pastors and Delegates, that exercises, (even in Connecticut, where the Consociation system is perfected) these unmitigated hierarchal powers.

Equally visible, too, are the occasions, and the objects that drew forth the action of the New England Associations in 1836. It was not, exclusively, their aversion to the anti slavery agitation, on its own account. One grand reason why that agitation was dreaded, was because it furnished another occasion for moral and religious appeals and instructions to the people by others beside the associated pastors who claimed to hold the monopoly of that prerogative. Other lecturers, as well as abolitionist ministers as well as by men, and evangelists as well as lecturers, were intended to be reached and suppressed. This is evident from the language of the Resolutions and Pastoral Addresses, as well as from the expressions used during their discussion, by the advocates of these measures.

SUBSEQUENT DEFENCES AND EXPLANATIONS.

All this is corroborated, moreover, by the language held on the subject afterwards—by the defences which were set up, when these high handed measures came under review, and into debate.

The Annual Report of the N. Y. State Anti Slavery Society, in Sept. 1836, made allusion to the opposition the Anti Slavery cause had been called to encounter from the action of the clerical associations in New England. This allusion drew forth L. Bacon, a prominent Congregational minister at New Haven, Conn. to reply what he was pleased to consider an aspersion. In a letter to Gerrit Smith, first published in the New Haven Religious Intelligencer, and afterwards in the Utica Friend of Man, April 19. 1837, he labors to show that this action of the associations was not put forth from any special hostility to the Anti Slavery cause but as a necessary act of self-defence, on the part of the pastors, for the preservation of their essential rights, namely, the exclusive monopoly of religious teaching and the control of the meeting houses—nay, in reality of the entire territory of the parish, for this object. Abolitionists had no special ground of complaint, according to Dr. Bacon:—It was the people, abolitionists among the rest, that the ministers were called upon to keep in their proper places and to instruct as they judged best and protect from the inroads of irresponsible and unauthorized teachers. He traced the rights of the Clerical Associations, to the Saybrook Platform, (of which the reader of the preceding numbers has had some account) declaring it to be "the only constitution of the associations"—"approved by the Legislature (!) and accepted by the churches." He thence deduces the power of the associations to act for the churches in such matters as were involved in the proceedings at Norfolk, in 1836. He says:—

"The legitimate powers, then, of the General Association, are of course, those powers which, by the Scriptures (!?) and by the usage of the churches, naturally belong to an assembly of pastors, representing, by delegation, all the pastors in the State. The Platform describes the functions of a District Association by directing that "they shall assemble to consult the duties of their office, and the common interest of the churches," that they shall consider and resolve questions and cases of importance which shall be offered by themselves or others, and that they "shall have power of examining and recommending the candidates of the ministry to the work thereof."—Of the powers and duties of the General Association it says nothing, manifestly taking it for granted that whenever the pastors delegated from the district associations should come together, they would know without teaching, that they were assembled to consult the duties of their office and the common interest of the churches, and to resolve questions and cases of importance propounded among themselves, or referred to them by others.—What then have the General Association done which transcends their legitimate power?"

A hard question, to be sure, where the power claimed is an unlimited one! "The only Constitution of the General Association," it would seem, "says nothing of its power."—

Whence, then, is that power derived? Or what is it? Or where are its limits? "The only constitution"—"manifestly took it for granted" that the General Association understood the limits of its own powers, (if there were any) "without teaching!" An admirable constitution, to be sure! And one which a Njeholag or a Metternich would be delighted to study.

After repeating the language of the second Resolution, Dr. Bacon proceeds thus.

"Every pastor is to control the occupancy of his own pulpit, this is the very essence of his office. If the pastor would consult the wishes and views of his church, if he would submit the question, in any instance, to the advice of his brotherhood, there is the church meeting. If he would govern himself, in a particular case, by the opinions of the proprietors of the meeting house, with whom he is connected in a civil contact, as their religious teacher, there is the Society meeting. If he would do anything contrary to the feelings of his brethren in the pastoral office, there is the association. He and his church would act in concert with neighboring churches, there is the consociation or council of pastors and lay delegates. An agent or lecturer would consult with the pastors of a district, or with the Churches as represented by their Pastors and delegates, let him go to the Association or consociation, and ask for their advice and consent."

THESE DEFENCES EXAMINED.

In what language could the supremacy of the Pastors over the people be more distinct and fully affirmed? "If the pastor would consult the wishes and views of the Church" he had the liberty to do so! He could go to the church, to the Society, to the association, to the consociation, for advice, if he pleased. Whether he did or no, he controlled the ears of the people within the limits of his parish. "This is the very essence of his office." And the agent or lecturer who would have access to the people, must obtain "consent" in some form, either from the individual pastor, or from the associated pastors, or from the consociations virtually controlled by pastors, and in which one pastor counts as much as all the lay members of a whole church!

The right of a church or society to control its own house is not to be questioned. No agents or lecturers had complained of that.—Some of them may have forgotten that in New England the Congregational Pastor of the Church and controls every thing—that is the very essence of his office." The defence with which Leonard Bacon held his sentiment is manifest from his representation in the same letter, that the evangelists and lecturers had invaded "the independence of the Churches" because, in some instances, they had spoken to them without leave of the pastors! A notion of Church independency which the early English Independentists had dreamed. After all, the event proved

that Mr. Bacon understood the current usages of his sect and of his times. The people, to a great extent, demurred, protested, and complained. They submitted, nevertheless, as was foreseen. In all North America is there an organized Spiritual Despotism. Romanish or Protestant, wielding higher powers than these? where, in fact, is there a parallel to it? What other sect has parcelled out the entire territory of a State into parishes, and set up a Clergy claiming authority to say whether an evangelist or lecturer shall come within the bounds of the parish to lecture and preach, or no? For—let it not be forgotten—the claim set up extends to the entire Parish, as well as to the Meeting House or place of Sabbath worship. This is apparent in another paragraph of Mr. Bacon's Letter in which he characterized an agent or lecturer as guilty of usurpation, for "thrusting" himself into the congregation as a religious teacher, without the pastor's consent. It will not be denied that the "congregation" or portions of it was generally reached by the agents and lecturers in the district school houses, and that this practice was the chief ground of the complaint, since country meeting houses in Connecticut were seldom used for evening meetings during the week, especially in winter, when most of the obnoxious lecturing took place. And it was because congregational ministers who were lecturers and evangelists, and who understood the usages of their sect, were unable or unwilling to withstand those claims of the associated pastors, that the work of anti slavery lecturing, so far as they are concerned, has been, in Connecticut, abandoned, not for want of congregational ministers who would gladly occupy the field, if the associated Pastors would yield their consent. In Massachusetts, if I mistake not, very nearly the same result has been reached. No Congregational Minister, I am persuaded, could retain caste with the ministers of the sect, should he adventure to lecture promiscuously through that State, in the district school houses, without leave of the Pastors. In Connecticut this is known to be the fact, and that reason has been given by Congregational ministers why they could not occupy that field, as anti slavery lecturers. Churches, too, have declined adopting certain Resolutions on slavery, because, in doing so, they should not act in harmony with the wishes of the Associations and Consociations. If this be not avowing subjection to an organized Spiritual Despotism, what is?

In the same letter, Mr. Bacon fortified his argument by saying that the itinerant evangelists and lecturers of whose "usurpations" he complained, "depend, not on the churches, but on the minorities in the churches." Just

as though it were a settled principle, (as it doubtless is) wherever Associationism has established its sway) that minorities of Churches have no right to hear preaching or lecturing without leave of the associated pastors.

What it was that had troubled Mr. Bacon and his brethren in the pastoral office is evident from various portions of his letter. In one place he speaks of "a class of ministers whose trade is revivals, going about, each like a wandering star, whose glory is not in a clear steady light of its nucleus, but in a thin blaze that trails after it." Further on, he laments in the following strain.

"One class of itinerants preaches temperance according to the latest discoveries. Another is determined to know nothing but anti-slavery. A third department makes war upon popery. [No wonder the Associations were alarmed!] A fourth is devoted to what is technically called moral reform," &c. &c.

Now the question properly at issue was not whether this system of operation was the wisest and best that could have been devised. Very possibly there might have been little or no occasion for it, had the "pastors" instructed the people as they should have done.—And had there been no occasion, there would have been no danger of superseding the pastors. Among a people whose pastors were "determined to know nothing" of temperance, anti slavery, moral reform, anti popery, nor revivals, as they ought to know, it was not strange that the want of itinerant teachers was felt. At all events, the people, or any portion of them, majority or minority, had a right to judge for themselves, and so had the itinerating evangelists and lecturers. What right had the pastors, deeply implicated as it seems they felt themselves, to undertake acting as judge and jury in their own cause? And what shall we say of Ecclesiastical Arrangements, Associations and Consociations, that take for granted this prerogative in the associated clergy? The simple fact that these itinerants troubled the pastors, is proof positive that their flocks, or considerable portions of them, wished to hear such itinerants. And who shall deny them the right? The associated Pastors did deny it, or their action is unmeaning, and futile. Alas! the right was successfully denied. There is no blinking the fact. Physical penalties were wanting, to be sure. But the spiritual lash, supplied their place; just as in the case of the Catholics in America, where no inquisitorial fires have been kindled. It was not the force of argument—but the superstitious dread of ecclesiastical excision, that prevailed. That civil penalties would have been inflicted if the associated clergy had possessed the power, there can be no rational doubt. Their theological Quarterlies had already declared

"the radicals," against whom this measure was directed, "justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." In several of the States incipient measures of legislative proscription were then in progress or in contemplation, and not a man among the conservative clergy lifted a word against it.—Some of their religious journals had avowed the object of putting down the agitation of the slave question by popular indignation. McDowell's Moral Reform Journal had been indicted by a Grand Jury headed by a Presbyterian Elder, and at the suggestion of the N. Y. Observer. The reign of the pro-slavery mobs was at its height, and anti-slavery lecturers in Connecticut were frequently assaulted by them. At such a time it was that the General Association of Congregational Ministers in Connecticut and Massachusetts adopted the Resolutions and Address we are considering.

An incident occurred during the discussion of these documents before the General Association of Connecticut at Norfolk, that may suffice to settle the question. E. R. Tyler, a congregational minister of Connecticut and at that time an anti-slavery lecturer in that State was present on the occasion, and took the liberty to remonstrate against the action in contemplation, that it would tend to "encourage disorders in public assemblies," that is, excite pro-slavery mobs. The pertinency and force of this objection could not be gainsayed, after so many mobocratic demonstrations against abolitionists immediately on the heel of colonization and other meetings conducted by the same class of clergy, in which speeches and resolutions of a similar character had been put forth. Mr. Bacon coolly retorted—"What have we to do with the consequences"—in evident allusion to the maxim of abolitionists, (accounted so fanatical by Mr. Bacon and his associates) that we are to do our duty in reproving oppressors, and leave the "consequences" with God. The quotations I have just made are taken from the same letter of Mr. Bacon to Gerrit Smith, in which he attempts to explain his meaning, but admits his use of the language. Posterity will judge of such conduct, which no subtleties can cover over or palliate.

EXTENT OF THE PROJECT.

Nor can we look upon these measures of the General Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts as having been adopted with a view of simply suppressing the agitations of itinerant evangelists and lecturers within the narrow limits of those two States. All the free States constituted the theatre of those agitations and the prominent stated clergy of various sects, particularly the Presbyterian

and Congregational, closely connected, were decidedly opposed to them. The old States of Connecticut and Massachusetts in which the associated clergy had been so efficient, a century previous, in suppressing similar agitations, were naturally expected to take the lead. We have already recorded the presence of Presbyterian clergymen from other States, one of them, (Dr. Beecher,) all the way from Ohio, to urge forward, in the Congregational Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts, these high handed measures. Was it for Connecticut and Massachusetts alone that they cared? Dr. Beecher was President of Lane Seminary, and, notwithstanding all his early anti-slavery professions which had been somewhat remarkable, had assented to the action of the Trustees and Faculty of that Institution, requiring the disbanding of the Anti Slavery Society formed among the students, a measure at which a majority of them demurred and left the Institution, some year or two previous to the events we have been recording. It was in the course of this disturbance at Lane Seminary that Dr. Beecher assured some of the students that the whole system of itinerant lecturing and evangelizing would be suppressed—that the leading clergy of the country, Old school and New, East and West, had come to an understanding together on the subject—and it would be done. This perhaps accounts for the fact that in quitting Lane Seminary, not a few of the students abandoned all further preparation for the ministry, and sought avocations in which they might remain freemen, well convinced, as they must have been, that a few leading clergy controlled nearly all the churches in the land, as the event has since proved.

A JUDICIOUS SELECTION.

We have alluded to this matter in this connection for the purpose of suggesting the inquiry why Dr. Beecher and the other leading clergy of the Presbyterian Church did not first begin the experiment at home, in their own Ecclesiastical bodies, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly, without writing for the Congregational bodies of New England to act? Why must Dr. Beecher make a journey of nearly a thousand miles to operate upon the General Associations of Connecticut and Massachusetts, and get them to adopt the measure, first? Was it because he remembered the ancient renown of the New England Clergy among whom he had been educated, and the exploits they have achieved against itinerant evangelists in the days of Whitefield, and Finley, and Pomeroy, and the Cleavelands? Did he discover the superior power and availability of the Congrega-

tional Associations over the Presbyterian Assembly and Synods? And was this because of the inconvenient lay delegation in all the Presbyterian Judicatories, from the highest to the lowest, while in the deliberations and the action of the Congregational Associations, the voice of a single lay delegate is not to be heard in the debate, nor the uplifted hand of a single unanointed layman to be counted?

FACTS IN CORROBORATION.

Whatever may have been the cause, the field of so called but mis-called Congregationalism, in preference to any portion of the Presbyterian Church, was selected for the delicate experiment, and it succeeded to a charm! Attempts have since been adventured in the Presbyterian church, but not with equal success. On Presbyterian ground, in Central and Western New York, and in the Western States, church secessions have been and are multiplying. Independent Churches are springing up and a new Anti Slavery Presbyterian church has been organized by John Rankin and others. Presbyterian Abolitionists, to a very great extent, have shown that they cannot be made to submit to the yoke that sits so quietly upon the necks of their anti-slavery brethren in Congregational New England! So far as fidelity to their principles in their church relations are concerned the abolitionists connected with the Congregational churches of New England are among the last, if not the very last, to be mentioned. And the tone and texture of their political abolitionism bears testimony to the rigor and efficiency of their ecclesiastical training.

The action of Presbyteries, Synods, &c. against itinerant evangelists and lecturers, is evident imitation of the Congregational Associations, of New England, and doubtless designed to effect the suppression predicted by Dr. Beecher, has been less vigorous in tone, for the most part, and less efficient in administration. The voice of the laity is not as generally and as fully suppressed in the Presbyterian church of the middle and western States as in congregational New England. Itinerancy is not as effectually displaced, and anti-slavery ministers are not as generally forced to succumb. Three or four splendid exceptions in the two States of Connecticut and Massachusetts only illustrate the general rule of an unbroken control over both ministers and people by the Associations.

A LESSON.

Of all the organized hierarchies of America, the simple association of Congregational ministers appears to bear off the palm. Already there are indications that a portion

the Presbyterian clergy, and of a high conservative stamp, are beginning to consider the advantages of that peculiar mode of operation. No organization more perfectly expresses the separation of the clergy from the laity, and few, if any, are susceptible of being made, more effectually, the vehicles of clerical power. Its appearance is so unassuming that suspicion is disarmed. Its power is so unlimited that nothing escapes its jurisdiction, so impalpable that it cannot be met, so unique that it is never successfully grappled with, so potential that it is in no way to be withstood but by escape. A laity whose clergy are thus organized lose their liberties in a day, without missing them for a century, and only awake to their error after the capacity and even the earnest desire of spiritual liberty has departed. No other form, probably could have so soon prepared the primitive churches for the deep corruption and hopeless subjugation that followed. Let no one infer the danger of Congregational Church Independency, from all this. The value of the true coin is not to be impeached by its counterfeits, nor the glory of realities to be discredited by shams. Congregational Independency and Clerical Associations are antipodes that cannot come together; antagonisms that can never be reconciled. The touch of the latter is the death of the former, and there can be no greater contradiction or impossibility than independent churches provided over by associated pastors, banded together, and not members of the churches they superintend. If Church History, especially that of the first two and the last two centuries cannot teach the people so plain a lesson, it were in vain to prosecute such a study, or to attempt setting up any barriers against ecclesiastical power, short of that utter abandonment of church institutions which so many despairing New Englanders are now beginning to contemplate as a choice of evils. If there be any form of an hierarchy under which the spirit of Christian liberty can long be preserved, most assuredly, the Association of Congregational Pastors is not that form. Two centuries of experiment just before Constantine, and two centuries just now gone by, have settled that question beyond debate.

UNDERSTANDING OF CO-TEMPORARIES AND FRIENDS.

What degree of authority the General Association of Connecticut and Massachusetts were understood, at the time, to have wielded, in these Resolutions and Pastoral Addresses, may be seen from the tone of the Cincinnati Journal and Suminary, a religious paper, conducted, at that time, by a son of Dr. Beecher, if I mistake not, and patronized by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of

the Western States. In reply to some anti-madversions, by anti Slavery editors (for none others demurred) upon these ecclesiastical usurpations, the Editor of the Cincinnati Journal indulged in no little merriment at the thought that any one should question the legitimate right of the associations to control the action of the churches. He claimed that those bodies had been "from time immemorial the Court and Legislature of Congregationalism, so far as they have one" and intimated the absurdity of supposing that "the delegates and representatives of the Church, acting with the Clergy" did not have the right "to say what the Churches may and may not do." In the same connexion he represented those who complained of this, as holding that "a free church government is a church free from all government," &c.

In this it was assumed, to be sure, contrary to the fact, that the churches had representatives acting with the clergy, in the associations, and that the general associations represented the Churches, whereas, they only represented the District Associations which are composed exclusively of ministers, while neither the District Associations nor the General Association (either in Connecticut or Massachusetts) are either appointed by the churches or controlled by them. But when this was pointed out by abolitionists, in their papers, it led no correction of the statement. More than this: the clerical Editors of Congressional papers in New England, who witnessed the controversy, never corrected the statements of the Cincinnati Editor, or expressed any dissent from the representation he gave, of the power of the Clerical Associations over the Churches.

While these high powers were exercised to suppress anti Slavery discussion, the standing objection to taking action against Slavery was, that ecclesiastical bodies possessed not the requisite ecclesiastical power! Even the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, that same year, gave this as a reason why it could make no expression of sentiment concerning Slavery!

ONE RIGHT ONLY LEFT UNTOUCHED.

It may be said, to be sure, that Congregationalists who were abolitionists could not help knowing that they had a right to secede from the Churches, when they found them settling down under this unrighteous control and therefore there was no great occasion to complain of any serious grievance in the case. This plea in fact, has been made, and is made still.

But it deserves notice that whoever should secede from a Congregational Church on such a ground, would do so from the very fact that he found himself under a spiritual

despotism from which he felt it necessary to escape! So that the fact of an existing spiritual despotism is not thus to be disproved.—The very argument itself confirms the fact, instead of disproving it. An abolitionist who continues in a church thus controlled, does, of necessity, certify, by that fact, either one of two things: viz: Either his retaining his position says that he considers the action of the Associations and of the Churches in submitting to it, no very serious grievance, or else it says he is under a spiritual despotism from which he dares not even attempt to escape!

The members of Episcopal and Romish Communions in America have the same right to secede from those communions that members of Congregational Churches have. But they seldom do it, however much they may feel the wrong action of the ruling authorities. And the fact proves that they are not only under a Spiritual Despotism, but controlled and crushed by it.

OCASION FOR ITS EXERCISE.

The course of passing events indicates, plainly enough, the necessity of exercising this right; before the incubus of an organized priesthood extinguishes forever what little is left of spiritual life, and of religious liberty in the country. From twelve to twenty years ago there were indications of vitality in the churches and of impressibility in the community in general. It is otherwise now.—The same ecclesiastical bodies that were then busied in devising means for putting down itinerant evangelists and lecturers are now occupied in recording lamentations over the spiritual dearth that rests on the churches and the hardened insensibility or open infidelity of the world around them! Before the General Associations and kindred bodies had driven the evangelists from the field, there were hundreds of them at work, in the place of units now. The same men that silenced them have seen and attested the result, and yet they cling the closer to their conservatism and draw tighter the chains of ecclesiastical proscription! Fifteen years ago the students at Theological Seminaries and Colleges, to a great extent, were the very men to improve their vacations in itinerating and reformatory labors. At one time they could be counted by scores, if not hundreds in the field.—Where are they now? Who thinks of looking in that direction for help? The truth is, the work of itinerating, whether as evangelists or lecturers is well nigh broken up by the ecclesiastical bodies, and by very few of the stated pastors is the necessary instruction, moral or religious, supplied. At such a time, if ever, the question of secession and re-organization becomes vital; and on the issue is suspended the destiny of the nation, and of many generations to come.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

JANUARY, 1848.

SLANDERING THE MINISTERS.

Such facts as the following which might be collected to almost any extent, supply a sufficient comment upon the charge that abolitionists slander the majority of the northern clergy, in representing them hostile to efforts for the abolition of slavery.

A sermon by E. N. Bartlett, published in the Oberlin Evangelist, for April 20, 1816 contains the following.

Said a minister recently at a meeting of the largest ecclesiastical body in our country, "there was no member of his Conference that would do any thing to promote the agitation of this subject; (abolition;) but the feeling against slavery was rising among the people of Indiana and throughout the world; and while Methodist ministers in Indiana would not encourage this feeling, they could not do otherwise than present the petitions of members of the church." An honest, but most extraordinary avowal! A glaring specimen of moral delinquency! And yet its applicability is much more extensive than to the Indiana Methodist Conference.

Our readers will remember the similar testimony given, some time ago, on the floor of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, and still more recently in the (N. S.) General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, of this latter incident, as following paragraph from the Philadelphia Correspondent of the Emancipator, writing under date of May 30, 1816, is an appropriate record.

Where the northern members have intimated their intention to vote for action on the subject, the reason given for it has been that their churches will be divided unless it be done. A little impatience was manifested by the southern delegates at this; one of whom charged it upon the northern clergy, that they had assisted in raising the public sentiment against slaveholders, and having done so, they came up to the General Assembly, and ask for action that will quiet the excitement which they had helped to raise. But to this it was with great truth and honesty replied, that the statement was not correct—that the clergy had endeavored to keep back public sentiment on this subject—that it had proceeded in spite of them—that it was impossible for them to stay, it, or prevent division in their churches unless the Assembly would take action.

This is substantially the reason which influenced the Methodist Convention to depose Bishop Soule.

In the debates of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, we find a very striking manifestation of progression. The stale phrase of 'organic sin,' is abandoned for the very definite one of 'involuntary slavery.' This is progress. I go for the clean distinction. Henceforth I am for exculpating all involuntary sinners—involuntary slaveholders, involuntary thieves, involuntary liars, involuntary knaves, involuntary robbers, involuntary adulterers, involuntary rakes. None of your insidious discriminations. Whoever involuntarily commits a crime—that is, whoever commits it with good intent, and, because, in his opinion, it is better to commit than not to commit it—is excusable.—*Cor. True Am.*

UNCHARITABLENESS.

It is often said that reformers who insist on radical and unpopular measures, ought, in all charity, to concede to that class of professed reformers who do not go to all their lengths (or who having commenced doing so, turn back again) as much sincerity and honesty as they claim for themselves, and perhaps more sagacity and good sense. Well; all this may be so in some cases, to be sure, and, sometimes it doubtless is the fact that zealous reformers run into extremes and wiser men are obliged to stop short, or turn back from the course they had themselves begun. But then, in respect to this more moderate and much praised class of reformers, there are often some very remarkable things to be observed, and the notice of which very much tends to confirm the more radical class in their suspicions that something besides the wisdom coming from above, and altogether different from it, has something to do with their moderation and prudence. A man espouses a good enterprise, is very zealous in it for a time, but finds his friends forsaking him, his support withdrawn, his worldly prospects darkening, his name cast out as evil. If a merchant, he loses customers; if a lawyer, he loses clients; if a physician, he loses employers; if a minister, he loses "pew holders"—"society men" and salary payers. All this is known, and known too, that the effect is strongly marked, upon the person placed under the process. He speaks of it himself, he gives expression to his anxieties, his embarrassments, his fears, his perplexities. He complains, he remonstrates, but all to no purpose. The next thing you know of him is, that he grows more cautious, less active, less uncompromising, and finally that he has altogether changed his position, reduced or remodelled his standard of reformation, till he floats down with the current he moves in, and ceases to make or to attempt making any head-way against it.—Among his own friends the thing is understood, and he is complimented for his prudence. As for example: A niece of a prominent Doctor of Divinity, who is pastor of a wealthy church, in one of our eastern cities, is accosted thus:

"Why! Miss ——— your Uncle, at H—— is quite an abolitionist, is he not?"

"Oh! no—not now," responded the young lady, "he began to be, at one time, and preached once or twice on the subject, but he soon found it would not answer at all.—The most respectable part of his church would have left him, if he had not desisted."

And so the Doctor has the reputation of being a very prudent and sagacious reformer. No ultraist—no disorganizer! This instance illustrates scores—hundreds—perhaps thousands, all over the country. Is it strange that more radical and unyielding reformers have some doubts concerning the integrity, the Christian prudence, the superior good sense, sagacity, and heavenly wisdom of such reformers? Do the public—do the very men most accommodated and propitiated by such compliances give credit, in their own convictions, to any thing more than to the shrewdness, the cupidity, the servility of such pliant reformers?

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

December 1847, and January 1848.

R. Dixon, Livonia,	360 94
Aug. Beach, East Otto,	1 00
O. Miner, Syracuse,	1 00
R. Gardner, Florence,	1 00
D. Abbey, Moscow,	1 00
A. D. Miner, Lima,	1 09
G. P. Reed, Warsaw,	1 50
H. P. Crooker, Dryden,	1 00
N. A. Frost, Riga,	1 00
B. E. Peck, Rochester,	50
B. L. Stedman, Livonia,	1 00
Dr. W. D. Cook, Sodaus, (his share of the printing press at Pery,)	32 75
S. Miles, Fabius, for himself and others,	6 00
E. W. Twing, Springfield Mass.,	1 00
J. Keep, Litchfield, Ohio,	53
T. J. Keep, Hartford, Ohio,	50
J. Dewey, Abington, Conn.,	1 00
J. Stoyell, Moravia,	1 00
J. H. Reeves, Newark,	1 00
R. W. Horton, Walworth	50
L. J. Hicks, "	50
J. Lawrence, "	50
O. Murdock, McLean,	62
R. M. Smith, Penn Yan,	1 00
I. Wilcox, Camillus,	50
D. Porter, Pompey Hill,	1 00
W. D. Dewey, Penn Yan,	1 00
W. Dewey, Pekin,	2 00
W. Smith, New Haven, Conn.,	30
A. Painter, "	1 50
A. Walker, N. Breckfield, Mass.,	2 00
D. Carr, Winthrop, Me.,	2 00
L. S. Beecher, Sandusky city, O.,	1 00
A. Jessup, Harbor Creek, Pa.,	50
S. Kingsburg, N. East, Pa.,	50
J. M. Baker, W. Bloomfield,	50
W. F. Sheldon, "	1 00
P. Field, Charlemont, Mass.,	1 00
S. Lyman, Roxo,	50
M. A. Evans, Poughkeepsie, (by S. Lyman,)	50
P. Adams, Franklin, Mass.,	1 00
J. Jones, Clyde,	1 00
S. Cole, Cambridgeport, Vt.,	1 00
I. Taft, Kingsville, Ohio,	50
J. Carpenter, Andover, O.,	50
H. Jones, Concord, O.,	50
C. S. Rowley, Franklin Mills, O.,	50
A. J. Morley, Newton Falls, O.,	90
S. S. Jocelyn, New York,	1 00
D. Thurston, Winthrop, Mo.,	1 00
P. R. Pitts, Honeoye,	1 00
G. Dunce, Hopewell,	50
J. Mosher, Canandaigua,	1 50
J. Ingraham, Bristol,	1 00
D. C. Wells, Hunt's Hollow,	2 00
W. Wear, Clear Creek,	50
A. Mosher, Chapin's Mills,	38
L. H. Allen, Owego,	2 00
E. Strong, Hudson, O.,	50
T. Kilbourn, "	50
S. E. Barker, Howlett's Hill,	2 00
J. Campbell, Litchfield,	2 00
S. Morse, Orangeville,	1 00
M. Cushman, Amherst, Mass.,	1 00

397 59

Deduct commissions,

1 26

Received for two months,

396 33

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

BRIDGE. VOL. VI—No. 2. } HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., FEBRUARY, 1848. } WILLIAM GOODSELL, EDITOR
WHOLE NUMBER. 72. } AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, 12, 25.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

SEND MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

OF SPIRITUAL DESPOTISM.

Liberty—its Definition—its Place, Progress and Retreat. The Forms in which it is naturally embodied, which should therefore be abandoned.

NO. XIII.

HIERARCHICAL TENDENCIES AND PROGRESS.

It is not strange that the exercise of such responsible powers by the clerical Association always tends to the introduction of ecclesiastical arrangements with more and definite powers. The leading clergy are commonly ready, on their part, to obtain for their supervisory body that assent of the churches which, in the Eastern never holds. The laity, on their part, finding themselves, as a matter of fact, though without any formal assent on their part, under the control of an unlimited and responsible authority, and taking it for granted, at length, from education and habit, that the churches must be under the superintendency of an organized body of some sort, are commonly ready to give their positive sanction to some such body; on condition that there shall be introduced with it, a delegation, however small and insignificant, from the laity. In matter of fact, as Emmons said, "Associationism tends to Consociationism," which is one form or modification of Presbyterianism, in this very manner.

Thus, in the ancient churches, the mere voluntary association of the pastors or bishops came first, the lay delegation afterwards, diocesan episcopacy next, and the episcopacy at last. The people, all along, taking refuge under the more advanced form of ecclesiastical authority from the lower form which stood nearer to them; while the leading clergy, on their part, quite unawares, availed themselves of the opportunity to elevate themselves to a still higher dignity, by extending their sphere of jurisdiction.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts, with her boasted Cambridge Platform, has been unable to secure herself, altogether, from similar tendencies. We have seen how the simple unauthorized Association obtained the sanction of the Churches of Connecticut, in 1708, by the provisions of the Saybrook Platform, in connexion with the establishment of Consociations of the churches, composed of Pastors and Lay Delegates after the model of Presbyterianism. Whether the Clergy gained more power, or the People more liberty, by this compromise, we attempt not now to decide. But in Massachusetts, soon after the Resolutions and Address of the General Association, in 1836, it became manifest that both among clergy and laity, there were indications of a disposition to take the same advance step that was taken in Connecticut in 1708. The measure has not yet been matured. In Connecticut, as we have seen, the thing could not be done in less than fifty years from the time it was first determined on. Among the first tokens of displeasure in Massachusetts at the gag resolutions of 1830, shutting the pulpit doors against lecturers and evangelists, there came up distinctly from a portion of the laity, the demand that, since the General Association claimed such high powers over the Churches, there should be a lay delegation from the Churches admitted into that body! In other words, as a refuge from Massachusetts Associationism the people, or portions of them, began to demand a modified form of Presbyterianism! It is easy to conjecture that the semi-Presbyterian Clergy of the Old Commonwealth, were not very sorely frightened with such a threat. With some of them, it had been the very thing they had been looking after, for years, and they were only watching to see when the proposition could be safely branched. Instead of being driven to an abandonment of the action of 1836 by this demand, the prime movers of that measure may perhaps have foreseen and intended that effect, as one of the important results to be secured. Be this as it may, the clerical body in Massachusetts have already had under advisement, the very measure in question, viz: the introduction of a lay delegation into the Associations; and, in addition to this, the establishment of Con-

sociations upon nearly the Connecticut model. At the meeting of the General Association of Massachusetts in June, '46, the subject was up, for the second time.—The following is from the Boston Recorder of July 2, 1846.

The subject of so modifying the character of the General Association as to admit lay delegates, having been referred a year since to the district associations, was called up, and reports from those associations, were heard. It appeared that, with two or three exceptions, those bodies had had the subject under serious consideration, and their delegates had come with definite answers, some of which were given in writing, and others verbally. The result was that nineteen of the associations were opposed to the change in question, and four of them in favor of it.

A motion was made to dismiss the subject, which led to a brief discussion. Rev. Mr. Tracy thought that if just the change in question were not adopted, some change was desirable in the character of the Association. *It was now in effect a legislative body, deciding questions which in their influence go down upon the churches. No similar body that he knew of, exercised an absolute authority over the churches. The Association was in fact a bishop with many heads.*—Rev. Mr. Fiske of Wrentham questioned these statements, &c. &c.

Considerable discussion ensued. Dr. Todd, denied that the Association had any authority over the Churches. Dr. Bates was in favor of dismissing the subject, but hoped it would come before the Association in another form. Mr. Packard was for having something to bring the Churches together, as well as the Ministers, and recommended the Conference System, as in Maine. The subject was indefinitely postponed. And so a majority of the district associations (clerical) preferred the simple clerical association, without any formal assent of the churches, to an Association regularly authorized, but containing a lay delegation.* The matter-of-fact authority of the Association, was truthfully stated by Mr. Tracy, and should be pondered by all who imagine the Churches can be independent, while their pastors are associated. Under no circumstances, perhaps, more favorable to freedom, could the experiment

* A portion of the Clergy who voted against the lay delegation may have done so, and probably did, for the same reason that some of the laity would have done so. They did not wish the Churches to give the authority of the Associations any sanction, as they would do, if they sent delegates. But others of them, doubtless, voted in the same way, because they felt the authority of the Association sufficiently established, and wished to preserve it from the checks incident to a lay delegation. Among the laity, likewise, different views are entertained, some hoping to check clerical power by the lay delegation, others unwilling that the Churches, in any way, should recognize the Associations.

have been tried, than in Massachusetts, and under the Cambridge Platform, but we see the result.

The question of a revision of that Platform, for the purpose of securing uniformity of discipline, by means of Consociations, or authoritative Councils has also been before the General Association of Massachusetts, within a year or two past. A committee was appointed, who selected from their number a sub-committee, of whom Dr. Woods of Andover was Chairman, and who made a report favorable to the measure, and embracing the details, which has been published and discussed, in the Boston Recorder. Some opposition was elicited, and for the present, the matter rests, though it is thought by some that it will, in some form, be proposed again. Whichever way the question turns, and whether the Associations receive a lay delegation or remain as at present, the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts must remain, virtually under the control of an organized priesthood so long as they consent to have pastors who are members of any association or ecclesiastical body besides the local Church.

CONGREGATIONALISM AT ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

We may form some idea of the manner in which Dr. Woods or his successors, will modify the Congregationalism of Massachusetts, when they obtain a little more control, by the manner in which they have organized the so called Congregational Church connected with the Theological Seminary at Andover; some account of which appears in the Boston Recorder of April 2, 1846, from a correspondent who opposes the adoption of the Manual, reported by Prof. Woods, as stated above.—We deem the particulars too significant to be confined, in their circulation, to the State of Massachusetts, at a time when so many, all over the country, desirous of Church Independency, are looking to that State, for a model. The writer says.

If I am rightly informed, the church was not organized by a council; but the Trustees of Phillips Academy appointed a committee of their number "to report on the subject of forming a church in the Theological Seminary," and their report was adopted as a constitution by the original members.—This report was, "That the church in this seminary be founded on congregational principles, as far as may comport with the nature and statutes of the institution; and that it be grounded on the Cambridge Platform," with certain "exceptions and provisions" which they specify.

One of the "provisions" is, "That the appointment, and should the case require the removal of a pastor, shall be the province of the trustees." Here one of the first and foundation principles of Congregationalism

is surrendered to a civil corporation, any one or all of whom may be christian or infidel, of any faith or no faith; and what some of them have been since that day, is pretty well known to such as are acquainted with the history of the institution.

Another provision is, "That no act of censure, affecting either the pastor or professors, shall be passed without the previous approbation and sanction of the trustees."—Whatever a pastor or professor may be guilty of, the church can do nothing till this civil corporation shall give them permission, and tell them how to act. And on one occasion the members were even told, that if they voted in a certain way, they would virtually censure the professors, which it was forbidden them to do; and that then every one who did it might be disciplined by the other portion of the church.

It is also provided, "That such members of the church as shall belong to the board of trustees, together with the professors, *be ex officio*, ruling elders." And this board of ruling elders (the "upper house," they used to call it) which the church has no voice in appointing, has claimed the extraordinary right to sit and vote in the "lower house;" and then, if found in the minority, to sit apart and negative their doing. What is more, a committee appointed to consider this claim, once reported "that it would not be inconsistent with the Cambridge Platform" for them to do so.

By this time your readers will probably be inclined to ask some such questions as the following:

1. Have the Congregationalists of New England a theological seminary in which, from its "nature and statutes," a purely congregational church cannot exist?
2. What one principle of Congregationalism (we hear considerable of the principles of Congregationalism in the Manual) is found in this congregational church?
3. While the reverend professor holds out, in one hand, this Manual to the congregational churches of Massachusetts, does he hold on, with the other, to the constitution of his own?
4. How much influence have his old principles had in the shaping of the Manual?

POWER OF COUNCILS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Some further view of the condition of religious liberty in the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts may be obtained from the following article on Councils, from the N. Y. Journal of Commerce, written probably by Mr. Hale, one of the Editors, a Massachusetts man, and educated a Congregational minister. We have said that the system of consociations, as in Connecticut, has never been established in Massachusetts, and under the Cambridge Platform. And we hardly know how to understand Mr. Hale's use of that term.—The Massachusetts Council is a temporary body, called for a particular occasion. The Connecticut Consociation is composed of the Pastors and Delegates of a county, acting as a Stated Council or Court. Perhaps it was because the Massachusetts Councils had come to exercise judicial and authoritative powers, like Consociations,

that the writer gave them that name.

"Passing events indicate that the policy of this denomination, which claims to be freest in the world, must come under common discussion, and answer with it the charge of upholding a hierarchy. The theory of Congregationalism is, as we demand it, that every local church is a plote in itself, with full power without assistance or assent of others to perfect organization and carry on its operations; that it can invite, install, and dismiss its core, and that the officers are equally free to accept, continue and resign, according to their own pleasure, and that every member is equally free to choose his own field of usefulness, responsible to the association only for a general deportment becoming Christian profession, and the performance of such labors as he voluntarily engages to undertake. The compulsion which requires a man to submit to the control of others, especially, which compels a parish to accept, listen to, and support, a pastor whom they do not approve, or compels a pastor to settle with or remain with a parish, who thinks he should be more useful or more happy elsewhere, the theory of Congregationalism rejects. The Pilgrims thought religious liberty involved not only the right to think and speak, but the right to elect teachers and leaders in worship. They did not understand how a congregation could worship according to the dictates of its consciences, when obliged to listen to instructions which they deemed heretical, or to worship in any way which contradicted their conscience. Notwithstanding these theologically radical principles of independence it has been the custom of Congregationalists to call councils at the settlement, dismissal of ministers, and on other occasions, with the oft-repeated declaration, however, that these councils were only advisory in their decisions, and their public performances only suitable ceremonies, and of any necessity or binding obligation, was on such grounds that the policy of Congregationalism came some years ago, under peculiar circumstances, before the courts of Massachusetts. Ministers with their parishes had resolved no longer to employ, or to tender their services, then brought suits for their salaries. The Supreme Court of that State declared it was a custom to settle and dismiss ministers by councils, and as the contract was definite, as to time, a minister who had been settled by a council could not be otherwise dismissed; for that by custom this had come a law. When a minister had been dismissed by his parish, and had declared that he would not consent to a mutual council, and the parish had thereupon called an extra council which determined that he ought to be and was dismissed, the court held he was not, because it was not demanded of him at the time that he should unite in a council. The society then called another council, as the court had ordered, demanding of the minister to unite in it, which he refused; and that Council determined as the other had done, and dismissed the minister the third time. But still the court held he was not dismissed, because some of the same men were on the second council who were on the first, and this rendered its proceedings null and void; for that a man could not be a judge who had already made up his mind. We state these facts from recollection, but they are substantially correct. Thus the courts of Massachusetts while they disclaimed all interference with

ecclesiastical affairs, and refused to inquire whether a minister had broken his contract by preaching exactly opposite doctrine from which he was employed to preach, did he overthrow the whole fabric of congregational liberty, and establish mutual councils, which might or might not be possible to be obtained, as ecclesiastical tribunals, for the parishes and pastors in absolute control. Under these legal decisions, some churches have been despoiled of their pastors, ministers who refused to go away, though being told that their services were not wanted and would not be tolerated. Opposed as these strange legal doctrines have been, it is difficult to correct the mistake; for the time of settling a pastor is a time when it is agreeable to talk of, or a provision for, the dissolution of the relation. Several cases have occurred recently, in which the doings of councils in meddling the liberty of pastors or parishes, have attracted unusual attention.

At many months ago, one of the churches in Boston invited Mr. Reid, of Salisbury, Massachusetts, to become their pastor, and he accepted the invitation; but the consociation, which was the council in the case, and which had authority, refused their assent. A very long ago, a parish in the same neighborhood desired, with entire unanimity, to call a particular minister as their pastor, who had accepted their invitation; but the consociation refused their assent, and the consociation claimed final jurisdiction in the case, the wish of both minister and people set at naught. Out of the jurisdiction of consociations, new councils would be called, until one was found which would perform the customary services of an association.

At now a similar result with that first case has happened before a mutual council in the matter of the invitation presented by the Church of the Pilgrims, to Mr. Storrs, of Brookline, near Boston. Mr. Storrs, as Mr. Reid had done, declared his conviction that duty required him to accept the invitation; but the council in this case refused assent. It is understood that the ministers were in favor of dismissing Mr. Storrs, and the laymen against it. In both cases the gentlemen are compelled to remain and labor, contrary to their conscience of duty. Such forced relations can only be expected to last long, or be quite broken while they continue. If a minister or church have doubts about what ought to be done, they may well ask advice and abide by it; but it is a new doctrine among Congregationalists, that councils shall compel, or shall compel, or anything compel, the breaking or continuance of pastoral relations, whether either party is distinctly desirous of termination; and the fact that these proceedings do indeed overthrow the Congregational plan of free action must bring up the question whether the practice ought not to be adopted by such councils shall be dispensed with. Mainly we should think the Puritan spirit must be considerably tamed, if the absoluteness of councils is long endured.

OTHER SPECIMEN.—DIFFICULTIES AT READING.

Another illustration of the workings of the "Council" system in Massachusetts may be found in the recent proceedings at Reading in that State. Some time in March, 1843, a portion of the Congrega-

tional Church in that town being dissatisfied with their pastor, Mr. Picket, on account of his defective style of preaching, and neglect of the temperance cause, (in their view,) addressed a letter to him, stating their dissatisfaction and "suggesting the propriety of taking measures to terminate the relations existing between him and the Church." This letter was signed by twenty-six of the members. "A mutual council was called to advise on this letter," which assembled in July. The decision of this council, gravely charged the letter writers with "breach of covenant—Invasion of the pastor's rights," &c. "The result of this council was not adopted by the church"—though at a church meeting just previous to the council, the proposition to dismiss the pastor had been negatived by a majority of five. "A second council was held by request of the Pastor, to consider the expediency of dissolving his relation to the church and parish. They decided that it was inexpedient," and confirmed the action of the former council against the letter writers, and broadly hinted the propriety of excommunicating them! The result of this council was also rejected by the church. "After this, the pastor put forth claims of power to suspend or negative the proceedings of a majority of the church, the majority having been charged, and being against him." Then, in March, 1847, four years after the writing of the letter, twenty-three of the writers were arraigned for a breach of covenant in writing it, and, having first deprived them of the right to take a part in the proceedings, (thus turning the majority in favor of the Pastor) voted to excommunicate them from the church! All this was ratified by a third Council, in April, 1847. At each of these councils "Rev. Parsons Cooke" was a prominent actor. Here the matter had to lie until some other council, a fourth, an ex parte council could be called by the aggrieved members, to set the matter right. (But what if no council (half pastors and half delegates) could be found to reverse the decision? Alas! for the congregational rights of church independency, then!) Fortunately, by looking, carefully, over the whole State, from Springfield to old Plymouth Colony, a council was selected, who decided that the three previous councils were wrong. The names of Drs. Osgood, Hitchcock, (of Randolph,) Beecher, and Messrs. Aikin, Kirk, Brigham, Packard, &c., (very much to their credit,) are found enrolled on the list of this council. But what must be the condition of a people, in respect to their religious rights when they

can allow themselves to be placed at the mercy of Councils in this manner? [The particulars we have from the Boston Chronotype as condensed in the Albany Patriot of Sept. 8, 1847. Also, in "the Result" of the council last mentioned, a pamphlet of 94 pages.]

So much comes of disfiguring the simple machinery of Congregational Independency with Associations and Councils.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN NEW YORK.

Congregationalism in New York may be less hampered by a compact and consolidated hierarchy than in New England. Its arrangements are too recent, and its territory too extensive and broken to admit of the rigid supervision of the Eastern States, at present. But we are mistaken if its starting point does not present more marks of affinity to Presbyterianism than would have been tolerated, at an early day, in the Eastern States, nay, than have, even yet, been introduced into any of the eastern arrangements except those of Connecticut. Already that direct recognition of the Associations which the New England churches, save in Connecticut, have hitherto hesitated to grant, have been incorporated into the Congregational polity of this State, without a struggle, in due form, so that the ecclesiastical character of the Associations is placed beyond question, and there is no room to say, (as in Massachusetts) that they were organized merely by and among the ministers, for their own "mutual improvement!"

"Most of the Associations in New York unlike those of the New England States, consists, not of Ministers only, but of Ministers and Churches. The General Association, accordingly admit laymen, when over they are deputed from the constituent bodies—Laymen are, however, rarely sent, as delegates to the General Association."

[Cong. Order, page 518.]

Here, then, it seems, the Congregational churches in this State, have the privilege of an indirect representation by lay delegates from the District Associations in the General Association, but they seldom have the benefit of it.* Thus they are deprived (no great loss, to be sure) of the privilege of interposing the check of one vote, on behalf of a whole church, to balance the vote of one Pastor, while the permission of a lay delegation has the effect to preclude the churches from saying, "we have no voice in your deliberations and will not be bound by your decisions."

How much direct part the churches took in organizing the General Association.

* It would be natural enough for the District Associations to send clerical delegates to the General Association, rather than laymen, since the clergy would hold a controlling influence in those bodies.

which took place in 1834, we are unable to say. The Convention was called by a committee of the *Ontida Association*; and it was called as "a convention of Congregational Ministers and Churches." So the yoke seems to have been very quietly put on the churches in the beginning. The Constitution of the General Association provides for delegates from Associations and Consociations; thus recognizing (either as a fact, or in anticipation) the Consociation system, a modification of Presbyterianism little known in New England out of Connecticut and perhaps Rhode Island.

It is quite remarkable that, in the face of all this recognition of a lay delegation in the General Association of the State of New York, that body should have declined, as it did, the reception of delegates from the Whitesboro' Association, a few years since, on the ground that that body was partly composed of *laymen*. Perhaps the difficulty was that some of those laymen stood as members of the said Association, in their own individual names, as ministers do, and not as delegates of the churches.

The Associations, in New York, as in New England, exercise the prerogative of licensing ministers, and the pastors generally hold themselves amenable to the Associations, rather than to the Churches over which they preside. On the whole, the leading Congregational clergy of this State, in general, so far as forms of organization are concerned, are by no means behind their brethren in New England, in respect to appropriate facilities for wielding ecclesiastical power. Their District Associations are, for the most part, in their elementary structure, a compound of the Association and Consociation of New England. And their General Association is a manifest improvement in the art of Clerical supremacy, over the New England ones, combining more fully the tacit assent of the churches with the absence of any real or effective lay representation of them.—The New York clergy of the sect have likewise this advantage over their eastern brethren, that their flocks are less familiarly acquainted with the principles and usages of primitive Congregationalism, having been trained, many of them, either in Presbyterian Churches, properly so called, or in those nominally Congregational churches that have been Presbyterianized by their connection with a Presbytery on the far famed "accommodation plan"—an anomalous arrangement, by which the laity are stealthily shorn of their Congregational rights, before they are aware of it, and placed in a position in which it is next to

impossible to regain them. Of the workings of this system, in New York, and especially in Ohio, the reader will find some instructive particulars, in the work on "Congregationalism and Church action," by John Keep.

CONGREGATIONALISM AT THE WEST.

From this and other causes, the Congregationalism of the Western States in general is of a semi-Presbyterian stamp. A large portion of the New England clergy are known to lean strongly towards the principles and usages of Presbyterianism, and when they emigrate to the State of New York or further west, they frequently become the strongest advocates of high Presbyterian power. Others of them who settle over Congregational Churches introduce usages there which they would never think of attempting in New England. The portion of the laity originally from New England are commonly too much occupied with secular business to attend to ecclesiastical matters and suffer their ministers to regulate every thing in their own way. An instance we have in the remarkable organization, already noticed, of the Associations in the State of New York.

Another thing greatly tending to facilitate the rank growth of Spiritual Despotism over the Congregationalists of the Western States, is the general absence, at present, of any marked exhibitions, on an extended scale, of that ecclesiastical authority in the Associations, which, although it exists, and is constantly and quietly expanding itself, is scarcely thought of, because not yet generally felt. Nothing is more common than to hear it said that the power of the clerical associations is merely nominal, at the West, while, at the same time, the very connexion in which this is said, reveals to the practiced ear, the deep though quiet hold that power has already attained. A single illustration may suffice.

An independent minister intending to remain such, removes to the west, and seeks a field of usefulness as a pastor. He finds a people who wish for his services. He preaches on probation, and is acceptable to the people. Of recommendations from the former field of his labors, (were any needed,) he has no lack. What hinders him from engaging, at once, in his proper work? The neighboring Congregational clergy inquire of him to what Association he belongs? He frankly tells them he belongs to none: he is a member of the Independent eastern Church (in New York it may be) from which he removed and knows nothing of Associations. He wishes to be-

come a member of the church where to preach. The clergymen tell him—they take care to make it a fact—they can have no ministerial intercourse with his brethren, in the neighborhood, and consequently no access to the people of the region—no! nor, permanently (under circumstances) to any one particular church in the State, unless he will become a member of the Association! On inquiry, he finds that such is indeed the fact! He forms. He places himself, without saying to know it, under the guardianship of an Association of Ministers, in a (strange to tell!) that he may become Pastor of a church claiming Congregational Independency, but which, manifestly compromises its independency, if it had any, in consenting that its Pastors should come under such a control.

And yet this minister, with great publicity and sincerity, no doubt, excuses his course by avowing that, at the West, clerical Associations have so little authority—in fact, none at all, either over members or over the churches, that joining of them was merely nominal, could do no harm! And the "Association" was so small, moreover, consisting of two or three persons, that, certainly, could have no great amount of control over the churches! And yet, it leaks out, in the same story, that they claimed and exercised the power, (in connexion with the Associations) of barring an acknowledged christian minister out of an entire State unless he would conform! And the same is done!

Thus potential do clerical associations become, before their power is perceived. In such a Western State (call it Michigan if you please) it is manifest that the friends of religious liberty must be on their guard, and be vigilant, if they would not have their sons come under the domination worse than Saybrook Platforms before they are aware of it.

In another Western State, we know of an accomplished minister who has been compelled to relinquish his past—a very important and eligible one—because, being a friend of the reformatory movement of the day, and coming in constant collision with the authority of the organized priesthood, he determined to shake off their yoke, and seek bread for his family, in some other location in which he might remain a man. This too, if we mistake not, was in a region where Congregationalism, if it had had the breath of life within it, might have afforded him shelter and protection.

THE CASE SUBMITTED TO A JURY OF THE PEOPLE.

The careful readers of the preceding sketch will now judge for themselves whether we have made good our position that in the machinery of an organized Spiritual Despotism—the essential thing is not the Pope—the Prelacy—the Episcopacy—or the modern arrangements of Presbyterianism—that the main thing is the organized *Clerical Caste*, whatever form or name it may assume—that, very frequently, the less imposing and more simple forms, are most to be dreaded, because most compact and, yet invisible;—that in cases where Prelates and Popes would be unable to reach the people or even the more obscure clergy, to control them, or would not take the trouble to annoy them, the *Association of Ministers*, with vague, indefinite, scarcely recognized, and even disclaimed and disavowed authority, will be found amply competent to the task of uprooting almost the last vestiges of spiritual freedom. The pages of D'Aubigny may reveal to us a Pope sufficiently liberal or careless to let Luther alone, if the organized clergy of inferior grades would only permit him to do so. And, at the present moment, if our European accounts do not mislead us, we have the phenomenon of a Reformatory Pope, contending against the conservatism and intolerance of the main body of the clergy who are ostensibly subject to him! Let us have done then with crying out against Popery, as constituting, exclusively the Anti-Christian Power over the church, until we have mustered sufficient discrimination and consistency to throw off the organized priesthoods that pollute the soil of the New England Puritans and of their emigrating descendants. If, to any good purpose, we would respond to the alarm bells that are rung in our ears, warning us against the encroachments of anti-Christian power over the church, we must learn to detect the Popes of Congregationalism (so called) as well as those of the Romanists.

CONGREGATIONALISM IN ENGLAND.

It is to be borne in mind that the system of Ministerial Associations has never been adopted among the Congregationalists in England, nor any judicial or legislative bodies erected, by representation, or otherwise, analogous to our American Conciliar Associations, unless we are to consider the "Congregational Union of England and Wales" (organized within a few years past) as the incipient step towards something of the kind. This "Union" was, in the first place, proposed and designed as a more annual

convention of Congregationalists, *en masse*, for purposes of mutual edification, for both ministers and laymen. The jealousy of the people was such that many, both ministers and laymen, refused to come into the measure, fearing it would lead to something like our American System of Associations or Conventions. These fears have since been increased by the virtual recognition of the representation system in the meetings of the "Union" and more especially by the proposition recorded below, and which we took from the "London Non-Conformist" some year or two since.

Mr. John Angell James, of Birmingham, read a long paper, (before a meeting of the "Union,") setting forth the evil of an incompetent and irregular ministry, and of the reception given to men of this description by churches and congregations to whom they were not previously well known. As a remedy to the mischief which he deprecated, he proposed the constitution of a body of three in London, one of whom to be a STIPENDIARY, whose business it should be to keep a constant vigilance upon all students going out, upon ministers movable and moving, upon churches wanting, or likely to want, pastors, &c. and, duly to register such facts, and all matters pertinent to them. The enunciation of this scheme was followed by so blank and embarrassingly protracted a silence, that Mr. James felt it prudent to declare that he did not mean to press it at that moment, but would introduce it at another time. Meanwhile, however, the thing was talked over, and, Mr. Burnett, we are told, said that whenever proposed he would resist it. Next morning the chairman announced two subjects for consideration, and that of Mr. James being in his judgment, the more important of the two, he would give it precedence. Mr. James, thus called upon, declined, after some thought, any fresh offer of his own plan; and, in place of it, proposed a committee to be appointed to investigate the subject, with a view to the production of some measure at the next meeting. Mr. Burnett, in his own characteristic style, opposed the whole project; and concluded his observations with a remark to this effect—"If you appoint the committee, you will damage the Union; and if you carry the original measure, you will destroy it." Eventually it was withdrawn, probably to be re-produced in some other shape.

It is only necessary for us to detail the facts, in order to put the body of independents upon their guard. The trio proposed by Mr. James would have been a perfect parallel to the three poor-law commissioners, and doubtless they would soon have had their provisional assistant. Mark now the inevitable consequence! See the immense and irresponsible power which would have been lodged in their hands. Students under surveillance—ministers contemplating another sphere, under galling restraint—churches having candidates palmed upon them, with a view to the furtherance of some autocratical under-current ends. Why, the thing would have been a perfect dissenting reform club—and most of the pulpits in the kingdom would have been, in a few years, at the disposal of a small junta of officials. But forewarned is forearmed. Will the independents suffer any such bare faced an encroachment upon their liberties? We shall be sorely mistaken in them if they do."

The subject has since been warmly discussed in the "Non-Conformist" and the fact is made apparent that the system of "licencing" ministers by ministers or ecclesiastical bodies, so familiar to our American Churches, has never existed among Congregationalists in England, and the recent attempt to introduce it there has proved an abortive one. The proposal endangered even the existence of the "Union" in which it was made. It follows that Congregational Churches in England, choose their ministers direct, from among themselves, or from among the young students, or wherever they can find them, without any ministerial interference from any clerical or other ecclesiastical body. We had this fact from George Thompson and John Scobie, (both of them Congregationalists, and ministers by election from the brotherhood,) when they were in this country.—The latter, if we correctly remember, was among those who were jealous of the "Union." It is difficult to make an English Congregationalist understand the usages of so called Congregationalists in this country.

GREAT NATIONAL SOCIETIES.

We have been considering the ecclesiastical organizations properly so called, from the simple clerical associations of the second and the nineteenth centuries, up, thro' Presbyterianisms and Episcopacies to the Papacy itself. There is, however, another vehicle of Spiritual Despotism that we have only incidentally noticed, but which deserves a more particular attention. The great National Associations, for religious and benevolent purposes, with their metropolitan Committees and affiliated auxiliaries, State, county, and local, have been found capable of wielding a power quite distinct, in its nature, from that which is properly called moral; that is to say, they have been found capable of exerting an influence, not so much from the moral motives they have presented, as from the amount of patronage they could command, and the degree in which they have been able to supercede, discountenance and disgrace any attempts at individual or local effort that does not obsequiously flow through the prescribed channel, and obtain the stamp of approval from the fountain head.

We have mentioned the fears entertained by Emmons at an early day, of the ultimate effects of this power, and it may be instructive to gather up a few facts that may guide us in forming an opinion whether or no those fears were wholly unfounded.

The comparatively modern date of these Associations enables us to trace their rise,

progress and growth, with a good degree of precision. Those of our country have all originated, and from small beginnings, some time since the opening of the present century and perfectly within the recollection of the writer. Those of England are but little earlier in their origin. And yet, in both countries, they have, in some cases become the formidable rivals, and in others, the chief instruments of the more regular and properly denominated ecclesiastical bodies. At first glance, we look at them as anomalous and entirely without precedent. But a little reflection enables us to trace many points of resemblance between them and certain arrangements of the Romish Church, of much earlier date, and running back into the middle and even earlier ages. The *Propaganda de Fide* (Propagator of the Faith) one of the most powerful auxiliaries of the Roman Pontiff, and sometimes so powerful as to excite his jealousy, what was it—what is it—but the Great Foreign Missionary Society of the Roman Catholic world? Then look at the order of Jesuits, founded by Loyola, in the time of Luther, the most effective prop and yet the most dangerous rival, at times, of the Papal throne, sometimes suppressed by the Pope, and then again revived, as a necessary though dreaded evil. A careful study of the older orders of Romanism, the Augustinians, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, &c. &c., would probably reveal to us the close affinities between these bodies and most of the voluntary associations of the present day, among protestants, that are so modelled and managed as to become the organs and implements of different classes of the clergy. They are, all of them, Catholic and Protestant, just such associations as must naturally arise in the absence of that general local church independency and enlightened and vigorous christian activity that the New Testament model and usage evidently contemplate and exemplify. Let the local churches become inactive from the prevalence of worldliness, and then the regular built hierarchy, from the Association of Pastors, upward, is the next development. Then, when the evils or the defects of these become apparent and when active and earnest men seek a medium and a field of operation or association, (in the absence of the local church, ignorant of it or hopeless of its restoration) up springs the different orders, associations, societies, &c., generally founded on some one single idea, most prominent in the minds of the founders, and naturally carrying over a wide territory all of similar ideas, or tendencies. With the Romanists, the ascent, tacit or

explicit, of the reigning Pontiff must be assured. With Protestants, the ecclesiastical bodies, whatever their name or shape may be, must be propitiated or must stand in the position of patron or advocate. Otherwise there are collisions and asperities, rivalries and feuds. These, in the history of voluntary associations, are no new thing under the sun—nor are the formidable powers wielded by them. The history of Romanism, for centuries before the Lutheran period, during it, and down to the present hour, has been, to a great extent, the history of the various workings of the voluntary associations, their bickerings, their dissensions, their rivalries, their alternate collisions with the regular hierarchies and their ultimate subjugation by them, and efficient services, thenceforward, for the aggrandizement of the victors. At a very early period of Church history, say the second, third, and fourth centuries, "the confessors" so called, or persons, whether clerical or laical, who had been called to suffer great persecutions, acquired thereby a reputation which made them formidable to the regular priesthoods, especially where their influence was combined. In the end, however, the clergy predominated, and thenceforward absorbed the entire current made by the Confessors, yoked them up in their harness, decked the clerical body with their honors, and used them up, for the benefit of the caste. Thus it fared with the recluses and monks, who held, originally, a formidable check upon the worldly minded clergy, whose gorgeous splendor and luxury set them in a troublesome contrast. One by one, the Voluntary Associations, whether compact or indefinite, have all fallen under the control of the clergy or have been suppressed by them. The most modern improvement is, to have the clergy contrive and shape them in the first place, and adjust duly, the relation of the Voluntary Association to the clerical body.

Our Protestantism of the nineteenth century, especially in America, boasts herself immeasurably, the wonderful modern discovery of the power of voluntary association, just as though centuries upon centuries of experiment had not preceded our own, and as though the main improvement in the modern machinery did not consist in the more perfect control of voluntary associations by the clerical caste. There is nothing essentially new, so far as this matter is concerned. The thing that is, is the thing that has been, and that will be, until New Testament Church Independency, intelligent local activity and individual responsibility shall again be restored.

Bearing in mind the recent origin of the voluntary associations in America, chiefly controlled by a few leading men among the clergy, let us take a few glimpses at their present position and influence.

THE POWER OF VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS AMONG BAPTISTS.

Our first selection of testimony shall be from a minister of the Baptist denomination, and in special reference to the state of things in that connexion, in which it was thought, thirty years ago, that the principles of Church Independency were too firmly established ever to be shaken. We copy from the *Christian Contributor*, by Elder Cyrus P. Grobvenor.

With Baptists, independency has ever been a radical and glorious principle. The strict and inviolable rights of the churches—their authority and ecclesiastical power under Christ, have been contended for and admitted. During the last twenty years, Voluntary Associations of a religious character have been multiplied, and their strength has been gradually increasing. As they have increased and enlarged numerically and geographically—as they have attracted and concentrated the influences of individuals and churches, they have claimed to exercise dominion and decide the line of conscientious action for all embraced in their general limits. In the Congregational and Baptist churches, no authority higher than the church has been acknowledged. They have no Presbytery or Conference to interfere with, or supersede the authoritative action of the body—the Church.

The Baptist Church has no right to delegate its authority to individuals to be transferred to a voluntary body, so as to interfere with subsequent thought or action in the Church. A Church is a perfect organization. It is not a fraction of a unit. Associations, Conventions, &c., are but the result of combining personal influence and action for the accomplishment of specific objects, not affecting in any way the individual churches in their rights, or fellowship, except that action is endorsed by the Church in their practice or action. All this we profess in theory, but what is our practice? No one who is acquainted with the history of Associations, &c., can doubt the tendency of large voluntary bodies to exercise power over all who differ from the popular side. Look at our Conventions; a complete trammel to the freedom of individual and Church action.—The fact that a majority of Church members voluntarily associate together, gives no right to control the rights or opinions of individuals or Churches, and yet so rampant is the spirit of aristocracy, that we are required to bow down to the august and powerful dictates of associated ecclesiastical wisdom.—We are now taught, that it is our duty to relinquish our conscientious scruples to meet the wishes of a majority. What more than this was ever claimed by the Church of Rome? When we are told that the Church (meaning the majority of the denomination) has a right to demand our blind submission to her pretended authority, the religious heart—of personal conviction of right or wrong, it is time we were awake and began to enquire whether we are living in the 18th or 19th century—whether we are Romanists or Baptists, Slaves or Freemen. We no where admit the doctrine, that the Church is a unit,

and that such collective assembly or congregation is not a church; but a mere fraction. Naturally we are growing wise rapidly.—We are now taught that the fact of our being Baptists, and others being Baptists, lays a foundation for intercommunion without regard to the general character of those who may compose such Churches—that the Baptist Church is such a unit as described—that to deny Church or Christian fellowship is equal to rebellion against the known principles of independent Church organization.

Every Church is responsible to Christ for its action. If a Church judges all other bodies to be heretical or immoral, they must either refuse fellowship, or they must carry the case to some tribunal for adjudication.—But there is no court above the individual Church. Neither Association, Convention or Council, can touch the matter, but in an advisory manner. Or, if neither of the above things are done, then the Church must fellowship, said heretical or immoral Church, accompanied with a very solemn and pious declaration of no communion with the heresy or immorality! but we do embrace in bonds of sweetest Christian love and fellowship, heretics and vile men, such as are unworthy of confidence and fellowship.

If such be the state of things among the Baptists, what must it be with the other sects who have dipped much deeper into the same system, and who have been less jealous of encroachments from that quarter!

AMONG CONGREGATIONALISTS.

We turn next to the Congregationalists of New England, and our witness shall be an equally well known minister of that sect, one who will not be suspected of extravagance or of a tendency to draw too gloomy a picture of the churches and ecclesiastical arrangements to which he still adheres, and from which he does not seem at all inclined to recede. The *Emancipator* of Joshua Leavitt, some time ago, in publishing a communication from a worthy minister in Connecticut, introduces it, editorially, with the article that follows:

THE AMERICAN BOARD AND SLAVERY.

The following able and discriminating article is from the pen of a venerable clergyman in Connecticut. It was prepared and sent to the Boston Recorder nearly a year ago, but that paper declined publishing it.—Time was when the Pastors of N. England were thought something of; and the opinions of the most obscure would have been respected by the conductors of a religious journal. But now the great societies with their arguments and reports occupy a large portion of the columns and almost entirely control the sentiments of the religious press. These societies, with their metropolitan managers, with a press almost completely subsidized, are weaving a net of hierarchy, in the comparison of which popery is as Solomon to Rehoboam.

The Sanhedrim of Jerusalem, the Vatican of Rome and the Star Chamber of London now sits at Boston, New York and Philadelphia. It is time the churches had some organ through which they can speak as separate bodies and the pastors as individuals.

This language is quite as strong as we have ever used in the Christian Investigator

—nay, it exceeds anything we have said in that particular connexion. Let no one think it strange that the "Pastors of New England" whose high claims we have recorded, and against whose domination we have protested, should be represented in so humiliating a posture. Whoever understands the workings of Spiritual Despotism knows well enough that the majority of the ministers as well as the laity come ultimately under the yoke. One of the chief ris- chiefs of a hierarchy is the subjugation of the mass of the ministers, and their loss of manly independence and genuine respect. Let no one imagine that the writer of these essays, (who claims to be a minister himself, and a pastor) is impelled by any wish to see the ministry degraded and lose its legitimate influence. The very reverse is the fact. There is nothing that can restore to the ministry of this country the independence and the respect that ministers of Christ ought to enjoy but their utter abandonment and repudiation of a clerical caste, with all the hierarchal arrangements it involves. To be respected they must take the position of *Christians* and men aspiring to become nothing more, and determined to be nothing less.

GENERAL VIEW.

A General View, in a condensed and statistical form, of the powers wielded by the leading American clergy through the voluntary associations, and also through the Colleges and Theological Seminaries under their control, is given by Pres. Blanchard of Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois, in a discourse delivered by him, while a Pastor in Cincinnati, before the Literary and Moral Society of Ripley, Ohio. A few extracts may be in place, here, though we published it nearly five years ago.

"There are now a few more than one hundred chartered colleges in the United States, exclusive of medical and law schools, and sixty theological seminaries. Of these, 21 are houses of Romish priests. Almost all these institutions are under the control and instruction of the religious denominations. Their professors, students, and graduated alumni, together, make a college and academy population, in the United States, of more than fifty thousand men. These men, dispersed through the country, to a great extent do its thinking and reasoning on morals and religion."

"There are, in this country, more than thirty religious sects, which have a membership of above two million one hundred thousand, influencing, more or less, a population directly connected with their congregations; and the opinions and measures of these religious denominations are largely influenced by a comparatively few leading minds, occupying posts of influence in the church."

"There are twelve leading benevolent so-

cieties, whose aggregate receipts and disbursements, at this time, must exceed a million of dollars. And though this sum is far less than the nation ought to pay for benevolent purposes, yet it is obvious that the collection and disbursement of such a sum, annually, by agencies, for the most part connected with the church, must necessarily exert a powerful influence on its opinions and measures. For besides that multitudes depend on these funds for their daily bread, the secretaries and agents of these societies, by the central position they occupy, and their personal acquaintance, gained by their necessary travel from place to place, are enabled to exert an almost incredible influence upon the public opinion of the church, to render those men unpopular whose zeal for reform disturbs the collection of funds by the societies they represent."

"These three influences combined—viz: that of the seminaries, the church organizations, and the societies, or, rather, the influence of the men who direct and control them, may be said, almost to make the public sentiment as to what is evil and what is good. For, in respect to morals and religion, institutions of learning are the nation's eye, churches are its heart, and benevolent societies are its hand: and whatever country is to be blessed with a pure religion, these points of influence must be pure. If the eye be dim, and the heart diseased, the hand will soon be paralyzed, and the body a corpse!"

"Now, on the men of wealth the college depends for its endowments, the society for patrons, and the denomination for popularity. And as the givers of money always influence the receivers, while the politics of the country will be controlled by the voters, whether rich or poor, the wealth of a nation will always give character to its literary and religious institutions. There would be no harm in this, were it not the experience of mankind that the wealthiest portion of the church is not usually the purest."

The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is a "close corporation"—a self-elected and self-perpetuating body. The churches supporting it have no voice in electing the members of the Board or in directing its affairs. Neither do the local missionary societies that collect funds for it, nor the contributors themselves. And yet its power over the churches is greater than that of most of the ecclesiastical bodies proper. The American Home Missionary Society, by its discretionary patronage of the feeble churches controls them to an injurious and alarming extent. The funds of the Education Society are, in like manner, distributed for the benefit of those who conform to the views of its managers. Mr. Colton, and other Episcopal writers have long ago said and without meeting contradiction, that these bodies are the most powerful and formidable Episcopacies in America, and hence they infer the necessity of Episcopal arrangements in some form. It will be in vain to attempt displacing Episcopacy and Romanism in this country by more liberal and democratic arrangements, so long as such a state of things continues. What

deserve particular attention is, that, for the most part, the same men who control these overgrown and aristocratic associations control likewise the colleges, the Theological Seminaries and the Ecclesiastical bodies proper.

ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

We hardly know where to pause, in our illustrations of "Spiritual Despotism" in this country. Almost every mail brings us some new specimen of it—some fresh instance of its exercise.

BAPTIST GAG LAW IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The following is from Cyrus P. Grosvenor's "Christian Contributor," Utica, February 2, 1848, and is signed by A. F. Fess and A. M. Piper.

TRIOY, N. H., Jan. 24, 1848.

Dear Br. Grosvenor,—The New Hampshire Baptist Pastoral Association held a meeting at Milford, the 18th and 19th inst., at which, after a protracted discussion, the following resolutions were adopted:

"1. Resolved, That the Pastoral relation is most sacred and not to be trampled upon with impunity.

2. Resolved, That in our opinion, if any agent press the subject of his agency against the wish of any Pastor, among his people, it is uncourteous and wrong, and he does it at the sacrifice of his denominational fellowship, and our ministerial support.

3. Resolved, That, whereas the Free Mission Society assumes ground in its operations against the Missionary Union, in which we have confidence, and it is the avowed object of some of its agents, to attack the principles of the Union, where they lecture, in a manner in our opinion unjustifiable, and thus introduce contention and divisions in our churches: therefore,

Resolved, That we kindly, but most distinctly disapprove their course."

A copy of these resolutions, being certified by the Secretary, were given to us.—We here insert for confirmation the words of the Secretary.

"This may certify that the above is a true copy of some resolutions which were passed at a meeting of the N. H. Baptist Pastoral Association convened at Milford, Jan. 19, 1848. Henry Tonkin, Sec."

Upon the resolutions, we have but few comments to make, they speak for themselves, and the public must judge for themselves. It may be proper, however, to say that we distinctly asked the following questions:

Should a portion of a church wish to hear the Free Mission agent, would he be justified in speaking to them in their own houses, or places, which they might provide, against the wishes of their Pastor? Or, should the whole church desire to hear our agent, and the Pastor be opposed, would he be at liberty to speak to them?

It was answered by a number of individuals in the negative, and by one it was said that an agent had no right to go even into

private families, to speak on the subject, and thus sow the seeds of discord among brethren.

Only one dissented from these views, and though it was not the action of the body, yet we are bound to suppose it was the sentiment of the body. And, indeed, the second resolution authorizes this conclusion plainly enough. It is *against the wishes of the Pastors*. They alone are allowed to wish and decide.

In the third resolution, we are forbidden *kindly but most distinctly*, to meddle with the principles of the Union, in which these Pastors have so much confidence. So we must not say a word either in public or private, on this subject, except by permission of the pastors. And we suppose that the law for agents, applies also to individual members of the churches. And now we suppose the Union stands on the only basis that can ensure stability to its principles.

UNIMPEACHABLE TESTIMONY.

The following, from the pen of Jedediah Morse, D. D., (father of the present publisher and proprietor of the N. Y. Observer) appeared in his "Geography" edition of 1792, page 219, as quoted by T. W. Coit, D. D., an Episcopal writer, in his "Puritanism and Churchman's defence," page 233.

"The Clergy, who are numerous, and, as a body, very respectable, have hitherto preserved a kind of aristocratic balance, in the very democratic government of the State, [Massachusetts] which has happily operated as a check upon the overbearing spirit of republicanism."

It was the Congregational Clergy, among whom the writer was so conspicuous and influential a member, that he had in his eye, of course. At that period, no other clergy were "numerous" in that State; and the Methodist and Baptist ministers then mostly "uneducated," could hardly have been "very respectable" in his view.

We took a pencil copy of the above extract, from a volume in a book store at Hartford, Conn., some time ago. Whether the Episcopal divine cited it in evidence of the anti-democratic tendencies of puritanism, or of the Congregational Clergy—or whether he cited it in evidence of the necessity, even in the view of Congregational writers, of some aristocratic check to democracy and republicanism, in the organized clerical body, we cannot say. Episcopalians do sometimes pull the one string and sometimes the other. We have known them to insist that Episcopacy, in this country, is less anti-republican than New England Associationism and Consociationism. And they make out a pretty plausible plea. We have known them, on the other hand, insist, as Dr. Morse does, that democ-

racy and republicanism need some aristocratic check, which the priesthood is bound to supply. Whatever may have been the scope of the Episcopal writer, the sentiments and the testimony of the man who, for so many years wielded the Congregational Associations of New England, at his pleasure, cannot be easily misunderstood, nor can his facts be set aside. The clergy of his sect, at that time, felt no awkwardness in the position in which their eminent author had placed them. Against democracy and republicanism they were, for the most part, open mouthed. They were honest and above board in their opposition, at that time. The "Geography" that published them to the world as anti-republican and anti-democratic, was, with their hearty recommendation and good will, a standing text book in their academies and schools. If we remember correctly, the early editions of it, if not the later ones, contained some pretty decided disapprovals of the universal liberty of conscience incorporated by Roger Williams into the political arrangements of Rhode Island.—With no desire to cast reproach upon the memories of the leading clergy of New England, in by gone days, we should be unwise not to understand their position sufficiently to profit by their history in its connexion with the present course of their successors, and the state of civil and religious liberty, in the country at large, at the present time.

"Only the actions of the Just,
Smell sweet and blossom in the dust."

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, February, 1848.

"I C. Taylor, Oberlin, Ohio,	\$1 00
G. T. Horton, Torrington, Pa.,	1 00
P. Curver, Churchville,	50
A. S. Shaffer, Galice,	50
T. Ewing, Nowland,	50
H. Thornton, Cambria,	50
H. W. Nichols, Lockport,	50
S. Lewis, Lyons,	2 00
S. Paine, Lake Zurich, Ill.,	50
J. K. Bartlett, Smithville,	50
S. B. Holley, Ellsburg,	50
F. Jellis, Whitesboro,	50
J. J. Johnson, Pruble,	50
M. Worcester, Tully,	50
M. Trowbridge,	50
J. Hills, Vernon Center,	1 00
J. Barnes, Peterboro,	50
B. Trufon, Bristol Centre,	1 00
J. Dewey, Tioke,	1 00
L. L. Rouse, Hume,	1 00
J. Butler, Bellevue, Ohio,	1 00
A. Richmond, Griggs Center,	1 00
J. R. Johnson, Ithaca,	1 00
	\$16 50
Do not Commission,	1 44
	\$17 94

J. J. MATTISON, PRINTER,
at the ONTARIO Messenger Office, Canandaigua, N. Y.
Book and Job Printing of every description done with
neatness, accuracy and despatch, and on the most reason-
able terms.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. VI—No. 3.
WHOLE NUMBER, 73.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., MARCH, 1848.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

[CIRCULAR.]

Union of Evangelical Churches.

At a Conference of Independent and Congregational churches, held in Butler, Wayne County, the 21st and 22d of last month, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed to inquire into the expediency of calling a State Convention of anti-slavery Christians, for the consideration of two points:—1. What is the Order, Discipline, Government of Christ's House?—2. Can denominational differences be so far merged at those who in particular localities acknowledge each other Christians, may be one communion and Church fellowship."

This resolution implies that there is already among those alluded to, agreement of the fundamental truths of Christianity; and in fact, such agreement is well known to exist throughout Protestant Christendom, by all who are commonly denominated evangelical. This, therefore, furnishes always a ground of encouragement and duty to seek for the scriptural union—for the directly commanded fellowship in one visible body—of brethren having essentially the same faith: And besides, there are thought to be now, special reasons for the measure proposed.

In the present position of Churches, it is as common to pass,

1. That one half of the means and efforts expended by Christians, are used in building up and perpetuating sectarian divisions, among those who mutually regard each other as true children of God. This is a chief reason why the work of missions languishes abroad, and every department of Christian benevolence is crippled at home.

2. That numbers of the ministry are gathered in particular places, who cannot be sustained, and are not needed; while large sections in our own and other countries, are wholly destitute of the preached Gospel.

3. Another result of sectarian divisions, is that in hundreds of localities, where there is room but for a single Church, three or four feeble ones are struggling to maintain separate existence; hence, often involving themselves in burdensome debt,—standing each other in the relation of rival, jealous

bodies,—through denominational pride and an envious zeal, (which sectarianism in many ways engenders,) neutralizing each other's efforts to do good,—and frequently absorbing the missionary benefactions of distant Churches, to maintain organizations needless, not only, but hurtful.

4. As a matter of fact, also, this multiplication of Churches, induces anxiety to procure numbers, rather than to build up in holiness,—prevents the exercise of faithful discipline,—and brings the Ministry and the action of Churches, more or less under the control of rich, proud men. And we suppose, that from this alone, the standard of godliness is in many places, brought down well nigh to the level of a wicked world.

5. In addition to all this, there are devoted Christians of different names, in almost every town, who have become weary of their sectarian connections;—there are large numbers of godly men, who for enlisting in the great objects of Christian reform, have been opposed by their own brethren, or harassed by ecclesiastical misrule, till some have felt constrained to secede from the Church, while others see not clearly what they should do.

It would seem, therefore, that God's time had come, to secure a visible, solid union of Christians on the broad plan of Apostolic simplicity: Such as the Saviour's prayer, (John 17: 20-22,) evidently, contemplates. And we have good hope that this transcendently important result can be effected.

The undersigned, constituting the Committee appointed at Butler, have therefore to ask, that those to whom this Circular shall come, will in some way bring the subject herein proposed before brethren in their immediate vicinity, and at their earliest convenience, send to either of us the result of their inquiries. If in favor of such Convention, an opinion is also desired as to the best time and place of holding it.

LEVI GAYLORD, Sodus, Wayne County.
J. R. JOHNSON, Ithaca, Tompkins County.
J. W. FOX, Sherburne, Chenango County.
WM. D. HENRY, Penn Yan, Yates County.
OVID MINER, Syracuse Onondaga County.

Dated at Syracuse, Oct. 7th, 1847.

A brother who sends us the foregoing Circular, says—"Do not fail to give us your views of this Union plan." Without knowing exactly what 'plan' the brother has in mind, we venture a few suggestions.

1. The evils of sectarianism are well set forth in the Circular.

2. There is undoubtedly a substantial union, between all truly evangelical Christians, though not between "all who are commonly denominated" such.

3. This union in spirit, lays a foundation for union in organization, and the measure ought every where, to be taken, of uniting all the Christians of a given locality, in a Christian Church. To continue the support

of sectarian Churches is to continue in the sin of schism, which is manifestly inexcusable.

4. A Convention to consider the subjects suggested in the Circular, is desirable—and the larger the Convention the better. Many such Conventions have been already held, but there needs more. If Christians throughout the "State" can be drawn to such a Convention, so much the better; if from many States, better still.

5. Such Conventions may discuss the topics proposed, and express the opinions entertained by the members; but no such Conventions can decide any thing on behalf of the absent, nor for Churches, or for the dissenting minority of its own body;—nor can it so bind itself, or any of its members, by its action, as to preclude their seeking, receiving and acting upon additional light. No Convention or Conventions, should undertake to act as a bond, ecclesiastical, of the union of Christians, or of Churches; nor attempt the establishment of any such bond—because,

6. Any permanently organized "visible body" beside or beyond the local independent Churches, and acting as by their authority, or on their behalf, must trench, of necessity, upon the independency of the local Churches. The organizing of such bodies is, in itself, and invariably, the incipient measure for organizing a new sect—thus running into sectarianism in the act of trying to get out of it. Neither the teachings of Christ or his Apostles, or the example of the New Testament Churches, warrant any such organizations, and all Church history identifies them with spiritual despotism, in some form.

7. The Convention at Butler purports to have been "a Conference of Independent and Congregational Churches." Conferences or Conventions of Christians is desirable; but Conferences or Conventions of Churches we cannot approve, for the reasons already given. The Churches have no duties which they can transfer, and no powers which they can delegate. All past experiments prove that Churches cannot permit themselves to be represented by delegates in Conferences and Conventions, without giving up, in reality, some portion of their independency, and coming ultimately under the yoke. There is no need of such organizations. All the good possible to be

done by them, can better be done by individuals coming together in their own behalf for mutual edification and instruction, without undertaking to transact business for the absent, or for the Churches.

8. If the phrase "*anti Slavery Christians*" implies that there are any Christians properly so called, who are *not* anti-Slavery, we must dissent. In calling such Conventions, and in organizing new Churches, on the principles of independency and Christian union, we would be careful not to recognize, even by implication, the Christian character of pro-Slavery churches, or of pro-slavery men. Instead of enrolling "*anti-Slavery Christians*," we would enrol **CHRISTIANS**, taking care to define Christianity so as not to include pro-Slavery and intemperance voters among Christians.—While none but *anti-Slavery* men should be welcomed, we should beware of making the impression that a sound *anti-Slavery* character, (as commonly understood,) is all that we require. For many zealous abolitionists are not Christians, and some of them do not pretend or even desire to be.

9. We hold it to be *schismatic*, and a violation of Christian union, to come out from pro-Slavery Churches, on the ground of anti-slavery, if, at the same time the Church, with all its pro-Slavery, is to be recognized as Christian. For our own part, we do not consider them Christian, and we think mischief is done by coming out of them, as some do, and then recognizing their Christian character, by attending steadily their worship, joining with them in religious conferences and prayer meetings, or coming to their communion-tables.

10. The Circular is headed—"Union of evangelical Churches." Such Churches need no outward visible bond of union, and can have none without becoming sectarian, and coming into ecclesiastical bondage.—And we hope to see no "union of evangelical Churches" that shall bind up true Christians, or Christian Churches with pro-Slavery voters, or with Churches that tolerate that outbreaking and scandalous sin.

Whether all these remarks are specially called for, in response to our brother, and to the Circular, we cannot say; but we deemed it a suitable opportunity to make them.

American Home Missionary Society.

(EXTRACTED FROM THE AMERICAN FREEMAN.)

The following items will give the reader some idea of the position of A. H. M. Society relative to slavery.

"One of the auxiliaries of the above society is the Philadelphia Home Missionary Society, which comprises with other territory the two slave States of Delaware and

Maryland. Another auxiliary in the Missouri Home Missionary Society; and a third is the Synod of Kentucky. The relation which these societies bear to the parent society, is thus described in the report of the latter society for the year 1845, p. 103:—"Thus the state and other large auxiliaries are not merely organizations to help the parent society; they are integral parts of it; bound together in one whole, by a common interest in, and free access through the parent society, to the great field to be occupied and governed by the same general principles and rules, in carrying on their work."

The following are remarks made by Pres. Blanchard of Knoxville College, before the Presbyterian Convention, held in Detroit, June 10, 1845:

"I do mean to say that the American Home Missionary Society in particular, instead of doubling the slaveholding Churches under its patronage as it has done within the last three or four years, ought, with an advancing public sentiment to have diminished their numbers. This society has one church in Kentucky into which slaveholders are not, and will not be allowed to come. Oh, sir! I am ashamed when I remember that I am an American citizen, and that only 35 churches are sustained by our American Home Missionary Society in the southern half of these United States to more than 900 in the north."

He then proceeded to show that the kingdom of God is built up by a slavery rejecting Christianity.—*Evangelical Observer.*

Allow us to state to the reader previous to his reading the following, that there is not a solitary church under the patronage of the Home Missionary Society in the South, save that of J. G. Fee's, which makes slaveholding a bar to Christian fellowship. So far otherwise, that the Synod of Kentucky refused to recommend J. G. Fee to the support of the A. H. M. Society, after his church had passed a resolution declaring slaveholding a disqualification for Church membership. It is already known to our readers, that notwithstanding the society voted supplies to Mr. Fee. And this fact, Mr. Peet and others have bruited far and near, as unanswerable testimony in favor of the Anti-slavery position of the Society. But the society only declares that a man who bears a consistent testimony against slavery shall not be starved on that account. But it also says that those who plead for slavery with all their might, and are ready to starve out Mr. Fee, and all others, who will not hug the abomination to the communion, shall not starve on that account. In a word it just puts slaveholding churches on the same ground that it does non-slaveholding. Sin on the same ground of holiness. Beelzebub in this thing, on the same footing with Christ.

The American Home Missionary Society

contains in the slaveholding States missions as follows, but one of whom, Rev. G. Fee, is an abolitionist:

Delaware 1—Maryland 1—Virginia 1—Georgia 1—Alabama 1—Kentucky 9—Tennessee 6—Missouri 23—Arkansas 1—Florida 1—District of Columbia 1. Total 49. [See report of that society for 1846.]

Hints on Revivals.

When we hear men zealously advocating revivals of religion, and at the same time decry and deprecate all attempts to discriminate between genuine and spurious revivals, or between the truth and error, the christian and the anti-christian affections that may be manifested during a time of religious excitement, we may well suspect, either that their zeal is not according to knowledge, or that there is a defective spot somewhere in their own religious experience and character, that instinctively shrink from the light of divine truth.

If all excitements on the subject of religion, and with those who exhibit strong emotions and high transports in the enjoyment of their religion are to be received and confided in, implicitly, and without further scrutiny, as evidences and exemplifications of the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, then, not only our Southern slave-traders, who hold protracted meetings, enrolling converts, buying up men, women and children, chaining them to their collars at the same time, but also vast multitudes of image-worshippers, both in Catholic and Pagan countries, in the cities of South America, in Sicily, Portugal, Italy, and on the banks of the Ganges, monks, friars, fakirs, brahmins, and the hordes of devotees flocking round and after them; yea, Mormon prophets and their followers likewise, are all to be regarded in the same favorable light! And why not all these, as well as those who, in the midst of the light now beaming in New England, in central and western New-York, in Ohio and Michigan, are ready to shout "Glory to God," to clap their hands, sing psalms, pray loud and long prayers, and then go to the ballot-box and vote for baby-stealers and women-whippers to hold the highest stations in this professedly Christian republic? God knows, and all intelligent men know, that, in point of moral character, the latter cannot be essentially superior to the former. The same may be said of those who, with similar religious manifestations, will vote for rum-bibbers, or for vendors of strong drink, thus helping to brutalize and destroy their fellow men. The sooner the community generally learn to turn their backs in derision upon all such sham revivals of religion

ness, and upon all who will consent to assist in promoting them, the sooner will the religion of Jesus Christ be redeemed from reproach, and the way prepared for its veritable revival among us, in its purity and in its power.

Whenever the state of religious excitement and feeling is such, that it causes the discussion of the fundamental doctrines and principles of religion as taught in the Bible, and exemplified by Bible saints, to seem inappropriate, dry, dull, unedifying and "throw a damper on the revival," we may be certain that there is something in the revival that needs to be purged out of it. If the first or fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah, the fiftieth Psalm, the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, or the fifth of James, deliberately read and faithfully expounded, and applied to the circumstances of our own age and nation, should "stop the revival," "draw attention from the salvation of souls," "grieve away the spirit,"—we may well meet the charge by saying, "Beloved, be not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they be of God." Many a promise of "revival," we know has been "stopped" or "interrupted" by the reading of a single chapter in the Gospels or of the Epistles, such to the annoyance of those who were carrying on the revival." But it would be impious to suppose that "pure and undefiled religion" received any injury by this procedure.

It is painfully instructive to notice the sad distinction made by some ministers and Church members, between *religion*, and a *revival of religion*. Ask them to describe or describe *true religion*, as taught in the Bible, and they will do it with great accuracy, comprehensiveness, discrimination, and clearness. Ask them to assist in promoting a *revival of religion*, and get them to work in that enterprise, and behold! you have altogether another thing exhibited before you. What they chiefly insisted on, and made most prominent in their descriptions of *true religion*, and would again insist upon if questioned, as most fundamental, they almost wholly overlook or thrust to the shade, the moment they undertake to promote a *revival of religion*. Both the *doctrines* and the *duties* of religion, as they themselves would still insist upon defining them, are thrown, to a great extent, into the background; exhibiting them in a very different perspective and proportion. Only a few topics, the most exciting to the passions of hope and fear, are brought prominently forward, while the divine character, purpose, aims, laws, and requirements, as laying the basis of moral responsibility and moral

obligation—especially the duties of life, growing out of our relations and nature, are either left out of the picture or are so hastily and superficially hinted at, as to make no very distinct impression on the mind, absorbed as it is, with other trains of thought. The consequence is, that the religion into which the converts are initiated, is often a very different thing from that which the teacher himself would insist upon, under any other circumstances than during a revival of religion; involving far less of self-renunciation, self-denial, and practical every day godliness in the disciple.

The very first thing requisite in promoting a revival of true religion, is to attain full, adequate, and scriptural conceptions of what true religion is. These conceptions, in their completeness and integrity, should be conveyed clearly and impressed deeply on the mind of the hearer, so that in "embracing religion" the convert may embrace precisely the religion of the Bible, and not something that partially resembles it;—the whole of that religion, and not merely some fragmentary shreds, clippings, and morsels of it—intermingled, very likely, with larger portions of mere husks, and delusions that will smother or displace all the rest.

Slave Auctions and Revivals.

At an Anti-Slavery Church Reform Convention we attended, recently, in this State, the subject of religious revivals was discussed, and revivalists who called themselves abolitionists thought us "opposed to revivals" because we spoke against the revivals of the *pro-slavery* religion, so frequently witnessed, both at the north and the south. Revivals of "pure and undefiled religion," as we said, were greatly to be desired, of course. It did not follow that a revival of the *opposite* kind of religion is not to be opposed and deprecated as a sin and a curse.

In illustration of our meaning, and with the hope not only of *defining* but of *impressing* our sentiments, we copy the three following advertisements which appeared in the "Christian Index," the Baptist paper of Georgia, published at Pensfield, Ga., Jan. 20th, 1843. We should like to see the man—minister or layman—who could stand up before an audience of northern farmers and their families, and read distinctly, these advertisements, and say he desired a revival of the religion exemplified by the Editor and Publisher of this "Christian Index!" And yet, by retaining fellowship and co-operation with pro-slavery Churches, northern or southern, all who do so, are saying that very thing! One minister, on the occasion above

referred to, objected to our saying that a *discrimination* should be made during revivals, between true and false religion, by answering very solemnly, and apparently with an expectation of producing an impression of profound awe, that it was "presumptuous and hazardous to attempt to *steady the ark of God in the time of a revival!*" As much as to say that all sorts of religion that manifest themselves in times of religious excitement, are to be received with reverence, & without scrutiny! The poor man was sadly shocked to find that his attempt at solemnity, produced only a laugh! And still more so, to hear us say that a spurious religion ought to be laughed out of the community, and *must be*, before "pure and undefiled" religion could be revived—that Christ regarded such religion no good for nothing but to "be cast out and trodden under foot of men"—that "He who sitteth in the Heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have in derision" (as Isaiah in the name of the Lord had derided,) all such hypocritical and sham religions! Were we too severe? Read the following exposition of the pro-slavery religion so prevalent in this country—the religion of all Church going pro-slavery voters—northern or southern, and then say!

EXECUTIONS' SALE.—Will be sold at the late residence of Jesse Perkins, deceased, late of Greene county, on Wednesday, the first day of March next, the following property, viz:

Allen, about 80 years old; Claiborn, 25; Dick, 25; Anderson, 20; Ann, 15; Israel, 14; Harrison, 13; Nathan, 13; Sirena, 14; Adaline, 12, and Wesley, 10.

Also, stock of hogs, stock of cattle, horses, corn, fodder and oats, plantation tools, &c.

All sold as the property of the said Jesse Perkins, deceased, under his last will, in order to make a division among the legatees of said estate. Terms on day of sale.

VINCENT SANFORD, } Ex'rs.
NICHOLAS PERKINS, }

Jan. 15, 1843."

"REVIVAL SERMONS, by Rev. Daniel Baker, late pastor, successively, of the 2d Presbyterian Church, Washington City, and of the Independent Church, Savannah.

The second edition of this very popular and useful book is just from the press. These sermons have been highly commended by learned divines and the religious press; but their highest recommendation is from above. They have been blessed to the conversion of over 9,000 persons. Of that number some 30, or more, it is believed, have become heralds of the cross. They may be had at our office," &c.

"NOTICE.—Will be sold on the first Tuesday in February next, in the town of Greensboro, Greene county, a tract of land containing one hundred and three acres, whereon James H. Ralls lived at the time of his death. Also, a negro woman, Mariah, and her three children, all belonging to the estate of said James H. Ralls, deceased. Sold by or-

der of the Honorable the Inferior Court of said county, when sitting as a Court of Ordinary for the benefit of the heirs and creditors of said deceased.

JOHN G. HOLTZCLAW, Adm'r.
Dec. 2, 1847."

A Mistake Concerning Creeds.

One reason why many orthodox Christians, in their commendable zeal to preserve a pure faith in the Churches, are so anxious to retain the common use of Church creeds is this:—They suppose that if they have no written Church creed except the Bible, binding their Church order and faith exclusively on that book, then they cannot consistently reject as heretics, any persons who profess to believe the Bible, whatever false doctrines they may promulgate, and however plainly they may contradict the essential truths contained in the Bible. But there is no foundation for this apprehension. Whether a Church takes the whole Bible, or any select portions of it, or any condensed summary of doctrine, of their own drafting, as their church creed, or basis of organization, the church has, of necessity, the right, in disposing of the case of any person charged with having essentially departed from the church standard, (whatever it may be,) to judge for itself, whether the person thus charged, has departed from the standard or no. The Church must, of necessity, claim and exercise this right, whether the Bible, or any condensed summary, be used as the standard. This is no violation of the right of private judgment in the individual in question. It is merely the exercise of the same right, on the part of the rest of the brotherhood. He has a right to think and speak for himself, and they have the same right to think and speak for themselves. And whenever they think his religion to be essentially different from their religion, they have the right to say so, and separate themselves from him; just as he has the same right, if he sees proper, to say the same thing of them. The rights are the same in both cases. When they came together, (or attempted to do so,) it was on the supposition that they mutually recognized each other as disciples of the same religion. This mutual assent and recognition entered into the very idea of Church relations. And when either party, the individual or the body, discovers its mistake, it has a right to terminate the relation.—The body has the right; and each individual has the same right. If the parties find they cannot agree in respect to the ideas embraced in their church standard, if they, or either of them, discover that the agreement is only in words and not in things, in

appearance and not in reality, they have a right to say so, and act accordingly. They must do so, if they are earnest and truth-loving men. And there is nothing in this that furnishes any just cause of complaint, if the grounds of the separation are fairly set forth. [Church excommunications and separations have been so long associated in the public mind, with the physical pains and civil penalties that formerly accompanied them, that it is difficult to restore the proper idea of them.] Whether the Bible or some other written creed is used as the standard, it makes no difference in respect to the right of the Church to reject those whom it deems heretical. Without any Church creed or before the Bible was written, the worshippers of the true God had a right to withdraw from the worshippers of false gods. Modern creeds did not confer the right, nor do they facilitate its exercise, nor shut heresy out of the Churches that most rely on them.

"Uncharitableness."

FURTHER ILLUSTRATIONS.—Another instance of that kind of prudence which we are so "uncharitable" as not to esteem of heavenly origin, we have in the story of a celebrated Doctor of Divinity in one of our Atlantic cities, who warmly espoused the anti-slavery cause, at an early date on his return from England, where abolition of a pretty radical type was then in the ascendant, and altogether fashionable in the high places of the ministry there. At home, he soon found the difficulty of introducing English fashions into American congregations, and received, as the price of his temerity, a salutation or two from the pro-slavery mobs, which some of his associates had been so basely fomenting. Open violence did not at first injure him. After a time he changed his location, then changed it again, and finding that every where, the current continued strong against anti-slavery, he became altogether silent on the subject, and common fame reported that this silence was in conformity with a verbal and mutual understanding to that effect, at the time of his latest settlement. Two of his sons had espoused the anti-slavery cause. One of them had entered the ministry and had become silent. The other, a merchant, retained in a good measure, his interest in the cause, and on one occasion, while visiting his father, adventured to remonstrate with him on his long silence, and urged, in the course of the conversation, the sacred obligations he was under, to plead the cause of the oppressed. "My son," responded the Doctor, "my obligations to your mother and sis-

ters are paramount to my obligations to slaves," very plainly intimating that his advocacy of the anti-slavery cause, would interfere with the proper support of his family. His son burst into tears, and withdrew. This Doctor, at the meeting of the American Board, in September at Brooklyn, 1846, responded to its celebrated Report, with emphatic "aye!"

Another instance has just come to our knowledge. A minister, for many years very prominent and active evangelist, successful conductor of, perhaps, some of our revivals, the "spiritual father" of one or two revival ministers more prominent than himself—a man whose very name has been identified with modern revival measures, who is now in the decline of years, dependent for support upon a "mixed multitude" of all sorts of pro-slavery as well as anti-slavery christians, was recently urged one of his flock, to open his mouth for the dumb. He admitted the solemn weight of the considerations presented to him, acknowledged the righteousness of the complaint pointed out to him, but pleaded his inability to comply with the request, because it would inevitably withdraw from him his already scanty support, in his old age!

Objections to Democracy.

Those who advert, as some appear to do, to the fact of human depravity and wickedness, as furnishing an objection to republican or democratic arrangements, in a government or church polity, would do well to consider, what they seem often to overlook, that this same doctrine of human depravity is predicable of all men, of those of "high degree" as well as of those of "low degree"—that if it writes "vanity" upon the claims of the masses, it inscribes "folly" likewise upon the pretensions of exclusives—that all degraded and wicked beings, of all other kinds, there is the greatest danger of conferring upon any of tainted race, exorbitant or uncontrolled power,—that the exercise of power tends almost irresistibly, to corrupt even the pure of those who have any remaining purity or even frailty, left in them—whatever of superior sanctity or wisdom may justly be claimed on behalf of the select and precious few who fear God and honor humanity, the very beat of these, least ready to think it safe for them to wield unlimited power—that, in some way, and in all forms of government administered by human beings, of mature age, the character and position of the masses must, does, and forever will, determine, essentially, the character of the authoritative government.

cised over them, upon the maxim of "like people, like priest,"—that under aristocratic and despotic forms of government, the influence of a corrupt populace, and such a government as a corrupt populace always will have, are never known to be less deleterious than under democratic institutions, so that, on a full view of the matter, the doctrine of human depravity, or, if you please (another phrase for the same thing,) the fact of human wickedness, so far from being an argument against democratic arrangements, supplies one of the strongest considerations in their favor.

Be it so, that a free Church, and a free State require, and imply a higher degree of of virtue, intelligence and self control in the people, than the more autocratic forms.—That very consideration holds out a premium for virtue, in the hands of a free government, while a despotism taken for granted the hopelessness of virtue, and the certain perpetuity of vice, and tends to verify its own predictions, by leaving little stimulus or exercise for the virtues of the masses.

And furthermore, when a people subvert or forfeit their democratic institutions by their vices, they only reduce themselves to the very position which all other institutions hold out for them. A free Church or a free State may break down in the attempt at freedom, and become again abject and servile. Very well! They are *now* only where they would have been *all the time*, without the attempt. The temporary respite from despotism was so much, (to humanity,) gained, at the worst!

The puritans, at the very time when they believed most thoroughly the doctrine of human depravity, were most thoroughly democratic in their aspirations, and admitted least of a compromise with aristocracy, either in the Church or in the State. The succeeding Clergy who inherited only the outside shell of their creed, or who modified, derided, or abjured it, during some portions of the history of New England, were the very men to engraft aristocratic arrangements into their Church polity, and ally themselves to every thing aristocratic in the State.

When men advert to the doctrine of human depravity, or to the fact of human wickedness, for considerations in favor of civil or ecclesiastical aristocracy, it is time to suspect that the true theory, and the humiliating sense of human wickedness and depravity, have failed to impress themselves sufficiently upon the deep recesses of their own hearts. In fact, there is nothing more common than to hear men, in whose theological system, the doctrine of entire human depravity has scarcely yet found a promi-

nent place—nay, who will lightly allude to that item in the creed of their more democratic brethren, with a jibe or a sneer, appeal, nevertheless, with the greatest possible earnestness and confidence, to the almost universal prevalence of brutality and ignorance among the masses, as an unanswerable proof of the folly of recognizing their claim to be heard and to act in the discharge of the responsibilities of social humanity, among which they are placed, and in which the very fibres of their moral natures, and moral accountability are identified and intertwinced.

The more deeply any men realize *their* own participation in the depravity of the race, the less likely they will be to court aristocratic distinctions, or aristocratic power. And the more fully they are convinced of the depravity of others, the less inclined will they be to put aristocratic power into their hands. All checks and safeguards against arbitrary power, are so many confessions of the depravity of the species; so many testimonials to the fact that men cannot otherwise be trusted, nor, scarcely, with even all these. On the other hand, in proportion as virtue increases in a community, while there is the less need for caution and restraint, either on governors or governed, there is the increasing consciousness that liberty, and democratic activity will be safe.

Under all the varying aspects of popular character, the democratic arrangement is the most safe—the aristocratic or despotic, is the most deeply charged with portents, or with realizations of evil.

PRESBYTERIANISM AND CONGREGATIONALISM IN WISCONSIN.

The American Freeman, Waukesha, (Wis.) Jan. 26, 1848, contains an account of the proceedings of the "Milwaukee Presbyterian and Congregational Convention, held at Summit, the 12th and 13th of that month. At this Convention a series of Resolutions against receiving slave holders into Mission Churches was "voted down by a majority of three or four"—some "sixteen or eighteen ministers and laymen" being convened. The Editor of the Freeman states also the following particulars, with the remarks connected with them.

There was a good deal of discussion about the terms on which an ordained minister could be properly invited to sit as a corresponding member of the convention, and it was decided that he must be a member of some ministerial or mixed body.—*That a church was not an ecclesiastical body*, and that no ordained minister, though a member of a church, could be allowed to sit with that body—he was not their peer. So it would seem the question presented at the last regular meeting of the convention, in behalf of the Prairieville Church, and other Congregational churches, involving the right of a church, on the

basis of convention, to ordain in its own way its own minister, is passed upon and negatived; not directly, but virtually.—This we conclude to be a greater approximation towards Presbyterianism than any thing yet revealed even in Connecticut Congregationalism, not to say Massachusetts Associationism. We are confident that not a solitary New England ecclesiastical body ever adopted the principle, of denying any regularly ordained minister, who was a member of a church, a seat as a corresponding member in any of its sessions.

"Instrumentalities of the Gospel."

"We are more and more convinced of the absolute necessity of securing the instrumentalities of the Gospel in the overthrow of slavery. Whatever effort it may cost, or whatever sacrifice, we must have the co-operation of the ministers and churches. The Liberty party is indispensable, as the hand by which a reformed public will be to act in the last resort. But the creation of a regenerate public will require the right training of the public conscience; and nothing can do this but the Christian ministry. To think of renovating the public mind without their aid, or of carrying the abolition question, *in their opposition*, is madness. We must bring into the work all the Bible and Missionary societies, and all the churches of the land. They hold the keys of the Bastille, and the poor slave is to groan in his prison until they consent to open the door."

The above is from the editorial of the Emancipator, while under the care of Joshua Leavitt, two or more years ago. It furnishes a text for voluminous and weighty comments. Let us hastily gather up a few topics for consideration.

1. The "co-operation of the ministers and churches" was yet to be secured; and their "opposition" averted, at the time of the writing of the article, and no marked change has been effected since. What a kind of church and ministry must this be? And how can Joshua Leavitt continue in fellowship with them? Was it because he despaired of ever securing that co-operation, that the editor afterwards was constrained to quit his post? And was it under this aspect of things that he gave his adhesion to the policy that, apparently, looks to a lower tone of political action against slavery than that which was formerly held by the Liberty party? Was it *this* that led him to change his position in respect to the constitutional power of Congress, over slavery? If so, we have an illustration, in his own case, of the power the church and ministry exert, in retarding the progress of political abolition.

2. "We must have the co-operation of the ministers and churches." Mr. Leavitt about the same time, labored to secure their co-operation, in the work—not of abolishing slavery, exactly—but of sending the slaves, bibles. In New England, quite a

number of popular clergymen said, "Yea." "I go, sir!" But what have they *done*?—What *can* they do, till they are ready to act for the abolition of Slavery, which denies Bibles?

3. "Whatever effort it may cost, or whatever sacrifice," &c. It would cost too much, if we should sacrifice gospel principles (the duty of immediate repentance,) to secure the co-operation of all the ministers and churches in the world. If their co-operation could be secured by forming some new combination into which "the doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of slavery" should not be incorporated, (and such a party the Emancipator has recently talked about as probable,) the loss of fidelity would greatly overbalance all the benefit of clerical co-operation, even if this "sacrifice" should secure it—which is doubtful. The "public conscience" would become scared under the process.

4. But let us give another version to the phraseology. "At whatever cost or sacrifice," we must have a thoroughly anti-slavery church and ministry, even if it cost the sacrifice of organizing new Church organizations throughout the country—a church and ministry whose "gospel" will be "wielded for the overthrow of slavery." What gospel that refuses this can be the gospel of Christ? If Mr. Leavitt is in favor of this, let all the people say, Amen!

5. And why should not every friend of religion and humanity demand this? "We must have" the co-operation of ministers and churches in the anti-slavery cause! Then we must not continue "co-operation" with ministers and churches of a contrary description.

6. Mr. Leavitt is correct in saying that nothing but the Christian Church and ministry can mould public sentiment aright on this question. But, as Mr. Leavitt also attests, the churches and ministry of the country are not doing this work. They are opposing it. The inference is inevitable, that they are not christian.

7. Mr. Leavitt's closing sentence is a corroboration of this conclusion: "They hold the keys of the Bastille"—and they will "not consent to open the door."

8. But let them not be quite certain that "the slave must groan in his prison till they consent to open the door." God may burst open that door, by terrible judgments, and sweep such ungodly ministers to destruction, in his anger. Or he may, in mercy, raise up a church and ministry that will do his bidding.

9. "Is madness," &c. It is not madness to think of "carrying the abolition question

in the opposition of the churches and ministry" that can be thus characterized! For Christ's Christianity can and will displace and supersede them. But it is "madness" to think of carrying this, or any other great moral object without the "instrumentalities of the Gospel." Such "instrumentalities," where they exist, do not need to be "secured" either by threats or coaxing. It is their meat and drink to do the work committed to them by their divine founder and Master.

Of Words without Definitions.

During the stormy times of the French Revolution, near the close of the last century, a little French gentleman, named Teste, was residing at Providence, R. I., in the capacity of French Consul at that port. On each foreign arrival, the chief citizens of the place, congregated on Waybosset bridge, which served them as a kind of public Exchange, would talk over, earnestly, the latest French news. The excitement rose to a high pitch one day, when the mails brought intelligence of the beheading of the French king, Louis XVI. The paragraph had just been read to the gaping circle, when Mons. Teste was observed, coming on to the bridge.

"Ah! Monsieur Teste," exclaimed a prominent citizen, "what ails the people of France? They have beheaded their king!"

"Do French-a-mans," replied Mons. Teste, "will have *de liberte*!"

"Liberty!" retorted the citizen. "And pray, Monsieur, what do you call liberty?"

"Don't care vat you call him!" responded Mons. Teste, "Do French-a-mans will have him!"

And so the French people had their liberty, such as it was, without stopping to ask after its definition, its conditions, or its nature. They had their fill of it, under the successive strokes of the guillotine, and gladly bartered it off, with the Corsican, for fetters.

The generation of Mons. Teste, is by no means extinct. We have clamorers for liberty—aye, and for religion, too—and for revivals of religion—who know nothing of them but mere empty names! Who care not to know—who cannot be persuaded, or made to know. They will have them, without scrutiny, and without knowing what they are. They will have *liberty*; but licentiousness, conducting through anarchy to despotism, will answer their demands just as well! They will have *religion*; but only dress up Atheism in canonicals, seat it in the divinity chair, doling out its worship for "the lesser devil of the two" and it is good religion enough for them. They will have *revivals*

of religion. But only give them their accustomed machinery, drapery, dramatic effect, excitement, and enjoyment, and they ask not and care not, whether it be a revival of benevolence or of selfishness, of purity or of corruption, of humanity or of cruelty, of holiness or of delusion, of succor to the widow and fatherless, or of thumb-screws for frantic mothers, and shambles for their infant children, sold from them at auction, by the pound!

We have drawn a picture. If those who can join with pro-slavery voting religionists in promoting revivals, discover their own features on the canvass, they are welcome to take it home with them, and hang it up in their parlors.

The Relation of Slaveholder.

While the American Board and its supporters are pleading the possible innocence of the "relation," and while even anti-slavery ministers who complain of the Board, are repenting the same doctrine to justify their ecclesiastical connexion with slaveholders at home, let us see how communally is running ahead of them. Even Cassius M. Clay, inconsistent as he is, cannot help seeing the anti-christian position of such men. Hear how he answers one of the apologists of the innocent "relation." We copy from his "True American," published in Kentucky, some time ago. If C. M. Clay has fallen from his integrity, and if he sinks into infidelity, on whose skirts will his blood be found?

"Is a man to be condemned as a sinner, simply because he is a slaveholder?" Yes! Mr. Rice. There is no help for it. God has decreed it! Nature swears it! Man's every instinct and immortal aspiration echoes the damning yea! The church, if she would, cannot shirk the test. She must either exclude slaveholding Christians, or fall! The morality of the world is ahead of the church! The Christian religion will not fall; no, never! But it will put on some other outward dress. It will have new teachers. There is a new era in the development of man's moral nature, of science, of politics, of civilization. The old creeds, forms and abuses of the church will become the cast-off shells of the now born chrysalis of expanded progression! As sure as God, the church South, so far as it is wedded to slavery, must fall! If it does not voluntarily change its position, so touch the worse for us; so much the worse for liberty; so much the worse for morals; so much the worse for the souls of men! Through more suffering, and tears and blood and crime and wo, we shall pass, as by fire, into the new era. But heaven nor hell can stay our onward march!

"Must every man holding this relation forthwith dissolve it, without regard to circumstances?" Yes. That is it! As to revolutionizing society, that is all stuff, a worn-out lie. It answered its day; it was in use some years ago; but British and other national emancipations have buried it so deep in the things that were, that Mr. Rice, and

the whole Church South, cannot resurrect it. It is worn thread-bare; it will no longer clothe a *Savage*, far less a *Christian*. There are more men in France given to adultery and fornication, than there are men in the South given to slaveholding, proportionate to number. What is to become of this illicit connection; what of those victims of sin?—Would Mr. Rice advise their "turning loose"? Many of them are helpless women, without "capacity to take care of themselves," would he revolutionize society—would he preach immediate reform? Yes, as a man and a Christian, yes! Those who are unable, by long departure from the right, to take care of themselves, should be taken care of by their destroyers! So of the slave, "poor things;" cannot help reach them as well in a state of freedom, as in a state of slavery? Then, why not act now, to-day? We honestly believe, that if every slave under the whole heavens were liberated this hour, that it would be infinitely better for master and slave, and all mankind."

An Argument for Church Creeds.

During a recent discussion on Church order, at a public convention, a good brother said he thought it necessary for a Church to have a summary of Christian doctrine that could be read in five minutes, as a bond of mutual faith and co-operation; for, said he, the people can't *all* study the *whole Bible* sufficiently for that purpose.

Now this feature of the creed system, as commonly carried out, furnishes one of the strongest objections, in our mind, to that practice. It is used as a labor saving machine, to supersede the necessity of that constant and universal study of the Bible which is necessary to make intelligent, independent, and well instructed Christians. God never intended that man should attain in "five minutes," to that full and comprehensive knowledge of divine truth that can be attained only by months and years spent in "searching the scriptures." The notion that "all the people cannot study the *whole Bible*," and that such study may be confined to the select few, and those entrusted with the task of condensing five minutes summaries of Christian doctrine, which are to answer for the mass of the people, instead of Bibles, is fraught with immense mischief. Interminable janglings, illimitable despotisms, unnumbered sectarianisms, monstrosities, and fragmentary one sided theologies, and religions come of these "five minute" bibles, of human invention.

Perhaps it may be said, that while the brief summary that could be read in five minutes, might contain all that is necessary as a basis of Christian co-operation and Church fellowship, yet the obligation resting on all to read the whole bible, is not superseded thereby, as there are many other things proper to be known and understood. Be it so. But the statement to which we

have objected is, that *all* Christians have not time to study all the bible sufficiently to ascertain, for themselves, what is essential as a basis of Church fellowship. The idea is that though the essential points may all be condensed within the compass of five minutes reading, yet in the Bible they are so scattered or so diffusely stated that most Christians have not time to find them, and ascertain what they are, without danger of overlooking something that is of fundamental importance. But, if this is true, then it is true that most Christians have not time to study the bible sufficiently to learn what true religion is, and what is indispensable to the salvation of their own souls; and so they must trust it all to those who have time to search out and condense the statements for them. And if those to whom they intrust this important business should overlook any thing essential, they must run the risk of losing their souls.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER:

"A dead church has always stood in the way of making this wicked world better.—It was so in the days of our Saviour, and so when Luther undertook to reform the world. And so in these days. I know it to be so in my own experience. When I embraced the temperance cause, the professed church were the greatest persecutors. And how very marked was the opposition to this anti-slavery enterprise in its early struggle!—Who, that took an active part, did not feel, in some way, a severe rebuke because we did not "wholly refrain?" And this ungodly tyranny is not dead, neither doth it sleep. It is awake whenever an opportunity offers for vengeance upon the head of any who are so presumptuous as to go a little in advance of the church. I sometimes think she stands a far aside of her duty as did the old Jewish Sanhedrin. And I will illustrate this by saying, there is at this moment what is called a great revival going on at M——. One of the latest converts to the M. E. Church, I think, was asked whether, in their great revival they prayed for the slave.—He very promptly said, "No! it would be very wicked to take all that slave property away from their masters." Is not this a fair specimen of pro-slavery revival? I have no reason to believe but nineteen out of twenty would make the same or some similar answer. So far as my knowledge extends, it is emphatically so. And what adds to the absurdity is, the preacher, or one of them, a few short years since, was alive to the interests of those stricken ones, but has learnt to be very prudent, to wholly refrain from that delicate and agitating subject.

How should every good man weep between the porch and the altar, to see the grace of God turned into lasciviousness!—May we not believe that if the professed Church continued to hold her peace on this important subject, "that deliverance to the captive" of our republican land, will truly arise from another quarter, "and who knows but they have come to their present exalted position in the eyes of the world, for such a time as this!"

May God hasten the time when Anti-Christ's kingdom shall be destroyed, and the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour be set up, and the whole brotherhood of man rally unto it. I remain yours,
for a pure Gospel,

A. R.

FAITH, LOVE, AND GOOD WORKS.—The definition of faith, to be complete, must be such as to include or imply good works.—And the definition of good works, to be correct, must always include or imply faith.

Love must be so defined as to include obedience—and obedience must be so defined as to include love.

Faith works by love, and love reposes on faith.

"This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments,"—and the commandment is fulfilled in one word—"thou shalt love."

Show thy faith by thy works—and "this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

"Faith without works is dead." And works without faith are abomination: for "without faith it is impossible to please God."

Faith and love are the foundation and essence of good works; and good works are the body and the manifestation of faith and love.

☞ The slaves of custom should consider that it is more honorable and noble to assist in making good customs which somebody will, one day introduce, than it possibly can be to contribute to the continuance of evil customs, which are destined, sooner or later, to be banished out of the world, as nuisances.

☞ There is nothing more pleasant or more popular, than to talk in favor of true principles and righteous measures:—the self denial and the unpopularity comes when we undertake to reduce those principles to practice; to carry those measures into execution; calling on all around us, and especially on those who applaud us for our talk, to put their shoulders to the wheel along with us.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

MARCH, 1848.

Watchman! What of the Night?

It is often asked, and sometimes debated, whether or no, the work of reformation in this country is going backward or forward. The right answer to this question may perhaps be, that while the principles of reform are spreading and expanding through the community in general, they are becoming, (as exhibited by the mass of professed reformers,) more diluted and softened. Thus as we know, while ancient christianity was extending its conquests over heathenism, it received corresponding taints from heathenism in return, till, at the moment of its ascending the throne of the Cæsars, it had nearly lost its affinity with the divine carpenter of Nazareth, and the christians had become heathenized, while the heathen were becoming christianized. There is no period more hazardous to Christian reformers, than that in which their reformatory labors appear to be making a general impression on the community. Progress, instead of compromise, becomes then doubly needful. Not to make advances in knowledge and virtue becomes equivalent to apostacy, and whoever, at such a time, persists in making advances, by the application of admitted truths to passing events and rising exigencies, will be very likely to be left quite alone.

THE SUDDEN DEATH OF JOHN Q. ADAMS

Should remind us that *our work*, whatever it may be, must be done quickly, if done at all. The champion of the right of petition did not think fit to be, at the same time, the advocate of abolition. He may have acted on the current maxim of doing only one thing at a time. He may have hoped to reach the period when his direct action against slavery would have been more effective. Who, among the earnest friends of the slave, does not lament his failing to do the whole of his duty, before he died.—Let us take care, then, lest we fall into the same error. Whatever of truth God reveals to us, let us declare to the world, *now*, for we know not whether we shall live till to-morrow. The declaration of half truths and the advocacy of half reformations, ill becomes men who must so soon lie down in the grave, and who know not whether the present hour may not be their last. "*Whatever thy hands find to do, do it with thy might*"—do it now. Whatever thou hast to say, or to do for God and humanity, do it the very first opportunity. Say it while your tongue refuses not its office; do it while your hand still obeys your volition. The

policy of selecting some favorite duties and leaving others to take care of themselves or to come up, by and by, is unsafe policy for those who are liable, with all notice, to be called to their final account.

BEING AND DOING.—Some say that the grand object of life is to *do*. Others think to contradict this, by affirming that the comprehension of human attainment is to *be*.

The truth is, there is no doing the will of God, without *being* what God requires us to be. And there is no such thing as *being* what God requires us to be, without *doing* what God requires us to do.

It is by *doing* that human character is formed. At the same time, the only activity that defines or moulds a sound character, is that which springs from the innermost depths of a pure heart.

Reformers who are always afraid of "carrying things too far, and going too fast" are commonly found, in the end, to have carried nothing any where, and to have gone no where themselves.

FARE AT OBERLIN.—We learn that the Office of the Oberlin Evangelist has been destroyed by fire, and that the subscription books of that paper were burned. Subscribers to that paper will therefore help themselves and the Publishers by forwarding their names and Post Office address now. Probably the books of the Oberlin Quarterly shared the same fate.

FALSE LIBERALITY.

The secret of many a man's *liberality*, (purse-wise and creed-wise) is his love of popularity; and it is no wonder that such a kind of liberality should be popular. The man of true Christian liberality, the liberality of Jesus Christ, is seldom or never, a popular man, for he never disguises the truth to please any one, he never countenances nor patronizes what he has no confidence in, for the sake of the reputation he might gain by it; he never attempts to secure two reputations by courting opposite parties, nor virtually unsays in one circle what he has said in another, in such a manner as to be claimed on both sides of controverted questions. And the man who will do none of these things, must make up his mind to be considered and treated as a narrow minded bigot, as long as he lives, or until the Millennium has commenced.

For the Christian Investigator.

Duties of Reform Churches, RESPECTING THE SUSTAINING OF MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL.

These churches are in great danger of being ensnared by a compromising spirit. Examples: In a large and flourishing vil-

lage, such a church has been formed. At first it encountered great opposition; was ridiculed and called by opprobrious names; had no suitable place for meeting, &c. But a change comes. The congregation increases, and some quite "genteel" people come in. A meeting-house is built in quite good style—is really a model of modern architecture, it don't bear any marks of a "nigger church." The merchants, and all the respectable business men of the village, have made up their minds that *that* society must live. They must help a little, of course. The church is highly gratified with its increasing influence! Can now conform a little, a little more—and a little more, so as to hold these men, "*to do them good*!"—Next, the pastor is getting to be rather popular. He is escaping from the stigmas which in former days, have been cast upon him. His position among the ministers of the village must be maintained. He was classmate of a distinguished divine, who is now a conservative pastor of the largest and most influential church in that whole region. It is a sad pity if the pastor of the reform church, cannot keep up a good standing with his old class-mate. So matters go on, until that church is shaped; and cramped by the degenerated community to which it began to conform, and then did not know where to stop. How does all this come about?—This is the secret:—The church did not dare to take their stand, that they would support such preaching as the world needs—though they should have that preaching but once in four weeks; so the preacher must shape his course to keep the subscription list good. In a retired country neighborhood, the process of reducing the church to this sort of conformity, is somewhat varied, but the result is the same. The minister must so preach as to suit "good society men," who hold the subscription rod over the head of minister and church; he must do this, "or pack up."

To resist this desolating current, will require great self-denial on the part of minister and churches. We have but just commenced our struggle. A sea of tribulation is before us, and there appears in clear view beyond it, the Land of Promise, where glorieth the Crown of Glory. J. R. J.

Ithaca, Feb. 25, 1848.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR, March, 1848.

H. Gilbert, Richmond,	\$1.00
R. A. Putnam, Epsom, (N. H.)	1.00
G. Smith, Peterboro,	10.00
W. B. Stone, Gardner, (Mass)	1.00

\$13.00

Not enough to pay the Printer's bill, either this month, nor last. This paper must have more support, if it is to be continued.

J. J. MATTISON, PRINTER,

at the ONTARIO MESSENGER Office, Canandaigua, N. Y.
Book and Job Printing of every description done with neatness, accuracy and despatch, and on the most reasonable terms.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. VI—No. 4.
WHOLE NUMBER. 74.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., APRIL, 1848.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

Ministerial Independency.

We have said so much of the importance of Church Independency, that we think it time to say something on the subject of ministerial independency. The evils of political despotism and of Clerical servility have been seen in their connexion, to be seen they are; for, strange as it may seem, they commonly go hand in hand. The separation of Churches and ministers can never be restored until the false notions prevalent are corrected and their effects brought to light. For the present we send our readers the substance of a letter I wrote, some time ago, to a good brother, in a brief note, had kindly expressed sorrow at some expressions, on the subject of the support of ministers and lecturers, and of their privilege of seeking other stations, when support failed, which we made in a public convention. In his letter he said: "I have but one word of reproof. It is for what you said at ——— your privilege, if you chose, of being an accountant, instead of a minister of the Gospel. How much rather would I have you say, 'Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel!'"

On writing over the reply I sent this brother with a view to its publication, at some time I was led to enlarge it somewhat, and the important subject of it is by no means exhausted. Some think that in order to get rid of a Clerical Caste, they must get rid of salaried preachers. But we are prepared to maintain the opposite position and show that the notion of Clerical superiority has its rise, and very natural, in the notion of a Clerical Caste. In this discussion we may enter perhaps at some time.

Honeoye, Ontario Co., April 17, 1847.
Dear brother,—I acknowledge, gratefully, the receipt of your kind letter, and the assurance, for which you will accept my thanks. I am especially grateful for your

"reproof" and for the kindness with which it was administered. I feel that I may read from you more than "one word of reproof," and yet you will, perhaps, think, before you have finished reading this letter, that I am not ready enough to receive the one I most need. Perhaps it may be so. It is often the case. And the man must be wiser and better than I am, to be always certain that his own heart does not deceive him, when he wards off reproofs.

I think it possible that you may have misunderstood the sentiment I intended to express at the Convention, or that I misunderstood you. And it may be that we differ somewhat in our views of the subject of those remarks. I know that very few, at the present day, hold the sentiments that I do, on that subject. The wide distinction commonly made between ministers and other Christians, and their responsibilities, leads to views of this subject that I consider hurtful and pernicious.

It grieved you that I spoke at the recent Convention, of my "privilege" of supporting my family by a return to the labors of the Compting House, if necessity should so require. You had much rather I had said "Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel."

Are you quite certain, my brother, that the two things you have here set in contrast with each other, are opposites? It was Paul who said, "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel." The connexion in which the declaration stands, will show that Paul, too, spoke of his "privilege," or "power," to do the very thing that I also claimed the privilege to do. And it was the mention of his privilege, in this very thing, that led him into the discussion that followed, in the course of which he penned the words you have quoted.

Have I not a right, says he, to eat and drink? And have I not a right to have a family—to "lead about a sister—a wife?" Paul knew that his right to eat and drink included his right to earn his food by honest labor; and that his right to have a family included the right, because it implied his duty, to see to it, that in some honest way, the necessities of his family were supplied—that if, in the course of Divine Providence, and for the lack of the "carnal things" that his ungrateful, or parsimonious, or indigent, or small, or heedless flock,

• 1. Cor. ix.

(who needed so much admonition on the subject,) failed to supply, it was not only his "privilege" but his bounden duty, to suspend, if need be, his other labors, and apply himself, (in some distant city it might be,) to the labors with which the shop of a tent maker, in need of a journeyman, could, alone, furnish him. As an honest, trust-worthy, humane, just, and sane man, as a covenant-keeping husband and loving father, could he fail to do this? Had he not said, of those who were delinquent, in this particular, that they had 'denied the faith' and were 'worse than infidels?' And had he not done this, for the obvious purpose of checking the already rising tendency towards that mendicant spiritual pauperism, (one of the strong holds of the "Mystery of Iniquity" even then at work) with which the "Man of Sin" succeeded afterwards in desolating and corrupting all christendom? [Compare I. Tim. v. 8. with II. Thess. iii. 6, 12.] See also Luke X. 7.

Who, that studies the life, the writings, the character, and the philosophy of Paul, can doubt that he often found occasion, even without a family, to suspend his intended journey in this direction, and his enterprizes in the other, to quit his stated and his itinerating preaching, for months at a time, amounting in all, to years, to devote himself to the occupation of tent making? Had he been connected with a family, as he claimed the "privilege" of being connected, if he had judged best, it would probably have subtracted years more from his public labors, to be spent in the tent makers' shops—or the compting houses, if he preferred.

The Savior himself spent only three years of his life in the public ministry, commencing at thirty. Why did he wait so long, when the world around him was perishing? in need not only of his miraculous powers of healing, but also of the gospel of salvation from his gracious lips? Why did he continue to ply the tools of the carpenter, the plane, the saw, the chissel, the broad axe, for nine long years or more, after he reached mature manhood, reserving only three for his public ministrations? Why did he not say, "Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel?" And why did he not, therefore, throw down his carpenters' tools? Was not a world's destiny hanging upon his shoulders, as never, before nor

since, upon the shoulders of any man living? Was not his grand work, a world's redemption, lingering for its accomplishment? Was it for him, the Messiah of God, and at such a time, to busy himself with such secular matters as house building, or, it may be, repairing stables for oxen? Could not any journeyman carpenter in Nazareth perform that service as well as he? Why not throw down his tools—and leave his indigent and aged parents and younger brothers to shift for themselves as they best could? Or why, by a miracle, could he not supply their necessities and go about "the work of the ministry"?—Was he not the light of the world and the life of men? Why then, bury himself, for nine long years, in the obscurity of secular toil? Why? Because the Savior was a man and the responsibilities of manhood, including those growing out of the family relation, rested upon him, and not by the cheap and easy exercise of his miraculous powers, but by his own magnanimous and self-denying labor would he discharge them.—Because the religion he taught was the religion of humanity and of patient duty doing, in all the walks, however obscure and humble, of our heaven appointed lot.—Because the preaching of such a gospel required, still more than the words of him who spake as never man spake, the eloquence of a patient, laborious, duty-doing, and law-abiding life. Because he would be the exemplar of his disciples and his ministers, teaching them by his deeds, as he could never have done by mere words, what was that preaching of the gospel which he had committed to their hands!

"Woe is me," indeed, "if I preach not" that "gospel"—but I could not do it, nor be in a position to do it, if I did not make it understood by those around me, that I still hold myself ready, as I have hitherto been, to take cheerfully and promptly whatever post of labor the Great leader may please to assign me. 'Tis now about twenty years, since, at the age of thirty-five, and at the bidding, as I thought, of Divine Providence, I left the duties of the Compting House for a more public field of labor. As an Editor, a Lecturer, a Preacher, I have done what I could, and am still ready to do what I can. So long as my brethren need my labors in this form, and so long as God sees fit to employ me in this department, both they and He will make it manifest by seeing that myself and the family God has given me are sustained in that field. When the support does not come, I shall know what the decision is, and shall feel it my "privilege," because my plain

duty, to enter the Compting House again—or some other field—(where my Master has work to be done,) and ply my tools there again, as well as I can. As I learned much in the Compting House that I have needed in the ministry, it may be that I need the same school again. As I earned something there for my subsequent support, it may be that the draft God sends me for future support in the ministry—old as I am—may be upon the same Bank.

Again and again, the matter has long hung in suspense, in times past, for months at a time, and I know not which way it would turn. Again and again I have imparted to my brethren the fact, and to let them know the principles I am governed by, that they should have no occasion to complain, afterwards, that they were not apprised of my circumstances and position.

This, if I understand him, was what Paul was mainly intent on doing (and the record is preserved for our benefit) in the very chapter from whence you have selected your text, for my benefit. On a full review of the matter, I see no cause to change my mind, until I receive further light, for which I should be grateful. I still think it is my "privilege" because it is my "duty" to stand ready to enter the Compting Room, the tent maker's shop, or the carpenter's yard (if able to do so) whenever the Providence of God, or the withdrawal of support by my brethren, makes it necessary for my family's support. As I once quit the Compting House for more public (not more sacred) labors; with many fears that I should not accomplish more for my Master, by the change, so I should go back there again, if He pleased, fully satisfied with the experiment I have made, and believing that I could serve him best in the field he first gave me; and to which he had returned me.

The messengers of divine warning to a deluded and besotted generation are sometimes recalled! The mission to Nineveh must needs be fulfilled, and no voyage to Tarshish, nor even to the East Indies and China, can elude it. But the mission once accomplished, though long delayed, the responsibility ends, and the prophet may not murmur at the result, whether of judgment or of mercy. God's Providence, as distinctly as his audible voice, may say to his messengers, in a day like this, "Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone." It only remains then, to shake off the dust from their feet, and retire. For months, at times, that sound has rung in my ears.—Whether meant for me, God's Providence

must decide. In the field where he has work for me, he will send me supplies. I could tell of most remarkable and unexpected replenishings—the ravens and the cruse of oil, could scarcely have exceeded. But of this there may be a last time. One thing I am certain. God neither permits me to run in debt, or to see my family suffer need, while I have the power of honestly supporting them.

Most heartily do I wish (your reproaches notwithstanding) that all christians and ministers could see the matter in this light. Alas! How many once promising ministers have I known, plunging by little and little into debt, becoming embarrassed, failing to fulfil their engagements, forfeiting their characters for honesty, and bringing the reproach of inhumanity, thriftlessness, idleness, and knavery, upon the Christian name, and all this because they had eaten and gone on, with the false theory of "preaching the gospel" by mere words—the theory that ministers, in distinction from other christians, are exclusively and irrevocably "set apart" for this work—"Once a minister always a minister, or nothing but a minister"—and "Woe unto them" if they do not always preach without ceasing, word-wise, whether in doing or there be any possibility of their preaching it by their actions, or no! The avarice and venality of the bulk of the clergy of our times, too notorious to be denied, arise very much, from this cause. They have been educated to preach. They have been ordained to preach. "Woe unto them, they do not preach." But must they starve? Certainly not! Then they must so preach as to get bread! There is no alternative left them, my good brethren, they may not claim the "privilege" which you were pained to hear me claim. Without that "privilege" they must please the people or they must starve. God will supply them by miracles. This they understand—they are tempted—they only diverge a little—"just for this once"—but intend to be more faithful as soon as it is more practicable. They slide imperceptibly. They fall! Their bones are whitening around us. Nay, they are stalking before us, the skeletons or ghosts of what they once were. How sad that the last remaining piety among us, should be led astray in seducing them!

Will you say Christ requires them to suffer privations and even martyrdom rather than swerve? Very true. And this concerns the private christian as well as the public preacher. When men of violence assault and murder us for our fidelity,

Christ, we must suffer it. That is another thing. Fidelity may require silence of Christ's ministers, at times, as it once did of him, when "he opened not his mouth."—Christ never told his ministers to keep on talking, constantly, all the time, at all events, and let their families starve.

I know of men (a son of our beloved Barney is one of them) who have chosen to retire from the field of preaching, technically so called—and resort to what are called secular vocations, rather than sacrifice their integrity by "preaching" to men who expected unflinching compliance and compromise as the price of their patronage.—Much as I regret the necessity, I honor such men. They have been compelled to choose, and have wisely chosen, between the timid, hesitant, half-suppressed preaching of servile lips, and the bold, unfaltering, and unmistakable, though silent preaching of a duty-doing life. God has not a few such preachers in the field, and their testimony will not be in vain. He can, in his own good time, if he sees best, open their lips, and collect audiences around them. And if he does not, the day of judgment shall reveal that they were God's true prophets, in a dark and corrupt age. Though Israel be not gathered they shall not lose their reward.

Would to heaven, our friend F——, of ———, were among the number of such men. He doubtless takes for his motto, "Woe unto me, if I preach not the gospel," and so (with his understanding of the maxim) he is compelled to preach. He preaches, as he must needs do, as much truth, and as little error, as the people will permit, till his principles are accommodated to his hearers. You condemn such a man?—No I do not. But chiefly because he permits himself to stand in an unnatural position, where God never intended his ministers to be placed, any more than any of the rest of his children. God never permitted a man to relinquish his original and God-conferred "privilege" of earning an honest living for himself and his wife and children, by any useful toil, however menial, to which he can turn his hands. To do so, would be to run away from under God's authority and protection—to run into the temptation from which we are warned to flee, and to fight against. God never made a human being capable of standing up erect, when voluntarily shorn of his manhood, and in manhood is wrapped up, of necessity, though the holy, the Christ-like "privilege" of obeying his God, in providing for his own imposed necessities, by the use of his heaven-conferred powers! If I knew

any thing of the gospel of Jesus Christ, this is an essential portion of it, the burden of his teachings, and the lesson of his life; and "Woe unto me," indeed, "if I preach not this gospel"—as God shall give me ability, by my deeds as well as my words. "The privilege" I would no sooner relinquish, than my "privilege" of obeying my Creator and doing his will. In order to be a Christian minister, I must, at least, be a man. And may God, in his infinite mercy protect our country and our common human nature from the curse of a priesthood, that must needs immolate its own humanity by forswearing its essential laws, in order, forsooth, that they may "preach."

Our Protestant Christendom is scandalized at the false spiritualism that enforces the perpetual celibacy of the Romish Clergy. But how much better, I beseech you, is the sentiment that the Protestant Clergy, with the "privilege" of having families, must have no "privilege" to discharge the duties growing out of the family relation, by the labor of their hands, when other support fails? Who can point out the difference in the principle, in the two cases? And who does not see the additional absurdity and inhumanity of the Protestant dogma, engrafted upon the Romish? If the "feelings" of the devout are pruned to hear Protestant ministers claim "the privilege" of keeping their families from want by the labors of the Compting House, in default of support from their hearers; then, in the name of holy consistency and sweet mercy, let it be understood with us, as it is with the Romanists, that "the sacred calling" is too sacred to permit the responsibility of the marriage relation! Let our ministers cease to mock God and "lead captive souls, women" by their solemn vows to provide for their house-holds, as heaven shall lend them strength, when they only mean that they will provide for them so long and so far as they can so shape the messages of God to a rebellious people as to draw adequate supplies from them, and when this fails, either modify the message or sit down and starve! And "Woe unto them" if they do otherwise!

I have recently heard it said, that the man engaged in the work of pleading the cause of humanity, with exhausted purse, in feeble health, with a dependant family, with inadequate support, with already accumulating debts, and having appealed to his well stored and full fed fellow laborers, in vain, for the needful supplies, and who, at length, reluctantly hinted his fears that he might perhaps be compelled to exchange that field of labor for some other that

would yield him support,—I have recently, I say, heard it said, that such an one gave evidence, that he was not the man of the right spirit for his station, because, under the circumstances of the case, he could announce his intention, unless sustained, of quitting the field. Such was the case presented at the Convention we attended, and it was for the purpose of opposing such sentiments that I rose to speak, and was incidentally led in defence of my own views, to unfold my own principles of action, bringing myself also under the same reproof.

Now, look, for one moment, at the case just mentioned. It would be worse than mockery, after the experience of the last twelve years, to say that the most devoted and gifted man in our ranks could go on and labor, in such a case, with any reasonable prospect of a fair and just support. The case of scores and hundreds driven from the field, settles that matter beyond mistake.* Then what is the sentiment quoted above? It is, that the lecturer, or the preacher, must go on, and starve his family or contract debts that he knows he can never pay! And in default of his doing this, (without a lip of remonstrance or complaint to his brethren who might easily support him,) he gives evidence that he is not the proper man for the work!

I reverse the statement, and affirm that the man who could do otherwise—who could go on and preach and lecture, and see his family suffer, while he could honestly support them, would give evidence, by that very fact, that he was not a competent, because not an exemplary messenger of the religion of mercy, of justice, of equity, of human relations, and of duty doing, to a perverted and priest-bestridden people!

What! For the sake of preaching mercy, must he become unmerciful? In order to preach justice, must he defraud and be unjust? That he may unceasingly instruct the people in the heaven established rela-

* I might mention the case of others, both editors and lecturers, who, to use the language of one of them, have found no small difficulty in reconciling their "public conscience" with their private conscience—their obligations to the nation, with their obligations to their creditors or their families. At the present peculiar crisis in the struggle for human freedom, there are several editors and lecturers whose course, as I happen to know, differs much from what it would be, if their support were in their own hands. The D. D. who said to his son "My obligations to your mother and sister are paramount to my obligations to the slave" presents only another exemplification of the same difficulty. When we censure such men, we should place the censure in the right place—in the act of consenting to hold public stations without providing some resource to depend upon, when other support fails, in the other lawful avocations of life. The history of the conforming and non-conforming clergy, among our Puritan fathers in England, when so many were virtually driven from their pulpits and so many more retained them by unholy compromises, would be found rich in illustrations of the truths I insist upon. It was by those who resorted to secular vocations that real Puritanism was preserved, in England, and in exile in Holland, and thence finally transmitted to our shores.

tions of life, and especially of the family, must he, himself disregard them? Shall he, indeed, devote his time, so unceasingly, to the promulgation of the religion of duty doing, as to neglect and trample under foot the plainest duties of life?

Any other religion, besides the true religion, may undoubtedly be taught, well enough, upon maxims like these, by the mere preaching of the lips: but the preaching of the true religion requires, above all things, the sweet discourse of a harmonious life. I will not say that the current and popular religion of the day is not best taught in accordance with the maxims and the philosophy against which I contend.—Let it multiply its preachers by such expedients as it best can, and bind them to its bloody car, by such ligaments of dismembered humanity as it best may. Let its organized clerical caste, of varied name and form (its name is legion) in addition to, and in connexion with, the congregation of patronizing contributors, shake its wizzard wand of starvation over the heads of its cowering members, exalting and deposing whom it pleases, petting its favorites with fat salaries, wrenching the last crust from its "impracticables"—and hurling its anathematizing "woes" after them, if they dare defile their anointed fingers with the implements of terrestrial labor:—let it do this with those who acknowledge its authority. I for one, do not belong to the order. I have never entered the threshold of its "sacred caste." I have asked for none of its favors. I fear none of its frowns. In repudiating the polity, I spurned the arrangements befitting it, and the maxims out of which it forges its fetters. God be praised for the "privilege" it shall never wrest from me, of preaching the divine laws by obeying them:—of preaching by my hands, by my lips, or my pen, as my Master provides a way for me: in a pulpit, in a printing office, in an editor's closet, in the farm yard, in the counting house, at the ballot box, at the communion table, in the prayer meeting, on the merchant's exchange, or on ship board. You bid me trust in God my dear brother, and not cease my labor. So I mean to do, as I have done, in the various ways I have just mentioned, as my Master has been pleased to call me. You see I have a wide parish, and work in abundance, before me. Pray for me, that I faint not, nor flinch from the tasks that may be assigned to me, whether the preaching of sermons, the mending of tents, the writing of "constitutional arguments," the keeping of merchant's books by double entry, the navigation of ships to India, the blacking of

shoes, the reproofing of senators, or the exposure of atheism in the school of theology.

WILLIAM GOODELL.

Suspicious Spirituality.

The spirituality of some reputedly pious people would be less suspicious, if it did not always lead them exactly in the same direction that their worldly interests, worldly reputation and worldly enjoyments lead them.

A professor of religion who has been somewhat engaged in reformatory enterprises, and who is moreover in regular standing in the Church, and in good repute for piety, (notwithstanding his sometimes troublesome ultrasims,) is solicited to cast in his lot with a new church to be gathered by secession from sectarian and pro-slavery churches, and organized on the principles of independency and christian unity, precisely as those principles are understood and advocated by this professor of religion. He has complained much of the pro-slavery position of his church and minister and knows they are making no progress.—He complains of their sectarianism, and of the spiritual despotism they wield and by which they are controlled. He has no lack of confidence in the brethren who propose secession. He would say, if inquiry were made of him that they were the best, the most devoted, the most praying portion of the church. But he cannot go with them! Why? He has become exceedingly "spiritual," all at once. He is afraid of making too much of morality and not enough of heart religion. So, he must stay in his pro-slavery sectarian church, with a worldly, time-serving, fashionable minister, and with scarcely a praying brother in the church along with him, to nurse his spirituality! At the same time, people cannot help knowing that the good man avoids a great deal of self-denial, by this lucky increase of "spirituality" just at this particular crisis. Instead of paying ten dollars a year as he now does, for church purposes, he would be expected to pay (as he is well able to do) twenty-five or thirty, in the little feeble secession church. His genteel family would have to quit their cushioned pew and carpeted aisle, for seats in an obscure upper chamber or wood-colored district school-house. They would lose caste in respectable society. The young folks, the aspiring and promising sons, the marriageable daughters, on whose prospects the doting parents had set their hearts so much, how could they lift up their heads among their associates? Or, "who that is any body" would seek their acquaintance, then? And

this is not all. Is the good man, a merchant, or a mechanic? He anticipates the loss of half his customers! If a physician he would lose half his patients. If a lawyer, half his clients, should he go with the hated seceders. He will have to bear the "inharmoonious name of come-out-er" and be called an "infidel"—a "disorganizer" and every thing else that is opprobrious.—And who could endure that? What a comfortable and convenient thing to be very "spiritual" under circumstances, like these! And to have a great deal of "christian charity" and "brotherly love" and regard for the "peace of the church" and tenderness for "the church and ministry"—and dread of "disorganization and schism!" No amount of "spirituality" of this sort now-a-days, ever cost any man a customer, a patient, a client, or a reputable standing in society. It is rather a recommendation than otherwise. It secures many friends and hazards the loss of none.

Here is another case in point. A minister, is for a time zealous in reformatory measures, an attendant on church reform conventions, a patron of reformatory publications, and bidding God speed, (by his words and by his Letters, it may be,) to some of the most obnoxious and hated of the "disorganizers." He even goes so far as to unite in inviting such an one, to hold such a convention in his own meeting-house.—The invitation is accepted. The convention is held. The same sentiments are advocated that, for a long time, this minister has professed to approve. He has not a word of dissent to utter to any thing that is advanced. But a large portion of the church and of "good society men," sickened for sectarianism—pro-slavery voters and supporters of those who grant runcences, are evidently displeased. The minister's countenance falls. He draws himself reluctantly to the remaining sessions of the convention, looks thoughtful, and takes no part in the rest of the proceedings. The thing passes off. What shall he do? Shall he go forward or backward?—To go forward is to "divide the church" and leave himself without adequate support. To go backward, in the same locality, might disaffect others. The next thing you hear of him, he has shifted his location. He is pastor of a church from which a faithful brother has just been virtually ejected for his fidelity in reproofing political sins—a church with whom some of the most pious and consistent christians in the neighborhood cannot conscientiously walk in fellowship.—Here this minister gives no offence to a portion of his church and congregation who

vote for slave holders. He has become exceedingly "spiritual." He has much to say about "heart religion." He is troubled that reformers are not more "spiritual!" Of all the reformers in the country, he knows of only one, a very rich man, whom he considers to be *spiritual*! He wears a very long face. He speaks with drawling tone solemnity, and makes "spirituality" his main theme. Here, his whole soul is drawn out. Here he is at home.—And when he feels it necessary, in defining or defending his position, to touch moral topics, he takes the philosophy of utility for his foundation stone, makes all moral obligation to rest upon expediency, almost divorces the idea of essential and immutable right, and confounds all moral distinctions, inasmuch that a phrenologist might almost be excused for concluding that he had no organs of moral perception at all, and was incapable of distinguishing right from wrong.

Alas! for a *spirituality* that lacks *moral perception*! A communion with God that reveals not—nay, rather, that obscures and obliterates all moral distinctions, that blunts the moral sensibilities, and that lends its possessor, like John Bunyan's pseudo pilgrim "By-ends" to cherish a religion that flourishes only in "sunshine," that walks only in "silver slippers" that cannot endure ignominy and "rags"—that "always has the luck to jump, in judgment, with the present way of the times," and that "chances to get" something "thereby." Had we room, we should like to copy from the Pilgrims' Progress a few pages here. Let the reader get the book and ponder Bunyan's pictures, especially the conversation between By-ends and his companions—"Mr. Hold-the-world, Mr. Money-love, and Mr. Save-all." A better exposition of the philosophy of utility has never, perhaps, been penned, excepting always the celebrated "little devil" Letter of Dr. Taylor of New Haven. We have a "*spirituality*" now in vogue, in certain quarters, that smacks strongly of the famous "town of Fair-Speech." In its ranks it numbers many such personages as "my lord Turn-about; my lord Time-server, my lord Fair-speech, from whose ancestors that town first took its name; also Mr. Smoothie man, Mr. Facing-both-ways, Mr. Any-thing, and the parson of our parish, Mr. Two-tongues;" to say nothing of "my lady Feigning and her daughters," who are reputed to have become very "spiritual," of late. Some of them will be very likely to write "stop my paper" on the margin of this sheet, or on some of its successors, before long.

From the True Westman.

Slaveholding Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery.

Mr. Editor:—

It may be asked, are there churches in this country which may be properly denominated Slaveholding Churches. This may be made to appear by a few plain questions and answers, exhibiting an analogy between a slaveholding church and a slaveholding state.

Q. What constitutes a slaveholding state?
A. When a part of its citizens, however small that number may be; hold slaves, and its constitution and laws allow them to do so.

Q. What constitutes a slaveholding church?

A. When a part of its members, however small that number may be; hold slaves, and its constitution and rules allow them to do so.

There being anti-slavery men in a church, no more constitutes it a free and anti-slavery church, than there being anti-slavery men in a state constitute it a free anti-slavery state.

Those churches sustain slavery by the very act of admitting slaveholders into their communion; as by that act they endorse the sin of slavery. Suppose a church should admit drunkards into its communion, would not that church endorse the sin of drunkenness? and would not temperance men say that such a church was the bulwark of intemperance?

Slaveholding churches sustain slavery, by refusing to change their rules so as to make non-slaveholding a test of membership when asked to do so.

Notwithstanding the zealous and most indefatigable labors of those who have sympathized with the slave, for these several years past; not one of all those churches have consented to bear testimony against slavery by excluding slaveholders from the communion.

When was it ever known that the churches ever excluded any of their ministers or members who have attempted to justify slavery from the Bible? If a church should refuse to exclude a minister from its communion for advocating gambling from the Bible, would not the church be guilty of sustaining gambling?

To their honor, be it said, there has always been a respectable number of anti-slavery men in those churches. When those men have asked the legislative bodies of those churches for a rule to exclude slaveholders; an attempt at justification for refusing to grant the request has been made by saying, that such a rule would be an *ex post facto* law, and that it would be unjust to adopt a rule to reach back and affect the standing of those slaveholders who have already been admitted into membership.

This kind of argument has been as satisfactory to a great portion of the membership, as if it had just come from heaven with a "thus saith the Lord."

Now if there is any force in this argument, one of two things must take place; either a church must continue to "fellowship the unfruitful works of darkness," and thereby sin against God; or disorganization must take place, and new churches which are anti-slavery, be organized in their stead.

Which horn of this dilemma will the advocates of this famous argument take? If they take the former they continue to commit sin, by disobeying a positive command; if they take the latter they become disorganizers, at least so far as these slaveholding churches are concerned.

If slaveholding churches are the bulwarks of American slavery, what then must be the

amount of guilt of those persons who knowing them to be so, continue to sustain them?

Am I not right in saying that all the souls of human beings, the parting of parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, cruel lacerations with all its bloody murders and all its untold immoralities which it produces, is chargeable to those churches?

M. HARKER.

Felicity, O., Feb. 15, 1846.

REMARKS.—The argument contained in the above, will not easily be confuted.—The principles are of wider application than the writer has given them. Slaveholding churches, as the term is commonly understood, are not the *only* nor the *chief* "bulwarks of American Slavery." Northern Churches with negro pews and pro-slavery voting members—sinning against more light and higher professions, than their "Southern brethren" do, come under the same condemnation.

When a *part* of the members of a church, however small, continue to cast pro-slavery votes, and the church neither admonishes nor reproofs them, it becomes a pro-slavery church, however high sounding may be its professions. If it has no "rules" for doing this, it should find some, as it easily might by taking the Bible for its Constitution and Statute book.

Church Independency and Christian Union.

There are some who would be glad to get rid of Sectarianism, if they knew how, but as to church independency they place no great value upon it, or perhaps would rather prefer to keep up some of their accustomed ecclesiastical organizations, in addition to the more local church. On the other hand, there are zealous sticklers for church independency who would be very loathe to give up their favorite sects, and unite, in church relations with all whom they consider to be true christians.

But, the truth is, church independency and anti-sectarianism must live together, or not live at all. You cannot keep up church independency in connexion with sectarian arrangements, nor can you get rid of sectarianism without disbanding and abjuring all ecclesiastical organizations except the simple local church.

If there could have been any such thing as the preservation of church independency in the presence of sectarianism, it is likely that some of our congregational or baptist churches would have found out the process. But the uniform and absolute failure of these churches to maintain their boasted independency proves that it cannot be done. And if there could have been any such thing as a feasible plan of Christian union in the presence of ecclesiastical organiza-

tions over the local churches, it is probable that some of the earnest friends of Christian union, in those organizations, would have been able, before now, to point out the process.

The moment you organize local churches on the plan of excluding some whom you admit to be christians, you lay a foundation for an ecclesiastical unity and co-operation between all the local churches holding similar views, to the exclusion of churches holding different views. Here then are a number of churches to be brought into harmony of action, to counteract the influence of another plurality of churches, that, in their turn, will feel the necessity of a similar co-operation, that is, if *they*, too, have set up some test, besides christian faith and character, as a condition of church membership. Some organization, beside the local churches, to serve as a bond of exclusive co-operation between them, springs up, ultimately, as a matter of course.—Equally certain is it, that these organizations, constitute them as you may, and call them by what name you please, will in a short time impair, and in process of time overturn, the independency of the local churches.

On the other hand, let there be never so many or never so few local churches intent on maintaining the unity of all christians, and let associations, councils, synods, &c., spring up among them, it will presently be found that christian unity means, as it did in the third and fourth centuries, the subjection of all to one ecclesiastical authority, rather than the intelligent and loving agreement and mutual assistance between christians. A sham unity supersedes and displaces the real one: nothing but stern authority and forced submission prevents schism. Here you have the *spirit* of sectarianism, and the *form* will appear, whenever hierarchal restraints are inadequate, or whenever powerful ecclesiastics fall into contention.

Theology of the Bible.

The grand text book of Christianity is the Bible, and one might be warranted to infer that, with theological students, the Bible would be the principal text book for study. But is this so? A pious young man seeks to "enter the ministry." He is told he must go through a course of preparatory study. He spends four years in a college, and three years in the theological seminary, to say nothing of the time spent in preparing for college. Now, how much of this seven years, is spent in a direct study of the Bible? What answer does

the published "Course of Study" exhibit? And what proportion does it bear to the time given to the study of the heathen classics—books filled with obscenity, ferocity, and the praises of heathen gods and goddesses? We do not here ask (though we might ask it) what time does the student for the ministry find for the ordinary reading of the bible, as every-body might read it, at home: but what time does he devote to it, as a study, in connexion with the assistance of his teachers?

Can any one answer these questions?—The Christian community, we think, ought to know. We hear much of the advantages of a "learned ministry." But *how* are our ministers learned? Is it christianity or heathenism that they are taught at the colleges and seminaries? Or, if both, in what proportion are the two mingled?—At the mint where our gold and silver currency is coined, they can tell us how many "carats fine" the composition contains, and how many of alloy. Ought not our theological minds to advertise us (perhaps they do) of the comparative purity of their issues? There is a suspicion, in some quarters, that the proportion of Christianity, in the comparison with heathenism might be advantageously increased!

A Whole Gospel.

The fragmentary policy of reformation is decidedly anti-evangelical, in its philosophy, and in its tendency. Efforts at mere fragmentary reformation take for granted that the difficulty is only incidental and not seminal; whereas the evangelical philosophy assumes that each specific vice is only a particular form or manifestation of general disease; that the *man* must be renovated, before he can be armed against any one particular species of temptation. All mere fragmentary reformations strike only at some one of what the evangelical philosophy treats as branches, without laying the axe, as that philosophy teaches us to do, at the root of the tree.

Let a reformer's attention all be absorbed with any one particular form of moral evil, and the result will very probably be that he will come to think little or nothing of the general disease while he is prescribing for the symptoms. In this way it is, that so many modern reformers, instead of learning a sound Christian theology, as they should do, from their reformatory efforts, are driven by their fragmentary policy, and *half* idea tactics, in an opposite direction.

The mischief is—not that specific evils are pointed out, and particular sins reprov-

ed. There is no need of forgetting that *all* sins are in essence, the same, and that *all* must be removed.

Veneration—Its uses and perversions.

A blind and ignorant veneration genders superstition. The want of veneration begets irreverence and unbelief.

To venerate nothing is quite as unphilosophical as to venerate every thing. He who determines to venerate nothing, will be likely to venerate something that ought not to be venerated. Man, as a being of limited capacities and yet capable of perceiving objects and beings above him, and beyond his comprehension, is a being formed for veneration, and is almost under a necessity of venerating something.

Veneration is connected with a sense of the vast—the illimitable—the sublime—the adorable. To be without veneration would be equivalent to a destitution of a sense of the sublime. And this would betoken the lack of the higher apprehensions and aspirations of human nature. Elevation of thought, of purpose, and of character, are closely connected with veneration, because they are also connected with a sense of the sublime.

The man whose religion introduces him to nothing mysterious, incomprehensible, vast—infinite—adorable—is removed but a step from the low level of sensuality, and might almost as well be without any religion at all.

A generation perverted by a misdirected veneration is likely to be followed by a generation by whom veneration is displaced. The want of all reverence, on the other hand, confirms many who are shocked at it, in a still closer alliance with their superstitions.

A well directed veneration does not check, but only guides and chastens free inquiry. And the true spirit of philosophical investigation, so far from displacing the sentiments of veneration, withdraws it from shams and falsehoods, only that it may be fastened upon sublime realities and profound truths.

He who knows most of God, and of spiritual and moral excellence, will see most to venerate, to adore. Brutes do not venerate, because they have no knowledge of the venerable, no sense of the sublime, no apprehensions of the infinite, no conception of the incomprehensibility of the objects they perceive.

Of brutalized men, the *least* brutal are those whose perverted veneration takes the form of superstition. The *most* brutal are those who have lost the sense of the sublime, the incomprehensible, altogether, and who venerate nothing at all.

Another Witness from Massachusetts.

A congregational minister of Massachusetts writes us as follows:—

"By the way, my brother, I could write you a long article on 'Spiritual Despotism' from my own experience. I have been called, in the providence of God, to pass through the furnace, heated as hot as it could be, for my destruction. That is to say, my brethren in the ministry, (not to say persecutors,) together with the churches under their control, have gone as far as their power has enabled them to go, to put me under the ban of ecclesiastical condemnation and exclusion. The Lord in mercy forgive them. The principles assumed and acted upon, and attempted to be carried out, were, in my view, the very essence of spiritual despotism, the seed and beginning of the rankest popery; and arbitrary domination over conscience, and convictions of duty. I have fearfully felt the exercise of this unholy power, and wept over it, not so much for my own trials and pressing burdens, as at the thought that such a spirit actually existed among the professed followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. There is—depend upon it—a terrible germ, (if nothing more,) of bitter despotism in the church, which is ready to be acted out, whenever an individual has the decision and boldness (hardihood, some might call it) to follow out his own convictions of duty, should those convictions lead him, in any manner, to depart from the usages or go against the wishes and councils of the Great Ecclesiastical Brotherhood. It is nothing to the purpose that those usages and councils have no scriptural authority. The delinquent must pocket his conscience, stifle his convictions, and bow in due submission to church or ministerial decisions, or be branded as an offender for whom there is no forgiveness, but certain condemnation. I know these things from what I have actually suffered. But God has graciously upheld me and delivered me (and this, too, without a surrender of conscience and a sense of duty,) so that I am still in the ministry, and permitted to labor for the salvation of souls. O may I be faithful unto death! I am happy also to say that God has given me grace to watch my heart and keep it from all unkind and revengeful feelings towards those who have sought my overthrow and utter ruin, as a minister of Christ. My prayer is and has been, that God would show, both to them and to me his abundant mercy, and bring us unto his pure and heavenly kingdom at the last, where all divisions and all despoticisms shall cease forever, and holy love fill every bosom.

I ought to say that I do not, in all respects, agree in your positions as to external church organizations, &c., &c., but I think you are engaged in a good work, and it is my prayer that you and all God's people may be led into all truth.

Yours, in the cause of human freedom and salvation.

When you see a shrewd man disposed to laugh at scrupulous simple hearted honesty,

and in the habit of rallying or bantering others for their rigid fidelity to principle, you have a right to suspect that he will not be very likely to hazard the risk of becoming very ridiculous or odious *himself*, by the commission of any excesses in those directions.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR,
APRIL, 1848.

Our Pecuniary Affairs.

We do not like to say much about ourselves, and especially about our pecuniary affairs, but it becomes necessary that our friends should be disabused of some erroneous impressions that have been made, in some way. The intimation has even crept into print, and from a quarter least expected, that we are very amply provided for and our bread "made sure," inasmuch we "feel" our "outs" and like Jeshurun are waxing fat, and getting a little too Napoleon like, in consequence of it. The good brother who publishes this, of us, must have heard some of the foolish gossip that amused us, a year or two ago, and that we did not suppose was worth noticing. Some have imagined that we were getting so rich with the "Investigator" that it would be wicked to pay us any thing for preaching and lecturing. Others have it that we are so extravagantly paid for preaching and lecturing, that it is no matter whether they pay any thing for the "Investigator" or no.

Be it known then, that since our residence in this place (Honeoye) nearly five years, it has taken all we have received from all sources, (and with pretty close economy, too,) to keep ourselves comfortable, and out of debt. We have no complaint to make. We have managed to get along. The little church we are laboring with, here, have done as much as they promised, for us, and more, too—have done all we could reasonably expect of them, considering what they are doing for other important objects, at home and abroad, and considering the limited amount of labor we have been able to perform here. We have had more 'irons in the fire'—political and ecclesiastical, than falls to the share of most ministers. No one department of labor has supported us. We have lived by all of them combined.—We could not have furnished our readers with the "Investigator" had it not been for the support we have received from the Church in Honeoye. On the other hand, we could not have preached to the Church in Honeoye with the support they have given us, without making out the the balance of our support from the "Investiga-

tor," or in some other way. Nor would both together have sufficed for us, some years, without some crumbs we have picked up from other occasional jobs, such as writing a pamphlet on the Constitution, &c.—If by three or four avocations, such as pastor, editor, lecturer, and author, we can manage to get a living, we are content. We only regret that we cannot devote to any one branch of our labor the attention it needs, and we should be glad to have our friends understand the facts, and not infer that we receive as many incomes as we have avocations. We have no very regularly adjusted compensation for any of our labor. Our friends in Honeoye furnish us with rent, fuel, provisions, cash, donations, &c. &c., amounting, by our estimate, on an average, to about \$300 per annum, perhaps a little over, sometimes. The "Investigator," after paying the printer, paper maker, &c., has sometimes yielded us \$150 or \$200 per annum, but latterly, since people begin to find out the cost of adhering to their principles, it falls off to \$50 or \$60. This deficiency, for a year or two, was partly made up by receipts, (in all about \$135,) for writing the view of the American Constitution. But that is bringing us in nothing, now.

At one time, we received occasional presents for attending Conventions, but our doctrine of opposing all sorts of sin, of caring for the white victims of oppression as well as the colored ones, and especially of striking a blow at the various aristocracies wielded by the slave power and sustaining it, has so sadly frightened many of our old friends that they do not care to see us very often. For a large portion of our labor, such as writing for other periodicals besides our own, we receive no compensation at all. Of those at Honeoye who first invited us here and chiefly sustain us, it is proper to say that they have had this general service in view, quite as much as our labors in this particular location.

Though our family is not large, and we try to study economy, and keep no hired help in the house except in time of sickness, or on some special occasion, there are some items not incident to all families, that must be added to our estimates. Our travelling expenses have been very considerable, and even our postage bill, though at the present reduced prices, would go far towards furnishing our table. These are among the unavoidable expenses incident to our position and former as well as present labors. On a retrospect of the last five years, and making the best comparative estimate we can, of our present funds, items of property of all kinds, fixtures, furniture

&c., with those of five years ago allowing for wear and tear, we conclude that, with all we have received of payments for services, donations, presents, and perquisites of all sorts, we should stand minus about one or two hundred dollars, but for the providential receipt of some few crumbs, from our little patrimony, long delayed, and which we have recently received. In other words, our labors have not quite sufficed to replenish our stores, for the last five years, but it comes so very near it that we are more than content. We thank God and our good friends for the privilege we have had, of standing at our post, and doing what we could, and we cannot but notice, especially, the kind Providence that has unexpectedly eked out to us the little balance we needed to keep our account square, just at the right time, as, for the last year, our labors of all sorts, have brought us in only about \$350. As to the future, our only concern is to know what God would have us to do. If support fails, in our present sort of labor, we shall know that our mission is to be varied. Whether to continue publishing the Christian Investigator has been a question, for some time. Its pecuniary receipts do not make it an object, but we hope it has done some good by attempting the cultivation of a new field of christian reformation. To our own apprehension there is a great work yet to be done, in that same direction.

But our friends must say whether or no our services are needed. We have very frankly stated all these particulars that our friends may not be misled into any wrong impressions by whimsical conjectures and flying rumors.

The Ministry Reproved by Daniel Webster.

We are not the eulogists, nor the admirers of Daniel Webster. Alas! for the nation so low sunk in morals as to honor and elevate such men! Alas! for the churches whose members and whose ministry are so corrupt as to fall in with the political parties that, without a blush, can seek the election of such men to stations of power. But alas! alas! when even such men as Daniel Webster are ahead of the ministry in their perceptions and declarations of moral truth! Mr. Webster would not now repeat the stern truths he was wont to utter in his better days. A pliant ministry and a worldly church must be responsible for dragging down into the ditch where they themselves wallow, the strong intellects, that their influence should have helped to sanctify. But hear what Daniel Webster could once say, of just such ministers as now, for the most part, occupy the high places of the American churches, northern as well as southern.

"It may be remembered, that some years ago, at the celebration of the landing of the Pilgrims, Mr. Webster was the orator; and having applied to the slave-trade, the keen edge of his eloquence, he gave a tone at the Pulpit, saying:—*'If the Pulpit be silent whenever, or wherever, there may be within the hearing of its voice a vinner, bloody with the guilt of Slavery, the Pulpit is false to its trust.'*"

Daniel Webster has since stained his soul with the "guilt of slavery;" but where is the pulpit, within the circles of society he moves in, that dares reprove him for his "guilt?" The testimony of Webster is on record that such pulpits are false to their trust! The record will be read in a coming day, and such ministers shall find him a swift witness against them!

Our Post Office Address.—We must again request our correspondents and exchange editors to direct their favors to Honeoye, Ontario County, (N. Y.) When the County is omitted, the letter or paper is liable to be carried to Honeoye Falls, Monroe County—altogether another place.

Back Numbers.—We frequently receive applications for back numbers, and sometimes for complete files. For the information of our friends we will make a few statements which may save some letter postage.

1. We cannot furnish complete files of our paper, from the beginning.

2. We can, (for the present,) furnish incomplete files, as follows, viz:

For 1843, being Vol. I., New Series, we can furnish all but the First number. We can add to this the Feb. No. for 1844, which makes all the 'Lectures on Church Reform' except the first number, and the lack of this is nearly supplied by the extra No. for Dec. 30, 1843, which goes in this set, making 12 numbers in all.

For 1844, Vol. II., N. S., we can furnish all but the January number. This volume contains, as now furnished, the whole of our correspondence with Gerrit Smith and D. Plumb, on Church organization. Also, some notices of the Am. Board, and of the Am. Tract Society, also of the controversy between Drs. Potts and Wainwright.—Green's 'Iniquity and a meeting.'

For 1845, Vol. III., N. S., we can furnish all the numbers complete. These 12 numbers contain, among other things, "Politics under the law of God," a Review of Dr. Bushnell—Christian Character of Statesmen—Proceedings of the Second Syracuse Convention—N. Haven Theology—Salvation by Christ alone—Review, in several numbers of the Biblical Repository, on Church fellowship with slave holders.—Present state of Churches and Ministry.—First number [in Dec. No.] on Organic Sins"—&c.

For 1846, Vol. IV. N. S.—All the numbers complete, (a very few sets.) All except the March number, a good supply.—This volume contains the remainder of our

review of the doctrine of "Organic Sin" as held by leading members of the American Board—Mode of conducting Christian Missions—Sermons on the death of Torrey; and on Christ's prohibition of kingly power—Our Theological Seminaries—Life taking and Chattelizing—Spiritual Despotism, Nos. 1 and 2, for Nov. and Dec.

For 1847, Vol. V., N. S.—All the numbers complete. These contain a Continuation of the numbers on Spiritual Despotism, &c., being historical sketches, and illustrating likewise the history of Church Independency; of Secessions from corrupt Churches; Christian Union, &c.

For 1848, Vol. VI., N. S.—All the Nos. as far as now issued. The Feb. number completes the historical sketches of "Spiritual Despotism," &c. &c.

3. Besides these files, we have spare copies of many of the numbers, which may be had separately, among which are the number for Dec. 30, 1843, containing proceedings and address of the first Syracuse Church Convention. Feb., 1845, containing proceedings and propositions adopted by the second Syracuse Church Convention. March, 1845, Salvation by Christ, alone, &c. &c.

4. Of the Old Series, previous to 1813 only eight numbers were issued, of which we have now only the following, viz: No. 2, on Reformation of morals and revivals of religion. No. 4, "The test question" stated &c. on grounds of secession from pro-slavery Churches. No. 7, Dangers of which Christian Abolitionists should beware.

Terms.—For the purpose of circulating these back numbers, [previous to this present year] we offer them at half price, i. e., twenty-five cents for every 12 copies.

Two gentlemen were debating the claims of the philosophy of utility, when one of them illustrated his meaning by saying that if two men were together in a boat and one of them must drown that the other might escape, it would be right for the one whose life was most valuable to push off the other for self preservation. "I shall be careful not to be caught in a boat with you," said the other, and the debate terminated.

No reformation can go forward without constant progress on the part of reformers. They must always stand ready to apply their fundamental principles in new directions, as new events, and new forms of moral evil shall require. To fail of doing this, by attempting to occupy only their first ground, just as they did before the newer form of evil manifested itself, is, in fact, to go backward, and give up all the ground that had been occupied.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR. April, 1848.

G. Trayer, Hemlock Lake,	\$1 00
E. S. Bailey, Brookfield,	2 00
L. Allen, Jr., Richmond,	75
L. Gurnee, Ovid,	1 00
G. P. Reid, Richmond,	75
A. G. Noble, Delhi, (Iowa.)	1 00
M. A. Garrison, Owego,	1 00
Total,	87 00

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES: VOL. VI--No. 5.
WHOLE NUMBER. 75.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., MAY, 1848.

WILLIAM GOODELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."--DANIEL, ix, 23.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

Sermons for the Times.

SERMON III.

Christian Progress.

"Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended; but one thing I do: forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."—Phil. iii. 13, 14.

Paul admits, in the text and context, that he had not yet reached the mark he was aiming at, and which it was necessary for him to attain. But, of one thing he was confident. He was neither standing still nor going backward. He was making progress toward the mark and the high prize set before him. *This one thing he is doing.* This one thing all true Christians are doing. "The path of the just is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

The text sets before us the following sentiments:

Christians are making progress; and progress involves change.

They are not stationary. They are not standing. They are going forward. They are not now, where they were yesterday: and they will not be, to-morrow, where they are to-day.

Let us consider what is implied in this saying, wherein Christians are making progress, and how this progress involves change.

1.—What Christian progress implies.

1. It is implied that there is room for farther progress; that there are advance positions to be taken. No Christian, at the commencement of his christian race has reached the end—no—nor yet the middle of it. And at the middle, he has not reached the points of attainment yet before him.

2. It is implied that Christians are sensible of their present comparatively low attainments, that they feel the duty and the necessity of making still further progress.

3. That they ardently desire, and resolutely determine, and vigorously exert

themselves to make progress. Without such desire, resolution, and exertion, no progress in the divine life can be made.

4. That they have rational ground to expect, that, with the divine aid, and in connexion with their own perseverance and fidelity, they shall be enabled to make the desired progress, and attain the end they have in view. "Every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure."

1st.—Wherein Christians are making progress.

1. The Christian is making progress in Christian experience. The term "Christian experience" is often used, specially, and sometimes exclusively, to designate the exercises of his mind and the state of his heart, while under conviction for sin, at the time of his conversion, and when he is just beginning to enter upon the Christian course. But this is only the *beginning* of the Christian's experience. He is adding to his Christian experience, every day, as long as he lives, as long as he exists or has any being. All his religious meditations, all his godly resolutions, all his holy affections, all his investigations and labors, all his hopes and his fears, his joys and his sorrows, his conflicts and his victories, his temptations and his deliverances, his falls and his recoveries, his declensions and his revivings, his prayers and his praises, his doubts and his discoveries, his afflictions and his consolations, his cares and his comforts, his trials and his triumphs, during his whole course, and at the close of it, are only so many parts of the Christian's experience.

Whatever the Christian does, or attempts doing, in the service of God and of mankind, adds to the stock of his Christian experience. In all that he does or attempts doing for God or man, or for the benefit of his own soul, he is going through a course of Christian experiments. He is testing the value of his Christian principles, just as the experimental philosopher tests the truths of philosophy by applying them to the objects and the purposes to which they are adapted. And it is by this course of experimental Christian endeavor that Christian experience is to be perfected and defined.

By all this experience, the Christian is learning more and more—he is enduring

more, he is doing more and more—he is becoming more and more what his divine Master requires and designs him to be.—He is making progress.

2. The Christian is making progress in knowledge.

He is learning more of himself. At first the Christian knows little of himself. He has learned something of his own heart, though comparatively little. "He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool." This, the inexperienced Christian is more or less prone to do. He is apt to trust in his own resolutions, his own strength, his own goodness. But as he learns more of himself, he learns more of his own weakness, and of his constant dependence on the divine aid.

The Christian is making progress in an acquaintance with the devices of the enemy. At first, he is comparatively ignorant of those devices. He little dreams of the snares which Satan has set, all around him, to seduce him again into sin. But as he makes progress in christian experience, he becomes better acquainted with these devices, and is better prepared to guard against them in future.

The christian is making progress in his knowledge of the Bible. The word of God is his constant directory and study.—He consults it, at every step, to know what he shall do. To the law and to the testimony he brings every contested question of religion and morals. To the lively oracles he looks for decisions, daily. Thus constantly making use of it for instruction and guidance, for reproof and for consolation, for the moulding of his principles and the shaping of his measures, he cannot fail to become more and more intimately acquainted with its precious contents.

And consequently, the Christian is making progress in his knowledge of divine truth. His views, at first, are comparatively vague and limited. He sees men as trees, walking. A few first principles of religion he cannot fail to understand, in some measure, yet not as clearly as when he shall have afterwards applied them to a thousand problems of practical importance, and found them, in every instance, to throw light all around him. The profounder depths of divine wisdom, he had, at first, hardly begun to explore. But as he makes progress in Christian experience, as he learns more of his own heart, and of the

devices of Satan, as he reflects more, and prays more, and studies more the truths of the Bible, his views of its sublime doctrines become more exact and comprehensive.—He sees their mutual connexions, correspondences, and relations as he did not once see them. He traces their bearing on Christian practice, as he did not once trace them. He sees the character and designs of God, the character and destiny of man, the distinction between holiness and sin, the parity, extent, and claims of the divine law, the grace and mercy of the gospel, and the final consummation to which the plan of redemption is tending, in constantly brightening colors, and ever new and still more interesting aspects. He experiences, in his own case, the faithfulness of the Savior's promise, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." And the longer he labors in the divine service, the more clearly and fully are the doctrines of the gospel revealed to him. The more he knows, the more he perceives yet before him to be learned, and the more eagerly does he pant for the knowledge yet in reserve for him. All he has yet learned becomes little in his eyes, in the comparison. "Forgetting the things which are behind, he reaches forth unto the things which are before."

The Christian is making progress in the knowledge of God, his Creator and Father; of Jesus Christ, his Mediator and Redeemer; of the Holy Spirit his Sanctifier, his Comforter, and his Teacher. As he walks with God daily, he is making daily advances in his acquaintance with him. As he leans constantly on Christ, his wisdom, his righteousness, his sanctification, his redemption, he cannot help becoming more and more intimately acquainted with Christ, the friend that sticketh closer than a brother. As his spirit holds a daily communion with the Spirit of all grace and consolation, he necessarily becomes more familiarized with his refreshings and his teachings. The Providence of God, which constantly leads and protects him, and which he sees at work, every day, all around him; in connexion with his constantly increasing knowledge of Christian doctrine, of which that Providence is at once the exponent and the evidence, is constantly teaching the Christian more and more of God, of the sublimity of his nature, of the glory of his character, of the comprehensiveness of his purposes, of the wisdom of his plans, of the extent of his dominion, of the efficacy of his power, of the accomplishment of his aims.

The Christian is thus making progress in

knowledge just as certainly as he is running the Christian race, and making any progress at all towards heaven. To suppose otherwise would be to imagine an absurdity, a contradiction in terms. As the man of the world cannot possibly live and move in the world without learning more of the things of the world, so the man of God cannot possibly live the life of faith without the activity which that life implies, and without the increasing knowledge of the things of God which a godly life, of necessity, carries along with it, and implies.

3. The Christian is making progress in holiness. As there is no trust-worthy knowledge of Christian doctrine without a life of holy obedience, it is certain that real and substantial progress in divine knowledge always implies progress in holiness.—The one cannot be separated from the other. They exert mutual and reflex influences upon each other. An increase of the one, in the Christian, implies or secures the increase of the other. The more the Christian learns of God and divine truth, the more he will love them and become conformed to them, in heart and life, which is the same thing as increasing in holiness.—On the other hand, the more the Christian loves God and divine truth, and the more he walks in conformity with them, the more he will desire to learn, and consequently will learn of them.

It is only in the light of Christian principles that Christian holiness and Christian obedience are ascertained and defined.—And it is only in the exercise of holy love and in the filial discharge of the duties growing out of our heaven-appointed relations, and the immutable nature of things, that the glory and beauty of those sublime doctrines by which moral objects are described and human relations revealed, are healthfully and clearly perceived. For the holy love of God and of duty constitutes that single eye which causes the whole body to be full of light. And "he that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him."

As the Christian learns more of himself he learns to be more humble. As he learns more of his dependence he learns to lean more and more on the omnipotent arm. As he learns more of the subtleties of the Tempter, he learns to be more watchful and vigilant in avoiding them.—As he learns more of the Bible and its doctrines, he becomes more conformed to its spirit and teachings. As he learns more of the nature, the beauty, and the sweetness of true holiness, he longs more and more after higher and still higher attainments in

holiness. And what he seeks after, he finds. As he learns more and more of the hatefulnecks of sin, he learns more and more to shun and avoid it. As he learns more of God, of Christ, of the Holy Comforter, and of heavenly and divine things, he holds closer communion with them, and becomes more and more assimilated to them. In proportion as he "learns righteousness" he "hungers and thirsts after righteousness," he is "filled" with righteousness—he becomes righteous.

As the Christian prays for increasing light and love, for larger measures of wisdom and knowledge, of holiness and conformity to God, and as he uses the divinely appointed means of their attainment; wrestling, struggling, running, fighting, agonizing, to reach the object he has in view, the prize he is panting after, so, of course, he is making advances towards the glorious goal of his destiny. He is becoming more god-like, more stable, more constant in the exercise of holy affections. He is less frequently turned aside—less easily overcome by temptation. With each increase of divine knowledge his soul expands and becomes more capacious. With each expansion he still loves God with all his heart and soul, and mind and strength, and consequently his holy love is increased. Each increase of holy love, in its turn, lets in a new flood of divine light, with which, again, his capacities expand. And thus he rises towards the heights of the Mount Zion he loves.

At every step as the Christian makes progress in divine knowledge, he makes progress likewise in holiness. He grows in grace and in the knowledge of his Lord and Savior. There is, indeed, a superficial knowledge that puffeth up. But such is not the experimental knowledge of the true Christian.

4. The Christian is making progress in holy activity, in benevolent self denial, patient labor, in Christian enterprise, in solid usefulness.

This results, of necessity, from his progress in knowledge and holiness, in the love of God and of mankind. These, rather, are the exemplifications, the manifestations of that progress. For "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous."

To love God is to serve God. To love man is to do good to man. Holiness is another name for benevolence, or love: for "love is the fulfilling of the law." Love is the essence of the gospel; the atmosphere of the glory, and the blessedness of heaven.

To increase in holiness is to increase in love, in practical, matter-of-fact goodness, benevolence, justice, equity, mercy, towards men; and in obedience, fidelity, humility, submission, veneration, towards God.

As the Christian learns more of God and of man—and as he loves God and man, more and more, he becomes more and more interested for the glory of God and the well being of man: he becomes more and more engaged in the service of God, and mankind.

As he learns more of Christian doctrine and duty, he sees more and more to be done, and feels the increasing weight of the reasons and motives which urge him forward to do what needs to be done. The more he learns of Christian truth and duty, of the commandments of God, of the principles and aims which mould and shape all divine institutions, and all divinely appointed relations, the more, of course, he discovers prevailing departures from the spirit of these institutions, the demands of those relations, and of the guilt and misery involved in those departures. He learns more of the necessity of numerous enterprises of reformation and of philanthropy, of efforts for reformation, in the Church, in the State, in the community to which he belongs, and throughout the world. He sees more clearly and feels more deeply, the moral darkness and corruption of a world lying in wickedness, the wants and the woes of a sick and bleeding humanity, the guilt, the wretchedness, and the danger of lost souls, of the heathen abroad, of the thoughtless and impenitent under the light of the gospel at home, of false professors in Zion, of dumb dogs that cannot bark, though standing as watchmen upon the walls. He sees more and more and feels more and more the degradation of his race, the brutality of the sensual, the oppression of the wronged, the cruelty of the oppressor, the sorrows of the oppressed. He sees the abomination of desolation, standing where it ought not—the altar under the altar, and the cup of God's anger in preparation for the Babylon that is to be destroyed.

And in all this, the Christian sees, more and more, of the work for God and for humanity, that needs to be done, and he feels more and more the weight of obligation resting on him to do with his might what his hands find to do, in this vast field of his work.

The more progress the Christian makes in practical experience, in wisdom, in knowledge, in holiness, in conformity to God, the more enterprising, and active, and

self denying, and uncompromising does he become, in every enterprise of philanthropy and Christian reformation, in every evangelizing and missionary endeavor—in suitable measures for calling sinners to repentance, for instructing and comforting Christians, for restoring and sustaining the holy order of Christ's house, and for bringing the kingdoms of this world under the dominion of the Prince of Peace.

The more he becomes acquainted with the extent of the divine requirements, the fraternity of the Christian virtues, the confederacy between all the powers of darkness, the unity and comprehensiveness of the divine aims, the universal applicability of the first principles which, in the beginning of his labors he had learned to apply in only a few obvious directions; the more in the progress of his labors he finds occasion and necessity for the wider and still wider application of these same principles, the more will the Christian, in the very act of making progress, come into sympathy and co-operation with the comprehensiveness and unity of the divine aims. His plans and his enterprises will be enlarged. He will raise higher and still higher, in the name of his Master, his divine claims. He will find his work to be no fragmentary work. He will wage an uncompromising warfare with all sin, nor dream of propitiating, by his neutrality, the ire of one soul fiend, in order that he may, with the less sacrifice or to the better advantage, attempt the subjugation of another! Casting his self, for strength and protection, on the divine arm, he will do manly combat, every where, and in all his activities and relations, for God and for the Right!—There can be no persevering Christian progress, short of this. For he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all, and in yielding to the enemy, any where, there is a virtual yielding to him every where.—Without such progress, the Christian must give over his warfare, and turn backward.

The more self denying, extensive, and successful his labors, the more will the Christian discover remaining still to be done. The completion of any one Christian, reformatory, and benevolent enterprise, however it may be described, will be found to involve and require for such completion, the espousal of every kindred Christian enterprise. One reformatory, benevolent, or evangelizing enterprise, whether completed or in progress, is only the Christian laborer's stepping stone to another, and yet another, and never will he be content to cease his reformatory labor, while life lasts, unless he can see every sin

overthrown, and the whole earth filled with the knowledge, the love, and the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea.

5. The Christian is making progress in holy submission, in unshaken confidence, in joyful hope.

The more he learns of the divine dealings, the divine Providence presiding over human affairs, the more he learns to confide implicitly in God, and submit cheerfully to whatever is appointed for him. He has learned that all things shall work together for good to those who love God.—He knows that the wrath of man shall praise him and the remainder he will restrain. He knows that his labor shall not be in vain in the Lord. His own practical experiments are teaching him more and more of all this, daily. His increasing familiarity with the divine promises, the divine purposes, the divine plans, the divine methods of operation, the great principles upon which God governs the world, all join to impress more strongly and deeply upon his heart, this consolatory lesson. And here, his soul rests, and finds shelter, in the midst of his labors, while the darts of the adversary are flying like hail stones at his head, and the floods of ungodliness are foaming and dashing all around him. He knows the ultimate purposes of God shall be accomplished, and in his certain triumph he is conscious of finding his own.—Christ's conquest is his conquest, and because his Great Captain lives, he shall live also.

And, in making progress, the Christian exults in the prospect of making future progress—

"While life, and thought and being lasts,
"Or immortality endures."

The higher attainments he makes in personal holiness, the higher and still higher, and heavenward, does he discover the summits of desirable attainment above him, delighting his eye, and soliciting his footsteps. The more enlarged and comprehensive his views of divine truth, the broader and more expansive appears the ocean of unexplored truth before him.—The more he learns of God, of his works, of his word, of his operations, of his providences, of his designs, the more is his soul drawn out after a still further knowledge of them, and the more deeply is he impressed with the conviction that—to use the words of another—he has but just begun to discover, as it were, a few pebbles upon the shore of the boundless immensity and eternity in prospect, and stretching beyond the reach of his conceptions. The more he loves, and admires and adores the

divine majesty and goodness, thus revealed to him, the more does he love to humble himself in the divine presence, and sink into comparative nothingness, that God may be all in all.

Thus does the very idea of the Christian life involve, of necessity, the idea of progress. The Christian cannot manifest life without activity, and all Christian activity secures or includes progress.

III.—Let us consider wherein the Christian's progress involves change. "Forgetting the things that are behind."

It can hardly seem necessary to adduce arguments in proof of the sentiment that Christian progress, such as has now been described involves change. Yet some illustrations may be useful, because many who hold and teach, in their way, the necessity of growing in grace, seem greatly alarmed and horrified at the suggestion that Christians or Christian communities are ever under any necessity or obligation to change their views, their position, or their course of activity. Christian stability, they seem to imagine, forbids all change. They dread any innovation upon the settled order of things, and will not stop to inquire into the evidences of its propriety.—To them, it is enough to know of any proposed enterprise or sentiment, that it is, to them, new, and requires them to change: they reject it, of course, as promptly and as resolutely as they would reject a proposal to abjure their religion!

There is, indeed, the change of instability and fickleness—the change of those who are carried about with every wind of doctrine, ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Such changeableness arises from the want of fixed and trust-worthy principles of investigation or action, or from an unwillingness to follow first principles, steadily, wherever they may lead. Such is *not* the change involved in true Christian progress, but is diametrically opposed to it. The change we advocate is a change growing out of a firm adherence to fundamental first principles in religion and morals, and the prompt and grateful yielding up of the soul to their guidance; it is involved in following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, through evil as well as good report, and in the discharge of new duties as well as old, whenever the providence of God shall determine, or indicate.

There is no progress without change—no growth without decay. In the growth of vegetables and animals this well known law obtains. Just so in mental develop-

ment—in moral and spiritual expansion and progress.

As we reach forward, and seize upon the things that are before, we lose our hold upon the things that are behind us. We may be said, as it were, to forget them, as the traveler, hastening towards the end of his journey, forgets the earlier part of the highway over which he has travelled, and the scenery which then engaged his attention.

Intellectual growth involves change.—As we acquire new knowledge, we part with our former ignorance and errors.* As we become better acquainted with any subject, our views of it undergo a change.—The objects do not change, but our perceptions of them change. If's change. And hence the skillful and progressive student and teacher of divine truth, is always "bringing out of his treasure things new and old." Like a wise master builder, having laid his foundation, he leaves it there, and goes on to perfect his edifice, not spending his whole time in laying the foundation over again! [See Heb. vi. 1.]

Moral and spiritual growth or progress involves change—a separation, as it were, from our former selves. We must "put off the old man, and put on the new." We cannot grow in grace without putting away our moral imperfections. Those who "go from strength to strength" are "changed from glory to glory."

Activity, effort, enterprise, in the service of God and of man, take for granted the desirableness, the necessity, of changes.—A change is sought by all who desire to produce effects, or who make any exertions.

And in all successful exertion, a change is produced.

It is only by producing successive changes that God himself, who changes not, produces effects, and carries on his benevolent designs, working all things after the counsel of his own will, and saying—"Behold! I create all things new."

Christian progress is constantly bringing the Christian to new stand-points, from whence he sees spiritual objects in new points of view, finds them to exhibit new phases, and unfold new beauties and glories. This constant, unceasing progression, will continue to introduce changes; not only through time, but through eternity.

John heard the four and twenty elders, as they fell down before the Lamb, singing a new song of thanksgiving and worship.—And, without any question, the spirits of the just made perfect, Paul and John, Isaiah and Daniel, Moses and Elias, Abraham and Enoch, yea, Gabriel himself, will fore-

or find new songs to sing, new glories to celebrate, new discoveries to promulgate, new wonders to admire, new heights to ascend, new depths to explore.

The Christian's progress is constantly bringing him into new relations, and introducing him to the new duties growing out of those new relations. And thus his activities, along with his intellectual and moral endowments, are constantly undergoing change. The child becomes a parent, the pupil becomes a teacher, the citizen becomes a magistrate, the babe in Christ becomes a patriarch—the faithful in a few things becomes a ruler over many things, and enters into the joy of his Lord. In this, there is change.

The varied stations of the Christian—the changing seasons—the opening Providences of God, are constantly changing the form of his activities. Now he is sowing his seed. Anon, he is bestowing upon his crops the necessary attention and culture. It is not enough to plant—he must wait. In due season he shall reap, if he faint not. The Christian's labor is not the monotonous round of superstitious or formal observances. He is engaged in refreshing and invigorating exercise of rational, a progressive, a varied, a productive labor. In this spontaneous and varied exercise, all his varied powers and faculties shall find room and opportunity to expand. He shall find new and cheerful employments enough, in the delightful charge of his ever varying duties, without being driven by the languor, the listlessness, the ennui of idleness, or of idle toil, to the artificial and feverish duties which the world calls amusement! There are no "nine pin alleys" nor "horse races" in paradise, nor on the track of those and narrow way that leads thither. The varied and ever changing, yet well connected employments, the soul-refreshing duties, and heavenly consolations, and glorious prospects, of the Christian, in his onward and upward progress, furnish him with abundant and ennobling substitutes for these.

The time would fail to show, in how many respects, the Christian's progress involves change. Alas! for the religious by whatever name he may be called, who religion permits him to live without constant changes! Assuredly, he cannot be running the Christian race—nor fighting the good fight of faith—nor making progress toward the Celestial City.

Reflections.

1. Since Christians are making progress we may learn to distinguish between Chris-

tians and many decent, quiet, good natured sort of people, who are sometimes mistaken, and who sometimes mistake themselves for Christians.

If you know such an one, twenty years ago, and still know him, you see him occupying, apparently, about the same position now, that he formerly did. He knows about as much of himself, of besetting temptations—he knows about as much of the Bible and its doctrines, of God, and divine things, of the interests of Christ's kingdom, of the ever opening developments of divine providence, of the exigencies of his species, of the wants and woes of humanity, of the pending contest between truth and error, between holiness and sin, as he did twenty years ago! In the matter of *progress*, the twenty years have been to him a blank! He might as well have been asleep all that time. He has neither grown in knowledge nor in grace—in holiness or good works—in activity or enterprise, in wisdom or in usefulness. The tide of a changed public sentiment may have drifted him away from some of his former errors. He has floated with the stream, but he stems not the current. He has made no progress from the world towards heaven. How then, shall he ever arrive there?

If Christians are making progress, it is manifest that a very large portion of religious professors are not Christians. So far from making any progress in religious knowledge, in holiness, in activity, and Christian usefulness, themselves, the greatest trouble they have, seems to be, that some of their friends exhibit some little degree of progress and of consequent change.

Without distinguishing between the change of instability and the change of Christian progress, they take it for granted that all change whatever, in the Church or its members, is indicative of disorder, disorganization, apostasy, schism! With them, the change involved in Christian progress is innovation—growth in knowledge is heresy—growth in grace is enthusiasm—increasing activity is fanaticism—and Christian usefulness “disturbs the peace of the Churches.” All these notes of alarm are frequently sounded, when all the difficulty is, that a small minority in the church, or religious community, are Christians, and like all other Christians are making some degree of progress, involving consequent change. And this leads me to observe.

2. Since Christians are making progress, it follows that Christian Churches are making progress, likewise: and Churches that

fail to make progress, are not, in reality, Christian Churches, in the full and proper meaning of the term. Christian character does not belong them.

Christian Churches are nothing more nor less than assemblies of Christians. Those who are not Christians may “creep into them, unawares,” but when detected they will be “put away” from them, or the “little leaven leavens the whole lump,” and destroys it.

If the members of a Church are making progress, the Church is making progress, likewise. And when any church fails to make progress, it fails to give evidence of being Christian—just as any individual Church member, or religious professor, who fails of making progress, fails of giving evidence that he is a Christian.

Mr. Robinson, pastor of the pilgrim Church planted at Plymouth, gave his flock a solemn farewell charge to *make progress* in christian knowledge and holiness, and not settle down where he and his predecessors left them. This charge was a scriptural and a reasonable one. Christian communities are under all the same necessities and obligations to make progress that individual Christians are. And the fact of continual Christian progress, is just as essential to the character of a Christian Church, or community, as it is to the character of an individual. In some respects, the obligations of a church to make marked and decisive progress rise higher and extend farther than the obligations resting on a single individual. They have greater facilities, in their social capacity, for making progress, than any mere isolated individual could have. Otherwise the benefits of religious association, or the organizing of churches, might be questioned. The individual lives but few years, and is removed by death. The associated body remains, and may add to its knowledge and usefulness, for successive generations. Every succeeding generation is bound to know more, and to do more than any generation that preceded it. It may stand on the shoulders of the former generation, and see farther, and reach higher, using all the discoveries the fathers had made, correcting their errors, and adding fresh acquisitions of their own, for a legacy to their children. In religion, as in the sciences, light should increase from age to age. New light brings new obligations, and reveals new duties. Those duties must be performed or neglected. If performed, the church makes progress in holiness, beyond the measure of its fathers, of a former age. If it turns its back on known duties, it apostatizes, altho'

the fathers, not seeing these duties, (or perhaps, not having occasion, or opportunity, in their day, to discharge them) did not apostatize in omitting them.

No religious community or church can remain stationary. It must go forward or backward. It must make progress, and must make constant changes in its progress: or else it must apostatize. There is no alternative, besides. This is the process and this the philosophy of church declension and apostasy, in every age in which it is witnessed. This was the alternative set before the Church of Ephesus, the Church of Pergamos, the Church of Thyatira, the Church of Sardis, and the Church of the Laodiceans, in the messages sent to them by John, from the Savior. If they failed to perform the new duties devolving upon them, on the discovery of new corruptions and new errors among their members, if they failed to reform these abuses and correct these errors by prompt and salutary discipline, if they continued to hold fellowship with those who taught the doctrine of Balaam—the doctrine of the Nicolaites—if they suffered Jezebel to teach and seduce the people in their assemblies—Christ would consider and treat them as apostates, he would remove their candlestick out of its place—he would fight against them with the sword of his mouth. And all this because they refused to *make progress* by the faithful application of their professed Christian principles, on all those new occasions, and in all those new directions, which, in the course of human events, demanded those new and specific duties at their hands. Undoubtedly they thought John a “disturber of the peace of the Churches” for “agitating them” with these messages and for pressing such “innovations” upon them.—“The Churches would be torn all to pieces” if such rash measures had been carried!—The result we all understand, in the history of those Churches.

How is it with the Churches of our own times? Are they making progress, or are they attempting to remain stationary, and thus in reality, going backward? Have the Puritan Churches made progress since the farewell address of Mr. Robinson?—Do they stand higher, in holiness, in self-denial, in heroic enterprise, in uncompromising fidelity, in a profound knowledge and heart-felt veneration of sound Christian doctrine? Are they more pure in their morals—more faithful in Church discipline—more separate from the world—more exemplary in their practice? How is it?—When men would exhibit the faith and godliness of the Puritans, do they fix their at-

attention on their successors of the present age, or of those who who lived two hundred and fifty years ago? How does the Methodist Church of the present day compare with that of the times of Wesley?—With the Methodists of fifty or even thirty years ago? To what period of the history of the Baptists must we look for their John Banyan, and their Roger Williams? The Friends—are they decidedly in advance of the standard of Lay and Benezet, and Woolman, and Penn, and Barclay, and Fox? And are the present Churches, of these sects ready to apply their own professed principles for the removal of the abominations that are practiced among them? Do they welcome the light that is offered to them? Are they taking the requisite measures for making progress in divine knowledge, by fostering free inquiry and discussion?

To ask questions like these, is to answer them. We all know that the Churches of the present day, (with few rare local exceptions) are not making progress, nor willing that any progress should be made.

3. Severe as may seem the bearing of our doctrine on religious professors, communities and Churches, that are making no Christian progress, its bearing is gentle and fraternal on all those who, having embraced the fundamentals of Christianity, are earnestly making progress, however weak and feeble may be their present degrees of faith, and however low their Christian attainments may be, in the comparison with those of greater maturity and higher degrees of knowledge.

The Christian is making progress, and Christian Churches also, but among these are the experienced and the inexperienced, the strong and the weak, the educated and the uneducated, the informed and the uninformed. Of course there are diversities of attainment: there are errors in sentiment and corresponding mistakes in non-essential points of practice. But this does not prevent christian fellowship, nor lay a proper foundation for diversities of sects.—Christ intended that the young and the old, the experienced and the inexperienced, the strong and the weak, should co-operate together, in the same churches, for their mutual improvement and benefit. Separation for such causes is schism. And in such separations, all sectarian organizations have their rise. The support of such organizations, is the systematic and perpetuated sin of schism.

The doctrine we have now been insisting on, agrees with and illustrates this statement. The wisest and strongest Christian remembers the time when he was a mere babe in Christ. The doctrine of *Christian progression* teaches him to deal gently with the weak; to take them kindly by the hand, and help to lead them along. Christ loves the weakest lamb of his flock, and the higher the spiritual attainments of the Christian are, the more meekly and kindly will he conduct himself towards the feeblest of his brethren in Christ, the smallest and weakest of whom is daily making progress in the divine life. The doctrine of Christian progress draws a broad line of distinction—even the distinction that separates the righteous from the wicked—between the most erring and ignorant Christian in the world, who, in virtue of his Christian life, is making progress, and the most learned, acute and subtle theologian who resolutely sets his face against Christian progress—who is determined to become no wiser himself nor allow any one under his influence to become wiser; who wearies himself to devise excuses for the neglect of plain but self denying duties, and who labors to keep the churches where they are, lest they should lose the friendship of an ungodly world.

4. The practical application of our doctrine of Christian progress, to each one of us as individuals, is at once obvious and weighty. *Christians* are making progress—a progress that involves constant change—a change identified with preparation for heaven. By this standard of judgement, can we honestly call ourselves Christians? Have we commenced this course of experimental Christian endeavor? Are we making progress in it, daily? The question is not, how far have we travelled, but, are we on the road, and going patiently forward? Are we learning more of ourselves, of besetting temptations, of the truths of the Bible, of God, of duty, of righteousness, of the beauty of holiness, of the deformity of sin? Are we making progress in holiness, in benevolence, in justice, in mercy, in meekness, in patience, in long suffering, in boldness, in gentleness, in humility, in fidelity, in goodness? Are we becoming more active, more enterprising, more self denying, more uniform, more stable, more consistent, more manly, more magnanimous, more comprehensive, more universally obedient? Do we flinch from no needed work of reform, in the Church, in the State, in the community, in the brotherhood of the human family? Are we more and more concerned for the conver-

sion of sinners, the conversion of the world, the introduction of the reign of righteousness, and peace on the earth? Or, if increasingly active and useful, in our public labors, are we equally intent in making progress in the work of reformation and purification at home—in our own lives, in our own hearts? Unless we can answer these questions in the affirmative, how shall we call ourselves Christians?

But if we are not Christians, by the test of this doctrine of Christian progress, what are our prospects then?

False and stupid professors, worldly Churches, and time serving ministers, are not the only description of persons to whom this doctrine of Christian progress should carry a loud note of alarm. If continued progress in the Christian life, be the indispensable condition of salvation, what shall we say to the spiritually dead, who have never fled from the city of destruction, nor entered in at the strait gate, nor set their faces towards Mount Zion? If he only that endureth to the end shall be saved, how certain must be the destruction of those who cannot be persuaded to take even the first step of self renunciation, of penitence, and of holy faith? If nothing but the onward, upward progress of increasing knowledge, fidelity, holiness, self-denial, activity, enterprise, and usefulness, can possibly carry even the regenerated Christian himself to the glories of the upper temple, into what depths of ignominy and perdition must those inevitably be plunged, whose only progress, alas! is in stupidity, selfishness, sensuality, love of the world, enmity against God, and injury to their fellow men? "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

Satanic Devices.

When the grand adversary can no longer prevent the propagation of long neglected and much needed truths, his next resort is to mingle the new truth with as large an alloy as possible, of mischievous error; or, when this cannot be done, to make the propagation of the new truth, the occasion of discarding, disgracing, or throwing into the back ground, some old and important but much abused and perverted truth; so that all that is gained to the cause of religion and virtue may be won back again to the empire of darkness by some new form of error, or by the loss of some old truth.

The history of all reformations and of almost all advance steps in the progress of theological and moral knowledge, is mournfully rich with illustrations in point. We advert to the well known fact, at the pres-

* I do not confound the Puritans with those persecutors in New England, who, having renounced Puritanism themselves, banished Roger Williams for adhering to it, and, in other ways, betrayed their departure from the truth.

ent time, by way of caution to the friends of Christian reformation, that they may be on their guard against the subtle enemy of all true Christian progress, who, by turns, can play conservatist or reformer, as best suits his purposes, thereby cheating mankind with an endless series of false systems, running round in a circle, like the routine of ever changing fashions in dress, contriving always to make the latest costume appear comely, in some eyes, whatever it may be; palming off some old cast off error of bygone centuries as a new discovered truth, and thrusting some old imperishable truth into the heap of justly discarded errors.

The fact of the case is, there are no new truths, though there are many that may seem new to us. And there are few errors, however apparently fresh and glistening, that did not once have their day, and run their baleful race triumphantly, for a time, and sink into apparent oblivion. "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

"Cheap! Cheap!"

Every body, almost, is agog after 'cheap' things—cheap goods—cheap labor—cheap education—cheap teaching—cheap clothing—cheap houses—cheap books—cheap fare—cheap newspapers—cheap everything! The consequence is a deterioration in the quality of everything that men seek after, proportionate to the reduction of the price. Our modern inventors and improvers have racked their wits to underbid each other in prices, till the durability of the commodity purchased, has fallen, in many instances, to one-fourth of what it was, in the days of our grandfathers.

Religion, too, among other things, has become marvelously cheap; and here, likewise, the chief custom is engrossed by those who can contrive to furnish the cheapest article: and as to qualities—no questions asked. Religion was wont to cost agonizing efforts, exhausting labor, unremitting watchfulness, immeasurable self-denial, loss of worldly favor, yea, moreover, it sometimes used to cost bonds, imprisonments, and even life itself! Who thinks of purchasing a pearl of so great a price, now-a-days?

So far from paying any thing, for its favors, the easy tempted vestal offers golden bribes, preferments, honors, pleasures, and worldly comforts to those who will only consent to embrace her. And all the world is be-crazed with her traffic! Cheap!—Cheap! Cheap!

The apothecary in every village, like rival shop keepers, hang out their various signs, and on all of them you may see inscribed,—
"Cheap! Cheap! Cheap!"

And well may they! Their wares count them nothing, and are nothing worth.—More than this. Like bankrupt vendors, in anticipation of the Sheriff's summons, and of closed doors, they do well to drive as brisk a traffic as they can, while they may—"Selling off at cost!" Alas! Alas! A dear bargain to the purchaser at that rate, or even with "the whole world" thrown in to boot!

Amusement vs. Instruction.

Public teachers, whether preachers, lecturers, editors, or authors, may be divided into two classes: those who seek to *instruct*, and those who seek to *amuse*.

Different minds desire different amusements. Some are best amused by frivolous fictions, others by frivolous facts, others by ingenious but idle speculations; some by a fascinating and some by a grotesque style: but all seekers of amusement are gratified with having their attention directed from *their own serious duties*. Some seek to be quieted, others to be excited, some to be made glad, and some to be made pensive, but all to be uselessly occupied. Tragedies furnish amusement, as well as comedies.—And there are religious amusements that lull troubled consciences.

Instruction has to do with important truths and with a view to practical purposes. But as most people love to be gratified rather than admonished, there are hundreds who run after amusement, to one who seeks solid instruction. Preachers, editors, lecturers, and authors, for the most part, understand this. They shape their wares for the market, and pudding and praise comprise their ideal of *success*.

A Ministry in Fetters.

We have already affirmed that the Organized Clerical Caste is a device by means of which a few aspiring clergymen hold the mass of their ministerial brethren in bondage. We have also said that Associations of Congregational ministers "for mutual improvement" furnish no exception—not even in the old Commonwealth of Massachusetts, under the Cambridge Platform. Some facts in illustration we have given.—The following is an extract of a letter we have lately received from a Congregational minister in that State:

"I believe I sent you a paper containing a brief account of the manner in which a resolution, presented to the General Association of Massachusetts, was treated by that body at its last Annual Meeting. It was evident from the manner in which that resolution was received that many members of that body did not dare to exhibit their real feelings, in reference to holding fel-

lowship with slave holders. They were overawed by the D. D.s and leading influences present. What ought to be done, I find it somewhat difficult to answer. The power of the Associations over the Churches is such that whosoever should withdraw all connexion with them would have his influence in a great measure curtailed. I desire to do that which will be most for the glory of God."

Thus writes this good brother. We respond:—Is it not most for the glory of God, that the ministry should be free of hierarchical control, and in a position to express their full convictions, without being "overawed?" And if so, does not the glory of God require that his faithful ministers should "withdraw" from all such despotic arrangements? Can they ever expect to have the kind of influence which God designs his ministers to have, until they become free men?

"Mild and Just."

Let it be remembered that a Baltimore correspondent of the Christian Advocate and Journal contended that the punishment of Mr. Torrey was *mild and just*. And the official organ of Northern Methodism gave circulation to the sentiment without rebuking it. Thus we see the persecution against abolitionists comes from the pro-slavery Churches, and yet we are told it is not time yet to secede. We must go on, supporting these persecuting Churches, which is the same thing as "partaking in the sin" of the persecution, under pretext of "staying in them to reform them!" We must help people sin, in order to "have influence with them" to prevent them from sinning! When you may stay in a gambling room and help roll the nine pins, or shuffle the cards to "reform" men from gambling—then, but not sooner, may you innocently remain in a persecuting Church, and help to keep up its credit by your influence and character under plea of trying to reform it. Take care that you do not lay a foundation for the discovery, by and by, that you loved the praise of men, and took pleasure in being honored and called brother by the persecutors of God's people. "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues."

Defective Reformers and Theologians.

The moral reformer who is not armed, at all points, with a comprehensive, discriminating and high toned system of theology, is like a mariner at sea, without chart, rudder, compass, or polar star, to guide him. The theologian, however orthodox and learned, who does not use his theo-

logical apparatus for solving moral problems and prosecuting moral reformations, is like a man learned in nautical astronomy who neither adventures out at sea himself, nor knows how to make his knowledge available to those who do adventure. To vary the simile, two such persons are like the two disjointed and spoiled halves of a pair of scissors. Together they might do great execution, but separated they are worth just nothing at all, and only disappoint the expectations of all who endeavor to use them.

Supervision of Missionaries.

It ought to be borne in mind, that the American Board have exercised the prerogative of standing between the Missionaries abroad, and the Christian public at home, and deciding whether or no communications from the former designed for the latter, shall ever reach them. As early as 1836 the Sandwich Island Mission printed a tract and also a circular, designed to exert a salutary influence on the Churches at home, in respect to the "Conversion of the world." J. S. Green says, concerning them:

"I am very sorry to say that our Circular, a very few copies excepted, and these mostly sent home by other conveyances" (the others having been sent by Mr. Richards and Mr. Spalding) "was suppressed at the Missionary Rooms, in Boston, and many of them actually committed to the flames, though sealed and directed to our private friends! I am prepared to make other statements on these points, if desired. Our agents too, I apprehend, fared little better, for I have never heard a syllable of them; and by a formal note of the Prudential Committee, we were forbidden to print any thing more of the kind."

All this from a Board that excuses itself from any responsibility in respect to slavery and polygamy in the Mission Churches, on the ground that it cannot interfere with the rights of the Missionaries and Churches!

Here we have another illustration of the power of voluntary Societies and Boards controlled by the leading clergy.

The professed reformer who does not learn from the obstacles he encounters, the doctrine of deavity, gives reason to fear, that it is not six that he is contending against so much as the inconveniences resulting from it. Such an one will not be likely to withstand temptation in its more seductive and winning forms, though he may keep up a show of fight against prevailing iniquities so long as violent opposition keeps him in a state of excitement. We have, long ago, learned to distrust reformers who can crack merry jests over human guilt and wretchedness, or discredit the fact or deride the doctrine of the deep moral pollution of the species. Their philosophy is too shallow to reach the root of the evil. On some mere fragmentary work they may render a sort of temporary service; beyond this, they are "off soundings," to use a mariner's term. Their plummets cannot reach to the bottom.

Society and Solitude.

Some seek solitude from misanthropy and from a willingness to escape social duties. Some love solitude because they love silent meditation, self converse, reflection, and intercourse with God.

On the other hand, there are those who seek society, because they love their fellow men and cheerfully welcome the tasks that are allotted to them: while there are those who are always wretched unless they are in a crowd, because they dread nothing so much as reflection, self converse, and the conscious presence of their Maker.

The true uses both of solitude and society are best secured by a due proportion and proper improvement of each, in their season. The public man, the merchant, the statesman, the preacher, who does most for society by his bright example and efficient, well ordered action, is the same man that counsels with himself and with the giver of all true wisdom in secret, whose public course is the natural result of his solitary reflection and prayer. A man may be a boisterous, bustling busy-body, but not a truly efficient, useful man, without understanding the value of solitude. On the other hand, the substitution of habitual and protracted solitude for active labor and healthful intercourse with society, is the loss of the end for the sake of the supposed means, the giving up of the fruit for its germs. Mere social activity gives us mountebanks. Mere solitude gives us monks. Activity, intercourse, and solitude, well tempered, gives us true men.

"Worth of the Soul."

We hear much of the "worth of the soul" from a class of writers and preachers who think it anti-evangelical or in bad keeping with a high degree of spirituality, to say or think much of the claims of humanity, or of the value and dignity of a man. It might greatly enlarge and purify their conceptions of the evangelical theology—it might do much towards rendering their spirituality more truly spiritual, if this worthy sort of people could but be made to understand that "the soul" of which they so much speak is nothing distinct from the man himself; that the man is the soul, that the "worth" of the one is the worth of the other—that the "salvation of the soul" is the purification and progress of the man—that the claims of humanity upon our regard and the claims of human salvation are one and the same—that a sensualized and brutalized man is a lost soul—that a man brought under the dominion of reason, conscience, moral law and spiritual liberty, is a saved soul—that those who crush, cripple, brutalize and degrade humanity are soul murderers, and that the process of saving souls is the redemption of men from beastliness, bondage, brutality, sensualism, ignorance, servility, degradation, subjection to appetite, passion, avarice, ambition (their own and other men's) from selfishness, transgression—in one word, from sin, and from the effects, the dominion, the arrangements, and the punishment of sin.

In times of reformation, there are always two classes of reformers, the conservatives, who are too prudent to make progress, and the radicals, who are too prudent, (with another sort of prudence, or sagacity,) to refuse making progress. These can never agree, or if, after a long struggle, they do come together, by a compromise, the conservatives, thenceforth, take the lead, and the reformation, though never completed, always terminates. A third class may be noticed, who, under the profession of being radicals, have, in reality, no root in themselves, are "radically" defective, in their ethics, mistake aberration for progress, fly off in a tangent, and lose themselves in their own smoke and thunder.

Words Fittingly Spoken.

The following resolutions were recently adopted at a Church Reform Convention in Georgetown, Madison Co., N. Y.:

Resolved, That christianity, in all its principles and character, is open, faithful, frank, and free; therefore, all secret societies and associations are in their character anti-christian and dangerous.

Resolved, That we look with deep concern upon the rapid progress of secret societies in the nominal churches as well as in the community generally; and that we cannot as faithful christians have any christian fellowship with those who persevere in sustaining these unhallowed relations.

Resolved, That our success as reformatory churches, is under God, dependant, mainly upon the personal piety and holy christian walk of the individual christians who compose our individual churches.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

May, 1848.

B. King, Rochester,	\$1 00
P. F. Noble, Napoli,	1 00
S. Brigham, Vienna,	1 00
Thomas Condon, Camillus,	1 00
G. Griffith, Granville, (Ohio),	50
W. W. Bancroft, do	1 50
L. Pierce, Hunt's Hollow,	50
T. C. Green, Mechanicville,	2 00
A. Kiegebury, Cazenovia,	50
J. Mills, Perryville,	50
S. Griggs, Lavanna,	1 00
G. Abbey, Honeoye,	1 00
I. Thompson, Theresa,	1 00
M. M. Burnham, Madison,	50
E. Burnham, do	50
L. A. Wicker, Stav's Square,	1 00
J. A. Hubbard, Champlain,	1 00
A. Coleman, Depauville,	50
L. Griswold, Rose,	50
J. Prescott, N. Hartford,	50
A. Mills, do	50
R. Roberts, Trumbull, Ohio,	1 00
J. P. Mann, Adams,	1 00
J. M. Mann, do	1 00
G. D. Mann, do	1 00

In all, \$21 50
Deduct Commission and Postage, 1 00

\$20 50

For some time past, our receipts for the paper have fallen short of the printer's bills. Many of our subscribers have paid us nothing, for a long time, while others have paid us in advance and a few have sent us liberal donations. We hardly know what to do, under such circumstances, but cannot continue long to publish the paper unless more is done, in some way, for the support of it. We make it a principle to keep out of debt, and our means are limited.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES. VOL. VI—No. 6.
WHOLE NUMBER. 70.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JUNE, 1848.

WILLIAM GOOD, L. JORDON
AND PUBLISHERS.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in a fool's day times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage. Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services:—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services:—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

Attempts at New Social Organizations.

If no other good comes of those varied attempts at improved social and industrial organization that are exploding, one after another, in a succession of splendid failures, thus much, at least, ought to come out of them; they ought to yield salutary instruction to all who witness them, as well as to all who are or who may have been engaged in them. In a spirit of impartiality and candor, without trouncing the disappointed, deriding the sanguine, or blessing ourselves for our superior sagacity and wisdom, we should look over the whole ground, and try to see things as they are, storing up whatever of rebuke or of congratulation, of encouragement or of warning, the facts may furnish us, and distributing these equitably among all portions of society, not excepting ourselves.

The first lesson of instruction we shall mention is this: There is something wrong somewhere, or we never should have witnessed such a series of attempts. In a world of plenty, and in an age of progress it cannot be that so many minds, in so many localities, should have so earnestly sought such radical changes unless there were something in things as they are that differs widely from things as they should be.

It may be said that the fault lies in the discontent and the folly that have been identified with these enterprises. Infidelity may be detected here; enthusiasm or fanaticism here; cheatery and imposture on the one hand; idleness, discontent, and credulity on the other. But candor forbids the indiscriminate application of such a description.—Men of rare talents, cultivated minds, and generous aims, have been among the leaders; and earnest, honest, hard working, patient laborers have been among the masses in more cases than one, and notwithstanding the failure. When we say that such efforts at amelioration indicate serious evils to be removed, we would not deny nor forget

however, that those evils, as well as the mistakes growing out of them, may have had their origin, to a very great extent, in the individual character and moral position of those who have been seeking the remedy, yet we would have it understood that the character and position here hinted at, are by no means peculiar to the discontented experimentists, but are shared in common with large masses who, (with even larger measures of moral imperfection, and for that very reason, perhaps) are perfectly content to settle down and vegetate, where they are. The very fact of discontent, in a false position, argues much in favor of those who are seeking a change, even if they have mistaken the true remedy. Give us any thing but contentedness in wrong *doing* or in wrong *being*.

One of the most important, yet delicate and intricate questions to be disposed of is—whether, or to what extent, the evils needing removal are of a social or public character, growing out of improper or perverted organizations and customs; or whether, or to what extent, they are merely personal and are to be reached only by a change of individual character and activity. Each branch of this question has likewise its minor sub-divisions. Institutions may be inherently wrong, or they may become inadequate or mischievous by perversion. Individuals may be depraved, or wanting to themselves, in despite of the best training, and the most advantageous position, or they may be so in consequence of a bad training and a false position; the fault, perhaps, to a great extent, of institutions either wrong in themselves, or made so by perversion. Institutions and individual character have a mutual and reflex influence upon each other. We may say that individual character is shaped much by existing institutions; but we must not forget that institutions have their rise in individual character, and receive their ever-varying hues and shapes from the same source. If our Fourierists or other experimentists have erred in attributing all the vice and wretchedness of society to false organizations, (as we think they have,) those also have erred very grossly, who have so insisted on individual character and activity as to convey the impression, or warrant the inference that they deem all inquiries into the original nature, or present condition of social organizations to be superfluous, or

any improvement even in the administration or conception of them to be Utopian.

When we hear from some classes of theorists and experimentists such loud complaints of the "drudgery of solitary labor," such importunate demands that labor be "made attractive;" when we hear them cry out in anguish, of the desolateness, and dreariness, and monotony of the "isolated family," and clamorous for congregating the whole parish under one roof; when we witness their pains-taking efforts for "co operation and mutual insurance and protection," what can we say less than that something, some how, or some where, must have been going on wrong, or our ears would never have been assailed by such sounds, our eyes would never have seen such a sight. We may contrast these complainings with the joyous shoutings and merry songs that greet us from many a farm-yard and harvest field, with the holy heaven of our own and our sainted sires' family hearthstones; with the quiet comfort and kindly assistance united with conscious independence of the favored neighborhood where we were reared or where we now reside, and we may hardly know what to make of such complainings. We may say, in our hearts, to the theorizers, as Pharaoh said to the petitioning Hebrews, "Ye are idle! ye are idle!" We may doubt whether they love the heaven-appointed tasks and duties devolving upon them. We may feel as though the sound of complaint came from a heart that dreaded solitary converse with itself, and the conscious presence of its Maker in the open field, under the blue sky, and that would fain escape from the conflict within, by finding self-forgetfulness in an uproarious crowd. There are some of us who can remember this "desolate" feeling and remember, too, when our night was changed into morning, and the long days of June, all alone, in the cornfield, passed not heavily, in the glorious company of the Highest. We may conjecture that family endearments have few or no charms for such complainers, who may seem to us like churlish or pleasure-loving husbands, who had rather be with their boon companions at some street corner or place of public resort, than with their smiling wives and prattling babes at home. Thoughts like these may come over us when we read the pages of the Fourierist, and if such imaginings

prevent the bad reality, it must still be said that here are frightful evils to be removed. But we not harden ourselves against those poor brothers of ours, whose hearts and whose homes may be less favored with sunlight from above than our own. If labor has ceased to be "attractive," and if the family has become monotonous and dreary, there must be a cause. It may be wholly in the bosom of the unhappy man himself. Or, it may be that his labor is excessive, and without due reward. It may be because he has no heart for the family relation; or it may be because that family itself is perverted, overborne, broken-hearted and spirit crushed, or unilluminated with the mental and moral light that should cheer and adorn it. Wherever the difficulty lies, it should be searched out, and, if possible, removed.—*There is an evil ascertained. There is a work to be done. There is a remedy to be applied. There is a brother to be taken by the hand—to be counselled—to be assisted—to be relieved.*

And in doing this, there are investigations to be made. Condition, along with character, and character along with condition, are to pass under review. No blind attachment to favorite theories, to pre-conceived notions, or to educational prejudices, are to be allowed to prevent or to guide our inquiries. To say that condition is nothing, in the formation of character and destiny, is to belie the truth. It is to deny the power of temptation, the benefits of culture, the advantages of virtuous society. To say that condition is every thing, is likewise to belie the truth. It is to annihilate the *man*, and substitute in his place, a *machine*.

Institutions, as well as individual character, must be examined. All sound institutions can bear scrutiny, and must be scrutinized in order to be understood and administered. Abuses of heaven-appointed institutions must be exposed—must be remedied.

The man was before the institutions; his nature, his responsibilities, and his necessities define them. Like "the Sabbath," which is one of them, they were "made for man, and not man for" them. While the nature of man remains what it is, the institutions growing out of that nature, must remain. When man perverts or misapplies them, he must suffer the penalty, till he purifies and restores them. No artificial substitutes of his own devising, can ever supply their place.

To charge the blame of human vices and miseries, exclusively, chiefly, or originally, to any of the institutions, or social organizations prevailing among men, involves ab-

surdity and contradiction, which may be detected, on a moment's reflection, by every sound mind.

All social institutions and organizations are more modern, chronologically, than man. There were men before there were any social organizations. It has indeed been disputed which was first, the oak or the acorn. But it cannot be doubted that there were men, before men were organized, whether wisely or unwisely, by divine appointment or by their own device, in accordance with the constructive laws of their being or in violation of them.

Into the two classes, just mentioned, all institutions and social organizations must be distributed. They are either natural, heaven-conferred, and salutary, or they are unnatural, of human contrivance, and pernicious. If you allege that man may meet certain new exigencies by new organizations, not essential to universal humanity, yet not at variance with the laws of human nature—Very good. Place these for the present, among the natural, the salutary, the heaven conferred. In their essence, and in a sense, they are so, for God gave man whatever wisdom he has, to devise what he needs. Of organizations or institutions, we have then, the salutary and the hurtful, the wise and the unwise. Mark this, while we proceed.

The vices and miseries of man cannot be charged, at all, on the wise, the salutary, the heaven conferred, or heaven approved institutions and organizations of society duly administered. No one will pretend this. Nor can their origin be traced, nor the blame of them chiefly or mainly be charged to the unwise and hurtful organizations of Society. For vice, folly, and misery must first have prevailed, and controlled human affairs, and driven men, in a vain hope of refuge and protection, to the construction of the false organizations since witnessed; and the abuses and perversions of heaven appointed and salutary organizations and institutions, must all be attributed to the same source.

In other words, man, individually, personally, must have become foolish, vicious and wretched, before he could have become *socially* foolish, vicious and wretched. For wise, virtuous, and well conditioned men, could not have established unwise, vicious, and misery-producing organizations.

This drives us back to the old remedy of regenerating the man individually, before he can be regenerated socially. But along with this old truth we must not take the old error that too commonly went with it, the error of forgetting that man individually, is a social being, with a moral nature socially

defined, with social relations binding him in every direction, with social responsibilities intertwined with every fibre of his being, with social duties pressing every where upon him, as the condition of his individual existence and well being.

To regenerate the man individually, he must be regenerated in his social affections and habits. Of course his social obligations must be presented to him, in all their comprehensiveness and entitleness.—And this is saying that all the heaven conferred institutions and organizations of social humanity must be understood and revered.

When we say that an individual regeneration is needed as a foundation for social regeneration, we do not mean that this individual regeneration can go on without finding its definition, or at least its manifestation, in the discharge of the social duties.—Nor do we say that the work of investigating and reforming social organizations must be deferred. We only say that the work of improved social organization requires the hearts, the heads, and the hands of regenerated men, that until these are brought into the enterprise, and with them the lights of Christian ethics and Christian theology, there will continue to be witnessed little better than, as at present, successive, laborious, and perhaps splendid abortions, and that the masses of human society, whether spiritually regenerated or not, must come more than they yet have done under the guiding and restraining influence of sound Christian instruction, before social organizations can be perfected as they should be. A review of the past as well as of the present, will illustrate our meaning, and supply us with a key to the future.

Before attempting any new social organizations, there should be a more radical and exact scrutiny of the old; we mean, not simply nor mainly the perverted forms of ancient organizations as we now find them, but the constructive laws of social organizations as they were in the beginning, and before they had been changed by human folly and selfishness.

Among these organizations, the family, the church, the state, are the most prominent. What they now are, may perhaps be found, on inquiry, to be vastly different from what they were originally intended to be, and what they might be. To discard, to undervalue, the original institution, on account of its present defects, perversions, or mischiefs, may be the most easy and natural thing in the world, but certainly it would be neither the most sagacious, or the most philosophical. There is presumptive evidence

In the very antiquity and universality of these institutions, however overlaid and be-mead with the accumulated rubbish and filth of guilty ages, that there once was and might again be more vitality and healthful efficiency in them than is now visible. We might hazard the conjecture that these institutions, rightly understood, wisely re-tored, and faithfully administered, would go far at least towards supplying the place of what is sought by our modern abolitionists that thus mock our hopes, and might do much towards a removal of the loud complaints that have led to them.

The Family! If there be any thing original, heaven ordained, in accordance with nature, and trust-worthy, we may look for it here. The family, we mean, as it once was, as it should be, as it might be, as it must be, before man can be blessed—before individuals can be duly trained—before communities can be wisely organized. If the family were what it should be, what it must be before any other organization can be fully perfected, what other organization should we need? The reader may be startled at the inquiry, and so are we. But the boldness of the inquiry should not preclude its consideration. *The family!* Let it be pondered. The family as it should be.—Would it not comprize the Church? Would it not comprize the State? That is to say, moral training, and necessary restraint combined?

Man is ignorant and needs instruction—he is vicious and needs admonition—he has wandered from holiness and needs to be won back to it. Hence the necessity of the Church.

In despite of instruction, of warning, of persuasion, some men will not so govern themselves as to avoid trespassing upon each other's rights. They must be authoritatively restrained. And this is what we mean by civil government.

The family should include both. Originally it did. But when many families became corrupted and uncontrolled, two other institutions were wisely introduced—the Church to instruct, to persuade—the State to protect, to punish, to restrain. Give us the family as it should be, and render its way universal, and what else, in the way of social organization, should we need? In the mean time, restore to us the Church and the State, along with the continually extending empire of the family, and what more can we desire?

Chronologically and philosophically, the family was first the, Church and the State afterwards. If any thing in addition to these is in reserve for our race, it must stand

on the basis of these—it cannot supersede or displace them. It cannot rise on their ruins. It cannot become a substitute for them. Emphatically and most assuredly, is this true of the family institution. No philosophy that would abrogate the family, or thrust it into the back ground, can deserve the confidence of the right-minded.—Mr. Owen's system looked to the abrogation of the family and proved a failure. Mr. Fourier's system acquits broadly at the partial absorption of the family, and seems also in process of failing. The laws of social organization, when rightly understood and followed, will leave the family institution unimpaired.

We have said that the loud complaints and earnest efforts of modern experimentists betoken something wrong; some where. We now add that they argue something wrong in the social organizations of the times, as we find them—something wrong in the family—something wrong in the State—and, emphatically, something wrong in the Church, the moral instructor and guide and exemplar of mankind.

Were mankind rightly trained, duly admonished, wisely guided, efficiently protected, as the family, the church, and the State should do these things, we should witness no such experiments as we now witness, we should hear no such complaints as we now hear.

The cry of infidelity, therefore, of licentiousness, of disorganization, that is so loudly raised by some of our leading conservatives, against the social experimentists of the times, whatever of truthfulness there may be in the charges, and were they even more indisputably and universally true than at present we are warranted to esteem them, proceed with a very ill grace, from the lips of those who, more than any other living men, are *responsible* before high heaven, and at the bar of impartial posterity, for the infidelity, the licentiousness, the disorganization they cry out against; since they are the very men whose derelictions have given rise to all that can be censured in these experiments; nay, to the experiments themselves!

For these are the very men who stand up as the resolute conservators and defenders of all those perversions in the heaven appointed institutions of social humanity, that have made them a stench and a by-word, nay, to a frightful extent, the scourgers and the seducers of those whom they ought to protect and to guide.

These are the men who, so far from revering the family, the Church, and the State, conspire to the annihilation of the family re-

lation, among the laborers of half the states in our boasted Christian Republic, (professedly the most free and religious nation on the earth) and who will not consent that either the Church or the State should do their proper work for the restoration of the family condition.

And this instance may be cited only as a specimen of the abuses, (in all nations witnessed to a greater or less extent, and in some form) of the heaven appointed institutions designed for the benefit of man. We told but half of the story when we said that the Church and the State were not wielded for the overthrow and removal of the most terrible and demoralizing oppressions. Every where, with insignificant exceptions, they are made the most effective instruments of the corruptions and grievous burthens that debauch and crush the great mass of the people.

What marvel, then, that these institutions have fallen into disgrace—and that the family, along with the Church and the State, partaking of their corruptions and sharing in their perversions, shares likewise, a portion of the same contempt, having failed to supply the precious benefits for which it was designed.

The family as it is, contrasted with the family as it should be, reveals to us the secret of attempted organizations by which the family shall be either superseded, or thrust into shade. Had family order, family training, family industry, family comfort, family morality, been what they should have been, we should never have heard a Robert Dale Owen nor a Fanny Wright demanding the abrogation of marriage and the training of children by the state—nor should we now hear faint echoes or dark hints in a similar direction from other classes of theorists, nor listen to piteous moanings of the dreariness of the "isolated family."

Were the Church what it should be, its membership could present *model families*, in such striking contrast to the families of a sensual world, that he who runs might read the true theory of social and industrial organization. We say not that partnerships, on a more extended scale might not sometimes be witnessed, but we do say that the misery of family society would not be among the occasions of them, nor would the family be superseded or thrust into the back-ground by the theory or the working of partnerships. We may venture to predict the general failure of organizations based on this capital error, and on the kindred fallacies, that human character and condition require nothing for their success-

ful development or reformation but some new and hitherto unknown organization:—that ill-trained men and misgoverned or ungoverned families can furnish the materials of successful industrial association, or that any such association without the family, instead of it, or taking its natural work of education out of its hands, can so train up a new generation as to fit them, better than the family institution can fit them, for the attainment of life's proper ends.

Were the State what it should be, civil government would find its proper functions and do its healthful work, without attempting to supersede either the family or the church, or take their proper work out of their hands:—another process by which the dreams of misty theorizers on social and industrial organization might be greatly chastened and simplified, if not entirely dispelled. Were it fully understood that State officials are not needed to superintend the nursery, the wash room, the farm yard, the artisan's shop, the counting house, the recitation room, or the sanctuary;—that other heads than theirs can better decide, and each for themselves, how babes shall be tended, and cattle reared, and garments shaped, and problems solved, and bargains made, and anthems chanted, and ethics taught:—were all men's eyes withdrawn from Courts and Cabinets, and Halls of Legislation, as the sources from whence they are to be supplied with habitations, clothing, bread and wisdom;—were all the cheats, impostures, charlatanism and quackeries of State astrologers with their monthly or annual prognostications displaced by a few grains of political honesty and common sense, the people might become more provident, self-relying, stable, patient, contented, and happy, in their heaven appointed family cares and labors. Political economy might once more become family economy, and find herself vastly ennobled and purified by the transition. The vagaries of an imaginary social and industrial re-organization in which the family relation should be overlooked, displaced, or dwarfed, might diminish, somewhat, of its magnitude, then. So much of the spectral illusion as that which sets the State House on the fore ground of the picture, along with the "Phalantery" or mammoth baby house of the "Phalanx," at which the congregated children of the whole township are to be rocked by steam in conformity with the latest improved method by law established—would, at best be likely to vanish from the picture. So much of progress as this, in the work of dispelling fantastic speculations and visionary dreams, the Church might very r. ba-

bly insure, could she so far hazard her fancied spirituality as to elevate to its proper place, in the sacred canon, the last chapter of the book of Proverbs, the best treatise of Political economy and industrial association yet extant.

At the door of the Church, mainly must be laid the blame of all that disjointed state of things in the heaven approved institutions of Society which now threatens their still further disgrace, if not frantic abandonment. The Family and the State, to a great extent, are what the Church makes or permits them to be. And the upheavings now witnessed are the natural and necessary result.

So long as ministers and church members are rushing eagerly into Secret Societies, Masonic fraternities, Odd Fellowships, *et cetera*, on the ground, openly avowed, that they need some association in which they can find that co-operation, assistance, common brotherhood, and sympathy that they know they must not expect in the Church, so long will Church Conservatives find Owenism and Fourierism enough to hoot at, with hoarse throats. And so long may even the unseemly contortions of these be welcomed by the eye of a serene and hopeful faith, as so many uncouth tokens that humanity is not quite throttled to death, yet, by the incubus of a corrupt Church and a dead faith, but is preparing to become instinct with new life, along with the predicted purification of the one, and restoration of the other.

Is the Bible Defective?

The Bible is a wonderful book and contains graphic descriptions of almost every phenomenon that can be found in the moral world around or within us. But who can discover there, any such frightful and grotesque pictures as our modern religious conservatives draw of the reformatory fanaticisms that so much trouble and annoy them? Any such pictures, we mean, as can with any tolerable show of fairness, be labelled with the names of the persons mainly intended to be satirized or described by them? Where, in fact, in what books, chapters, or verses of the Bible, can we find the *fac simile* of these modern pictures, except indeed where we meet with them from the lips of those ancient religious conservatives who levelled them against the supposed fanatics of their times, the disturbers of their own quiet, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, at the head of whom stands the divine carpenter of Nazareth himself, whom the titled theologians of that age, of rival sects, united in declaring a blasphemer, a disorganizer, and a traitor, worthy of death?—

"All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Assuredly, then, we may confidently look in those sacred pages for the "reproof" of all the fanaticisms that need to be reproofed, for the "correction" of all the "ultraisms" that need to be corrected, otherwise "the man of God," might fall of becoming completely armed and defended by a perusal of the divine directory.

We do not mean in this remark, to imitate the logic of those who insist that every specific form of moral evil shall be designated by its modern name, or described in every minute shade of which it is susceptible of being exhibited, before they can admit that the scriptures condemn it, or that goodmen can be warranted in declaring it sinful.—Our modern religious conservatives, for example, will not permit us to consider and treat slaveholding and rum selling as sinful or condemned by the scripture, because we cannot find "slaveholding, slaveholders, rum-selling and rum-sellers" designated, in express terms. We will not now treat them to a dish of their own ethics and biblical lore, by insisting, (as we might do, to meet them on their own ground) that they shall never censure "modern abolitionism" or "intotalism" or any of the "financial ultraisms" they so much protest against as being unchristian, disorganizing, and anti-scriptural, until they can find in the bible some direct exhortations against these alleged evils under the same names by which they commonly designate them, or in precisely the same form.

But we do demand of them to put their fingers, if they can, upon any portions of scripture in which the modern "ultraist-end ultraisms" that disturb them are as plainly described, pointed out, and condemned, as are the practices which these supposed ultraists are blamed for condemning.

When we take up the first and the fifty-eighth chapters of Isaiah and other similar portions of scripture—when we read pointed condemnations of those who "judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come before them"—who refuse to "loose the bonds of wickedness, to let the oppressed go free and to break every yoke"—who "forbear to deliver those that are drawn unto death and those that are ready to be slain"—who "pervert judgment and justice," and fail to "deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor"—who "as their neighbor's service without wages, and

give him not for his work"—who neglect to "let every one his own servant and every one his own servant go free"—who "hearken not" to God "in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor"—who "exercise robbery and vex the poor and the needy"—who "have given a boy for an harlot and sold a girl for who"—who have "sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes"—who "dent treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers"—who "oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow and the fatherless, and turn aside the stranger from his right"—who "pay tithes of mint, and annise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith"—who are the least of Christ's "brethren"—"a hanged, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, and in prison, and do not minister unto them"—who are those who have "fallen among thieves and pass by on the other side"—who "bind heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, lay them on men's shoulders, and will not loose them with one of their fingers"—who "devour widow's houses and for a pretence make long prayers"—"the hire of whose laborers that reap down their fields is kept back by fraud"—who "set up the workers of iniquity" instead of choosing "just men" who would "rule in the fear of God"—"execute judgment between a man and his neighbor" and "proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof"—when we advert to scriptures like these, and compare them with the facts of American Slavery and with the conduct and position of those who refuse to enlist themselves for its overthrow, it must be confessed by all reasonable and impartial men that we have done something that looks like citing scripture against American Slavery, its apologists and supporters and those who will not labor for its overthrow.

And so, again, it must be confessed that we seem to cite scripture in favor of "intemperance" as it is called, when we adduce such passages as the following: "Whoredom and wine take away the heart."—"Look not upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth its color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright."—"It is not for Kings to drink: me, nor princes strong drink, lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted."—"Wine is a mocker, and strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise."—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him and maketh him drunken also."

Additional force is given to the citation of these scriptures as made by "modern ultraists and innovators" when it is remembered that little or nothing has been done or even attempted by learned and able theologians of the conservative stamp to show that these scriptures, especially those that are cited against the oppressions existing in this country are not pertinently cited, and do not prove the very points to substantiate which they are adduced.

Presumptive evidence of the propriety and force of these citations is likewise found in the fact that some of the most eminent and industrious biblical scholars have either made them or have given them their sanction. So far as the slave question is concerned, it is sufficient to mention the names of Porteus, Wesley, Edwards, Hopkins, Adam Clark, &c., men had in honor for their general wisdom, piety, and sound learning by those most forward to brand with approbious and contemptuous epithets the living men who hold the same principles and advocate the same measures, considered "fanatical and ultra."

Common modesty and decency would seem to require respectful attention, at least, and courteous treatment to views thus defended and fortified. Especially might we expect this at the hands of those who profess so high a degree of veneration for the scriptures, and who maintain that nothing is to be received as true worthy for which we cannot find a "thus saith the Lord" in the Bible.

Instead of this, and in place of any attempts to meet directly the evidence adduced by modern reformers from the scriptures, the literature of modern religious conservatism is chiefly occupied with vivid pictures, not to say caricatures of "modern reformers and reformations"—of "ultraists and fanaticisms"—of "innovators and disorganizers."

One might be led to think that they regarded these phenomena the greatest evils on the earth requiring eradication or correction. Certain it is:—the evils of intemperance, of slavery, of licentiousness, of war, and of immorality in general, do not elicit a tithe, or tenth part, of the effort, at their hands, that they devote to the work of exposing, and reproving, and ridiculing what they consider the errors and evils of the agitation occasioned by existing opposition to those gigantic sins. We do not say that there may not be evils connected with reformatory efforts that should be pointed out and corrected, in connection with more scriptural and efficient efforts for reformation. But we do say that criticisms of refor-

mers, whether just or unjust, whether well-founded or ill-founded, are sorry substitutes for reformatory effort, especially when coming from those whose position as moral and religious teachers, (a position of which they claim the monopoly) marks them as specially charged with the work of reformation. We say further, (and this was the point in view when we commenced this article) that those who thus loudly censure the reformatory efforts of the present day, professing to take the scriptures for their sole guide, would do well, if they can, to refer us to such portions of Scripture as may warrant the criticisms they make, and bear them out in the reproofs they undertake to administer.

We feel that we have a right to demand of them that they bring forward as formidable an array of scripture testimonies against the over zeal, the imprudent haste, the reckless inconsideration, the unchristian impatience, the extravagant exaggeration, the uncharitable denunciation, of false or faulty reformers, as modern reformers themselves bring against slavery, intemperance, war, licentiousness, and other abounding immoralities and against those who either sustain or who will not oppose them: we have a right to demand that our dignified conservatives do this, or else concede thus much, at least, on the score of a decent impartiality and candor, that the evils against which modern reformers contend, including the apathy and inactivity of the Churches and ministry, in respect to them, are very likely to be quite as great, if not greater, than the evils incident to the agitations of which they have so much complained.

If the work of agitating the community against abounding iniquities, is so mischievous a work as our conservatives represent it to be, it is probable that the Bible contains many marked and pointed reproofs of such agitations which our conservatives will be able to produce; such reproofs, we mean as shall correspond and harmonize, apparently, at least, with *their own*.

If they cannot bring us as much scripture against such agitation as we can bring in its favor, nor so much as we can bring against the moral evils we contend against, (including the evils of clerical silence, and church apathy respecting them) they ought, at least, to bring forward some such criticisms, cautions, & censures, respecting such agitations as shall bear some manner of resemblance to *their own*. If the "radicalism" that so much trouble them, were equally abhorrent to the divine author of the scriptures, undoubtedly some evidences of that fact are to be found on the sacred

pagos, and are to be brought forward whenever just occasions shall require. Human nature and human tendencies are much the same in all ages; a consideration which seems requisite to give the ancient warnings and admonitions of the inspired penman their full weight and pertinency to the generations that come after. If there are "ultraists, disorganizers and radicals" at the present day, whose aberrations need to be reprov'd (and we will not deny that it may be so,) it is very likely that they had their prototypes in past ages, and that holy prophets, apostles, biographers and historians, who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, may have given some attention to this class of "evil men and seducers" and drawn their characters and measures in such unmistakable colors that we shall be able to discover them and point out their resemblances to similar men at the present time. The Spirit of prophecy, at least, must have anticipated such a mischievous generation, before hand, and given us some marks by which they are to be known and read of all men. We think we have no difficulty in finding the predecessors of the religious conservatives of our own times in those ancient records, and the picture has been so frequently held up for public inspection by our modern radicals to the annoyance of their opposers that one might take it for granted that repetitions would have been made by citing us to biblical descriptions of modern radicals connected with warnings against them, if the picture, (to the satisfaction of our conservatives,) could be conveniently found. It strikes us that here is a department of biblical literature that very much requires the attention of the conservative Doctors, and that they should lose no time in the cultivation of it, if they mean to retain their hold on the scriptures as the text book of their teachings.

To help them a little in fixing their attention to the precise points requiring biblical illustration, we will specify a few particulars in respect to which they would do well to bring forward bible testimony.

The "radicals" are wont to cite the example of Nehemiah, (CHAP. V.) as an instance of popular agitation (vide verse 7.) against the sin of oppression, in a case where nobles, rulers, and priesthood were involved in the condemnation. Our conservatives should tell us whether they think the bad example of Nehemiah and of the populace associated with him in that agitation was recorded for our warning against similar movements? Or; they should offset this example with some scriptural warnings and admonitions against such agitations. If they

think the beginning of the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, and the first chapter of the same prophecy, applicable in point, let them cite them. Conservatives have so phantastically deprecated popular agitation as an instrument of public reformation, especially in the case of political oppressions that they ought, in common decency to their opponents, in justice to the cause they advocate, (if there is any justice in it,) to fortify themselves, if they can, with the testimony of the Scripture.

On no point have the conservatives been more confident of their own wisdom, than in the matter of leaving great moral evils to work out their own cure, under general influences, without any direct attack upon them, in detail. To which of God's holy prophets will they appeal for exemplifications of the silent and quiet policy they so much recommend? Beginning with Isaiah and ending with Malachi, which of them did not violate the rules they have laid down and applied for the condemnation of the dreaded "radicals?" We do not forget their allegations concerning the Savior and his apostles.—The twenty-third and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, the fifth of James, and the messages to the seven Churches of Asia, with the prophetic history of coming ages wrapped up in the Apocalypse, are, perhaps, among the evidences they would cite in support of those statements. If so, they can bring them forward, and see how well they will answer their turn. Or they can make any other selections that better suit them.

They have had much to say of the imprudence of rebuking popular sins, of the danger of exciting the public indignation by so doing, of the impropriety and insubordination of reproving the sins and oppressions of civil rulers, of the danger of urging too sudden an abandonment of political sins, especially the sin of oppression, of the superior wisdom of expatriating the oppressed, instead of reproving the oppressors, of humoring and gratifying the prejudices of the oppressors against the oppressed, rather than demanding repentance of that prejudice—they have lauded the wisdom of a gradual and future breaking of the yoke instead of doing it, at present, they have most earnestly condemned every thing like zeal, fervor, and expressions of moral indignation against the sin of oppression, declaring it to be vituperative, denunciatory, and unchristian (though often challenged to compare the language they thus censure, that of prophets, apostles, and Christ himself on the same subject)—in the same manner they have condemned as infidel and disorganizing, all earnest reproofs of

ministers and churches for participating in these oppressions—they have claimed that none but ministers have a right to agitate moral and religious questions—they have characterized the insisting upon immediate and unconditional repentance for the sin of oppression as recklessness, impatience, and want of submission to divine providence.—The attempt to obtain church action and church discipline against this sin they have denounced as hostility to the Church and ministry of Christ. They have condemned it as a mingling of religion with politics while they themselves have recommended the voting for "the lesser devil of the two," in preference to voting for "just men ruling in the fear of God."

On all these points they have joined issue with those whom they stigmatize as "fanatics, ultraists, disorganizers, disturbers of the peace of the churches."

Now what we ask of these learned teachers in Israel, with Bibles in their hands, is this: that they show us how they justify their course by the scriptures:—that they bring forward just such *Bible* condemnations of the fanatics as they so freely make use of themselves. Let them show us, if they can, where the *Bible* reproves a class of fanatical reformers, so imprudent as to rebuke popular sins, so undutiful as to condemn the sins of civil rulers, so reckless as to urge the immediate abandonment of public sins.

Let them point us to the *divine* cautions against those "who reprove in the gate" because they do not seek to remove the victims of oppression instead of removing the oppressor—because their exhortations to repentance for the sin of oppression are in the present tense instead of the future.

Let them show us where the spirit of prophecy has forewarned the Churches against a race of evil men and seducers, waxing worse and worse, deceivers and being deceived, because they were over zealous and earnest against crying sins, consenting to no toleration of them in the church, or compromise with them in the State, and even stepping out of their proper place, as "laymen," and reproving sin without leave of the "clergy!" without a "licence" from any association, consociation, presbytery, Synod, Conference, General Assembly, Bishop, Cardinal, or Pope! Nay! even withdrawing all fellowship from such, unless they, too, would "lift up their voice like a trumpet, and show the house of Jacob their sins."

Let them bring forward the Scriptures that make it a mark of an "unchristian and denunciatory spirit" to reprove a neighbor and not suffer sin upon him.

Let them cite to us the Scriptures that nullify us against a class of "fanatics" who would "cut out the spirituality of the church" by teaching Christians to "carry their religion into their politics" and choose "just men, fearing God, and hating covetous" to be "rulers of justice and rulers of tone" instead of choosing "the lesser devil of the law" to rule over them.

Let them do this, and twenty other things that might be mentioned, in a similar direction, and they may then claim that their teachings are in accordance with the lively oracles of God. Let them do this, or either make their anti-scriptural complaints against reformers, or confess that they regard the Bible a very defective and faulty standard of morality and religion.

We have occupied our little monthly paper, so much with protracted invectives that we have done little towards giving intelligence concerning the progress of church information. Our friends in other States probably are not aware to what extent the work is going forward in various parts of this State. Christian Reform Conventions are very frequently held, and the proceedings are sometimes published in the weekly papers. The following may serve as a specimen of many that have been held within the past year.

From the Liberty Press.

Christian Reform Convention.

In pursuance of a call for the purpose published in the Liberty Press, the friends of Christian Reform assembled in Convention in Dr. Williston's Church at Bristol Hill, Volney, Oswego co., N. Y. March 8th, 1848.

The house being occupied by a funeral in the forenoon, the Convention was not organized till afternoon. At two o'clock P. M., the Convention was called to order by H. Gilbert, one of the committee signing the call. When on motion of P. M. Way, Dr. ALLEN KINGSBURY, of Cazenovia, was chosen to preside in the Convention. E. A. Finn was chosen Secretary.

Convention opened by a sermon from Lynskey King, from first Cor. 15, 53. After sermon a committee of seven was appointed to prepare business for the meeting, consisting of A. C. Lord, Ira Toby, Jacob Kendall, David Wood, H. D. Brownell, P. M. Way and O. W. Smith.

Committee in a few a few minutes made a partial report: resolutions Nos. 1 and 2.

1. Resolved, That Christian Union can only be effected by a substitution of the Bible for human creeds, and of christian character for christian theory.

2d Resolved, That God has summed up christian character in one word, viz: Love; Every one that loveth is born of God. The law, christian law, the law of God is fulfilled in one word, viz: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor, consequently every act which is inconsistent with this principle, is inconsistent with christian character.

Remarks were made by several individuals on both resolutions.

Evening Session.—Prayer by several friends. Discussion resumed on the resolutions reported.

Second Day—March 9.—Discussion on the resolutions continued by L. King, A. Gray, Dr. Williston, N. Shepard and others. Mr. Gray in the course of his remarks alluded to the position of the venerable Dr. Williston—he had been taught almost from his cradle to respect the name of Dr. Williston—had read and admired his writings; but when he found him arrayed against the cause of humanity and the slave, he must say that his confidence in Dr. Williston's wisdom as a teacher was greatly lessened.

This allusion called out the Dr., who defined his position on the slavery question. He did not understand that he was arrayed against the cause of humanity as he had been charged. On the subject of slavery he stood with Paul, and Peter, and the Savior himself. He had hated slavery, he said, from his birth; every feeling of his heart was hostile to the system, but he made no direct war upon it; he could not do so without impeaching Paul and Peter, and the Almighty himself. He did not think God was the author of slavery, but, nevertheless, he tolerated it in the state and in the church. God, he said, cuts up adultery, and theft, and such like sins, root and branch, but slavery and other governmental wrongs he regulates, modifies, taking master and slave both into his favor, acknowledging both, and while they sustain that relation, as his dear children.

Committee reported third resolution:

Whereas, resolves have become so common as to be almost powerless, being but a little feared and less heeded by the opponents of reform—therefore, henceforth, our acts shall give evidence of our devotion to truth, to efforts for a revival of pure religion, and of the abhorrence we bear to all who cause divisions in the church of Christ, either by dogmatical theories, wicked preachers, or, while they condemn smaller evils, apologize for or sustain, either ecclesiastically or politically, the great abominations and deep damning sins of war, slavery, intemperance, licentiousness, secret societies, &c. by the love we bear to each other and our steady aim to subvert every institution which is not of God, by ceasing now and forever, knowingly, to give our pecuniary support, or the influence of our names to sustain any combination of men calling themselves a church, whose principles or practice cannot be reconciled to the love of God and man. And our acts shall evince our openness of interest by identifying ourselves in christian fellowship with all persons in every neighborhood, or community, who admit and practice upon that one great fundamental principle of moral obligation.

Afternoon, Second day.—Discussion on the three resolutions by H. P. Ross, H. Nicholas, Ira Bristol and H. C. Moody. The discussion on the last resolution was mainly in reference to secret societies. All the resolutions were passed unanimously, though many, who had expressed opposition to the secret society clause of the last, had left before the vote was taken.

ALLEN KINGSBURY, Pres't.

E. H. Finn, Secretary.

REMARKS ON THE POSITION OF DR. WILLISTON.—We cannot forbear a few words concerning the position of Dr. Williston, as above defined, not that there is any thing new in it, or that we have any thing further to offer in refutation of his theory, which is essentially that of the American Board, and

has been largely discussed. But, in communion with Mr. Gray we cannot help feeling sad and perplexed when such men as Seth Williston deliberately range themselves on that side of the question. We heard him repeat much the same story at the meeting of the American Board at Brooklyn, at the time of their adoption of the famous Report. JOSEPH BEWELL too, another venerated minister, was there, to say least very much the same sentiments.—Sewall and Williston! Who would have believed it. More than thirty-five years ago, we listened to the preaching of Sewall; almost fifty years ago to that of Williston, in our early boyhood, and while he was a missionary in the "new settlements" on the Susquehanna. His very name, his countenance though changed by time, his voice, his gestures, well remembered, carried us back almost half a century, but, alas! not to the theology nor to the ethics that we supposed we learned from his lips at that time. Compromise with admitted wrong! A future in preference to a present abandonment of wrong doing!—The pure and holy One tolerating in the Church and in the State, and to the present hour, what the speaker himself had hated from his very birth! Was it SETH WILLISTON, of all theologians, once the most uncompromising, (the most awfully severe in his views of the inflexibility of divine justice) that said that! The missionary who told us that God would hear no impenitent prayers, would tolerate no unregenerate seekings and strivings—that God was too holy to pardon, until the sinner had abandoned his most darling sins—that the true penitent was one who would sooner relinquish his own future happiness than see the glory of God tarnished by the restoration to favor of one unwashed and unsanctified soul, undivorced from his sins! Was this the same Seth Williston whom we now heard half apologizing for slavery, yet disclaiming the apology, protesting his own hatred of slavery, yet declaring that he dared not oppose it directly, because God, and because Jesus Christ did not; (thus giving the skeptic to understand that he would gladly be more inflexibly just and humane if his God and his Savior would permit him!) could it be the same Seth Williston of whom our first lessons of high toned christian theology were learned?—If any one can conjecture what his sensations would be, to find his own venerated father, in his old age, confederated with a gang of petty pilferers, and half defending (on detection) the practice, he may form some conceptions of our shame and sadness

on hearing from the lips of the aged Seth Williston this strange doctrine. We had understood that he had avowed similar sentiments ten years before, but with us it was among the facts, that some speak of, never to be believed though never so strongly attested! But to hear it from his own lips, with our own ears! We were sorry that we had taken that sad journey to Brooklyn. But so it was, and so it is, and what account are we to give of so inexplicable a phenomenon?

If Seth Williston were one of those fickle, slightly, shallow mountebanks that prate every thing and understand nothing; if he had formally renounced the theology of Hopkins and of Bellamy which he once so ably expounded, and so resolutely defended, or if he could fairly be put down among those deliberate and calculating hypocrites who will preach what, in no sense of the word, they can be said to believe, it would be easier to account for the phenomenon. No man—it may be presumed not even Dr. Williston, will undertake the task of reconciling the theology of Hopkins with the ethics of the American Board, now endorsed by him. Nor can it be questioned that Hopkins himself, so understood that theology that it identified him with modern abolitionists in his reasoning and his measures. More truly than any other man, he was the patriarch of the entire movement.

On looking over the whole ground, we know of only one way of accounting for the position of Seth Williston, and other ministers of that stamp, in respect to the slave question. *They are the victims of their ungodly ecclesiastical connexions.* No soundness of theological sentiment can shield the man that consents to maintain a standing in ecclesiastical bodies controlled and guided, in their activities, by worldly and time-serving men. Whoever puts his foot into those most cunning devised traps of the devil has but one way to preserve his integrity, and that is, to get out of them, with the loss of clerical caste, more formidable to most ministers than loss of life.—The orthodox formula of sound words may be retained, in such a connexion, it is true, and the long accustomed flow of agreeable sensations may accompany the repetition of the doctrines. But, for *all practical* purposes, a man might as well carry the utilitarian philosophy of Paley, of Godwin, of Hume, of Voltaire, of Dr. Taylor of New Haven (they are all essentially one) into such ecclesiastical bodies as the righteous theology of Paul, of Hopkins, and (theoretically) of Seth Williston, and Gardner Spring. The *practice* of the philosophy

of expediency, as exemplified in the policy of holding such absurd and unholy connexions, will sooner or later render all adverse theories a dead letter, though stereotyped in the language of holy writ—quite as definite as that of any modern creed.

A lesson for young ministers is wrapped up in the story of such men. You are entering the ministry, perhaps, with strong resolutions—with high hopes. Your theology, your ethics, your stand concerning revivals and reformation, may be of the most ultra stamp extant, for time now being. You may even be equal in these respects (possibly) to the youthful Seth Williston, and may have encountered as much opposition and persecution as did he. But PROGRESS enters into the definition of *perseverance*. As new questions arise, you must decide them all in the light of your *principles*, or you must virtually abandon them. No clerical bodies ever permit any such progress. You may think you can join yourself to them and be a free and a true man. For the argument's sake I will admit that at the present time such connexions are not more corrupting than they were when Seth Williston became enmeshed with them, and that you are as firm and strong a young man as was he. This is admitting a great deal. I will not say that one man in ten thousand, a Paul, a Luther, a McDowell, may not enter into such ecclesiastical connexions without being ultimately destroyed by them. But I will say that in nine cases of ten—yes—in ninety-nine cases of a hundred—the saved men under such circumstances, are those who, like Paul, Luther, and McDowell, are either strengthened to burst the green withes that bind them to those unholy conspiracies; or, in the merciful Providence of God, for their rescue, are thrust out of them. If you must needs be confederate with ungodly and worldly men, any where, let it not be in any ecclesiastical bodies controlled by them.

An Apt Comparison.—Conversing, one day, with a friend of ours, on the state of things in the churches;—"I will tell you," said he, "just what it makes me think of.—Some years ago, when I worked at cabinet making, I used to think, with myself, that I might divide my tools into three classes.—The first class were in excellent order; I could always depend on them to do the very work I expected of them, and they never disappointed me. I knew what to do with these. They were to be kept very choice, and used as I had occasion for them. The second class were altogether too bad to be used at all. I knew what to do with them. They were just fit to be thrown away, and I had no more trouble with them. But the third class gave me a great deal of trouble. They were not quite good enough to use, but hardly bad enough to be thrown away; and so I was continually marring and spoiling some nice piece of work with them.—

And just so it is," continued our friend, very gravely, "with most of the ministers I know of, now a days. It puzzles a body to tell what to do with them. They will preach along nearly half an hour, sometimes pretty well, till you really begin to think they are going to make something out of it. And yet there is not quite edge enough to them to put on the finishing, and so you have but a clumsy botch of it, after all. And what is going to be done with such a set of ministers I really cannot tell."

How our friend has diagnosed of his problem, we know not, nor whether he still continues in the dispensation of edgeless tools. But we are persuaded the comparison has a wider application than merely to ministers. There are churches, church members, and deacons that very nearly answer the same description. "Like people, like priest." Edgeless professors will be likely to have edgeless ministers, and there will doubtless be plenty of them all till the community has decided what estimate to make of them. One can scarcely fail to be reminded in this connexion, of those maxims of the Savior—"If the salt have lost its savor, it is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and trod under foot of men." "I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." The lack of salt, the lack of heat, the want of edge, appear to signify very nearly the same thing. If the sermon should have edge enough to cut the hearers to the quick, it would cause an "excitement" and "disturb the peace of the churches"—and your pointless ministers are too "prudent" to do this. Their sermons reveal to you their knowledge of the "truth in the abstract" and their want of fidelity and courage *apply* that truth to practical questions.—This is the philosophy, the natural history of pointless preaching in all ages of the church.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE
CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.
To June, 1848.

G. W. Durant, Rensselaerville,	\$1.00
W. Osborn, do	.50
T. Condon, Canastota,	1.00
J. W. Taylor, Bristol Centre,	1.50
H. Hamilton, Marion,	.50
J. B. Edwards, Oswego,	1.00
B. Lewis, do	1.00
G. S. Loomis, De Witt,	5.00
Mrs. Lombard, Elbridge,	.50
J. L. Wilson, Port Byron,	1.00
E. N. Bartlett, Marshall, Mich.	1.00
H. Grow, Philadelphia,	5.00
J. Pierpont, Troy,	1.00
C. Arnold, Honeoye,	.50
R. Temple, Reading, Massachusetts,	.50
H. H. Temple, do	.50
J. Sperry, Henrietta,	.50
M. Stickney, Lockport,	1.00
J. C. Telfr, Oberlin,	1.01
B. A. Tisdale, N. Y. Mills,	1.01
A. Coleman, Ellipticville,	1.00
W. B. Bush, Caledonia, Ill.	.50
L. Strong, do	.50
A. Beecher, Oberlin,	1.00
J. Steele, Scottsburg,	.25
C. Holmes, Mt. Morris,	.50
C. Gilman, Rushford,	.50
	\$32.49
Deduct Commissions,	1.90
	\$30.59

J. J. MATTISON, PRINTER,

at the ONTARIO MESSENGER Office, Cananahigua, N. Y.
Book and Job Printing of every description done with
promptness, accuracy and dispatch, and on the most reason-
able terms.

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. VI—No. 6.
WHOLE NUMBER, 76.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., JULY, 1848.

WILLIAM GODDELL, EDITOR
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 19.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers, and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services.—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services.—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

THE REV. DR. BALAAM,
AND HIS SUCCESSORS; OR PETHORISM, AN-
CIENT AND MODERN.

Of all the Doctors of Divinity we read of, a ancient history, this Balaam, the son of Beor, is certainly one of the most remarkable in many accounts, and note-worthy. He seems to have been, in some respects, the prototype of a large class of highly respectable Doctors of more modern times. His character, philosophy, and ethics, his measures, policy, and tactics, all mark him as a highly accomplished ecclesiastic, and well deserving the extensive reputation and commanding influence, he seems to have acquired. In a number of particulars, it is easy to specify the grounds of his great celebrity; and to trace, in the same specifications, the close resemblance between him and his successors in after ages. The Spirit of inspiration must have intended to give us a clue, in his history, to the main features of the entire clan, in all future time.

1. In the first place, in the very outline of the story, you perceive, clearly enough, that Balaam must have been altogether free from the taint of suspicion, on the score of "enthusiasm, fanaticism, ultraism, or radicalism," as those terms are now commonly employed. Otherwise, so illustrious a monarch as Balak the son of Zippor, chief magistrate and Generalissimo of the Moabites would never have thought of applying to him for aid, especially on such an emergency, when a horde of fugitive slaves and insurrectionists, just escaped out of Egypt and likely to overrun the surrounding states must needs be put down, and ecclesiastical co-operation was wanted in the enterprise. A conservatist, identified in all his associations with the upper classes of society, must the Rev. Doctor Balaam have been, or such a mighty prince as Balak could never have heard of him, or at least, could never have imagined him a fit tool for his purposes. "Sound to the core on the

subject of" popular emancipation from despotism must he have been deemed, and utterly incapable of rejecting golden presents from oppressors, or, "the rewards of divination" would never have been sent to him, from Balak, any more than to Elijah from King Ahab.

No one can doubt to what class of our modern Doctors, this same King Balak would have looked for co-operation, had he lived in our day, and been President of the United States, or Governor of Virginia.

2. And yet Dr. Balaam, like similar characters at the present time, was a professed worshipper and accredited prophet of the true God—who, (as he must have understood,) had declared himself the refuge of the oppressed. His dignity, his reputation, his fat perquisites, depended vitally, on his keeping up a creditable appearance of devotion and fidelity to the true God. It was this appearance that gave to his prophetic ministrations all their power, in the eyes of the people. They understood, as he did, that Jehovah was the true God, and as long as Balaam could persuade himself and his hearers, that he was a true prophet of Jehovah, so long his religion and his rewards, his conscience and his covetousness could go hand in hand.

Without a question it was because King Balak understood the position and the professions of the learned and renowned Doctor Balaam in these particulars, that he made this application to him to help him curse Israel, the professed people of Jehovah. If the army of Balak, who doubtless deemed Balaam a true prophet of Jehovah, could only be persuaded, by him that the God of the Hebrews himself had consented to curse them (and they may have heard rumors that he had been wroth with them,) their enthusiasm and courage would be raised to such a pitch as to make them well nigh invincible. A skillful General of the Moabites was this King Balak! With as subtle, as pious, and eloquent a divine as the far-famed Rev. Doctor Balaam of Pethor for his Chaplain, he could scarcely fail of success. For even Balak himself, it is quite evident, had a strong belief in the power of Jehovah, and was really persuaded that Balaam enjoyed his favor, and had influence with him.

3. The reputed piety, therefore, of Dr. Balaam, his reputation as a prophet of the

true God, constituted no small part of his capital, so to speak, his stock in trade, when he started from Pethor, on that angelous speculation, upon which his heart was intent and in which he hoped to bring his piety, his learning, his zeal, his talents, his reputation, his genius and his eloquence to a profitable market in the court and in the camp of King Balak.

4. And all this time, it seems evident that Balaam supposed himself a true worshipper and faithful prophet of Jehovah. Renowned ecclesiastics, had in reverence among all men for their superior sanctity and spirituality, are the last men to suspect any flaw in their own characters, or to doubt that their hearts are in accordance with their professions. "The scribes and pharisees trusted in themselves that they were righteous," and the confident language of Balaam addressed to God under circumstances of peculiar solemnity makes it evident he considered himself high in the divine favor,—precisely as many of his successors do at the present day. "A deceived heart" had "turned him aside."

5. And one cause of Balaam's self-deception arose, doubtless, from the false standard of virtue, of moral obligation, and of sound character, he had set up, and which his false philosophy, false metaphysics, and false ethics must have taught him.

It is not to be supposed that so learned and ingenious a casuist as the Reverend Doctor Balaam of Pethor was unskilled in the lore of that elaborate and plausible system of moral philosophy that has been so successfully cultivated by his successors.—Nor is it difficult, in looking over the story recorded of him in the Book of Numbers, with the commentary of Jude, to designate beyond mistake, the outlines of the theological school in the descendant at Pethor, under the auspices of whose famous prophets, for aught we know, a flourishing and popular Seminary may have been established. No one need hesitate in respect to the main features of Pethorism. Nothing ultra, nothing radical, nothing over-strained or stringent, too severe, too uncharitable, too denunciatory, or reckless, could have found favor in the academic shades of Pethor.

Had we time, we might be tempted to reduce a text book of Pethorian theology and ethics, from the tactics and policy of Balaam, as the sacred historian has record-

ed them. Suffice it to say that no one will charge on Balaam the fault of leaning towards the theology of "Utilitarianism" that troubles so many, now-a-days. All the distinguishing features of the Utilitarian philosophy, on the other hand, in unmistakable colors and in bold relief, are visible in the picture.

6. Assuredly, Balaam was not among those who err in being too stiff and uncompromising in their ethics, too scrupulous and exclusive in regard to their political associates, and religious condutors. Was not Balak a profess'd believer in Jehovah as well as Moses? And were not the Moabites the children of righteous Lot, the friend of Abraham? What harm then could there be in his accepting a call to so respectable a body of worshippers? To be sure, he understood that their course of activity was not altogether "right in the abstract;" (see Numbers Chap. xxii, 12,) and that some pretty strong divine prohibitions might be cited against his accepting the invitation, but yet it seemed desirable to secure and retain the high posts of honor and influence that Balak had in reserve for him, and could he not quote (see verse 20) as high an authority for the policy he wished to pursue, as even any of his modern successors have been able to find for their own vindication, in the sacred pages? Who could blame him for deciding so doubtful a case, (in which the divine messages seemed not easily reconciled with each other) in the light of that same philosophy of utility and expediency, which had always been recognised at Pethor, a philosophy just as trust worthy as it ever has been since so ably expounded by Bishop Law, Dr. Paley, Jeremy Bentham, Hume, Hobbs, Godwin, and Dr. Taylor of New Haven?

7. And, besides, in accepting the call to the chaplaincy of the host of Midian, who can doubt that his motive was "the great amount of apparent good" to be secured by his decision? Assuredly, it was a good thing to secure, in any lawful way, the rich presents and high promotion to be obtained of Balak. Would it not tend to "make him more studious, a more zealous preacher, yea, make him improve his parish, which was according to the mind of God?"—How greatly, too, might he extend his sphere of usefulness and increase his influence by this measure? If the Moabites were not altogether right in all their measures, they needed his presence and preaching so much the more. And what good could he do them if he was so stiff and self-righteous as not to go nigh them, when so politely invited?

Assuredly, to do and to secure so

much "good" must have been "a good and profitable design." If any one doubts it, let him study closely the argument of Mr. Manoy-love, in answer to the questions of By-ends, in the Pilgrim's Progress, by John Bunyan.

8. And let it be remembered, in this same connexion, that the Rev. Dr. Balaam set out on his enterprize with a fixed determination not to lower down or mutilate the message God had given to him, and this design he openly avowed, and made it the condition of his accepting the call. "If Balak" said he, "would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." In what stronger language could Balaam have disavowed any sympathy with the murderous design of the Moabites and their king? And might he not have pleaded that "ecclesiastical connexion will never, in a sane mind, be construed into sympathy with the body on any question when sympathy is distinctly disclaimed, and the avowed and known intent of the connexion is to effect a change in the sentiments and action of the body upon that particular question?" If this plea be valid now, as it is deemed to be, why should it not have been equally valid in the times of Balaam?

9. And mark what unusual force attaches to this plea in Balaam's favor, beyond what could commonly be urged in cases otherwise similar, at the present day. When Balaam entered on the work of the ministry in his chosen field, it does not appear that he swerved at all, so far as his preaching was concerned! He literally kept his promise to deliver, *verbatim*, the specific messages God had sent by him, the whole of them, and nothing else! And what could the most rigid ultraist demand more? In this particular, the parallel between Dr. Balaam of Pethor, and many, if not most of the prominent Doctors of the same theological school, at the present day, fails us entirely. In despite of all the enticements, the promises, the princely liberality, and finally, the displeasure of King Balak and the withdrawal of his patronage, he persisted in telling him the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in his preaching! In doing this, he knew he was forfeiting his lucrative and honorable station, he relinquished his long cherished hopes of promotion, and, so far as appears, the greater part, if not the whole, of his much coveted gold!

Who can point us to any modern Doctor of Divinity, of the Petherian school, of whom so honorable a testimony could be borne! Our American reformers would be in extracts with any of our modern Ba-

laams who should exhibit as much conscientiousness as this! "Denunciatory and uncharitable" as they are reputed to be, they would be likely to desert their old and tried friends with indecent haste for the sake of exalting so magnanimous and influential a convert to their cause (as they would deem him,) to the highest posts in their gift.

Important improvements, it must be confessed, have been made in the tactics of Petherism since the days of Balaam. The march of mind has been onward. The measures growing legitimately out of that philosophy are better understood, and more unscrupulously adopted. Eminent divines of that school can maintain their reputation and standing as true prophets of Jehovah, now, without the hazards and sacrifices that Balaam felt it necessary for him to encounter. They have made discoveries in the Petherian philosophy of which even Balaam himself, perhaps, never dreamed.

Their "Limitations of human responsibility" and their doctrine of "organic sin" enable them to be altogether silent in respect to the will of God, or the right and the true in the abstract, in cases where the policy of civil government is concerned. Had Balaam been in possession of these important improvements upon his own system of ethics, and had the Moabites among whom he labored, become sufficiently sophisticated and corrupted by the discoveries of these improvements, the reputation of Balaam as a true prophet of Jehovah might have been maintained at the court and in the camp of Balak, without the utterance of those unwelcome truths that cost him the royal patronage and favor. How gladly would the greedy Doctor have welcomed such discoveries, how gratefully would he have glided into the good graces of Balak, and instead of "setting his face toward the wilderness" or "returning to his own place," disappointed and chagrined, he might have moved in the very first circles with as much dignity as do many of his hot hearted successors at the present time, in our own country.

10. Another thing to the credit of Balaam, in all due impartiality, should be mentioned. However pliant in his ethics, however lax in his theology, and however gross and sensualized in his philosophy, he had the knack, for which so many of his modern imitators are equally distinguished, of making all his pliancy, laxity, and sensualism appear to harmonize, quite commendably, at least in "sidantish" eyes, with the skeleton of the most inflexible and unbending creed of orthodoxy, extant. The outlines of such a creed are sufficiently visible in the sketches given us of his preaching at

the Court of Balak. The supremacy of Jehovah, the comprehensiveness of his plans, the certain accomplishment of his purposes, the sure preservation and glorious triumph of his chosen, the inevitable, irreversible and intolerable doom of his enemies, the coming and the conquest of the Messiah! Which of the ancient prophets were more explicit or emphatic on these cardinal points than was Balaam? From what modern orthodox Presbytery, or Synod, or Association, or General Assembly could the venerable Dr. Balaam of Pethor, have been excluded, with such an orthodox creed, so eloquently enunciated before kings?—Was it nothing that Balak and his Nobles had listened to such orthodox and eloquent sermons from his lips? And what better testimony to the pungency and power of his preaching could we ask than the fact that Balak felt himself reproved and was enraged? In what section of our modern Pethordam shall we search, torch in hand, for the Divinity Doctors before whose faces, and under whose preaching the bloody Balaam of the times do thus quail and quake?

11. Nor let it be once imagined that this eloquent, impressive, and highly orthodox divine, was devoid of *feeling* in his preaching—that he doled out his didactic discourses with the apathy of a stoic or of an iceberg. Whatever, in this direction, may be alleged of some in our times who “run greedily after the error of Balaam for reward” such was not the fault of the eloquent Bishop of Pethor. He never preached without the most intense and almost uncontrollable feeling. *Not he!* Cold preachers, methinks, were little in repute then, even amid the thrones and tents of Midian. The most impassioned eloquence was then in vogue, and without it, the “rewards of divination” would have been scanty. He “saw the visions of the Almighty, falling into a trance” (from the extacy of his emotions,) “but having his eyes open.” If the deepest and most sublime and overwhelming emotions and sensations under a sense of the divine majesty of the truths he uttered could have made Balaam a true prophet of Jehovah, not Isaiah nor Daniel could have been more trust-worthy or more favored than he! Compare his glowing and joyous announcement of the coming Savior, the “Star out of Jacob” with the kindred paragraphs of Job—“I know that my Redeemer liveth”—and of the dying Jacob—“The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law given from between his feet, until Shiloh come!” Then say whether, in the matter of impassioned feeling, the prophet of Pethor was a whit behind them!

12. What, then, was “the error of Balaam?” “He loved the wages of unrighteousness.” His *heart*, (in distinction from his convictions and his emotions,) was going after its covetousness, all that time.—His philosophy of utility was no mere speculation of the intellect. It had taken possession of his heart. In his estimate, utility was virtue, expediency was duty, and gain was godliness. Enjoyment, not holiness was his supreme good. Of self denial, strictly speaking, he was ignorant. He sacrificed nothing for the good of others.—While relinquishing the favor and the gold of Balak he did it grudgingly, and went away sorrowful. His apparent obedience was the forced constraint of conscience, not the spontaneous outgushing of a benevolent and filial heart.

He “ran greedily after reward.” He knew, from the beginning, what was the will of God—what was “true and right in the abstract.” But he *hoped* to find that “under certain circumstances” God would permit him to swerve from it! His philosophy, in accordance with his selfish heart, had taught him to expect that under certain possible circumstances, God might peradventure consent to excuse him from “insisting on *all* that was right and true in political action,” and who could tell but this very matter of cursing Israel might be the very point in respect to which the claims of the “right in the abstract” might be waived, “just for this once.”

And so he multiplied his altars in every conceivable position: he builded them first here, and then there, in hopes of getting soon a new view of the subject; knowing well enough all the while, and admitting what was true and right in the abstract! By these cunning shiftings of his position, by his incantations and enchantments, by the sweet savor of his pious sacrifices and oblations, offered up in company and by request of a bloody monarch, by these artifices to make that murderous Prince appear to be a devout and zealous worshipper, by this ostentatious and empty piety at the expense of humanity, a piety cherished as an instrument of his own selfishness, he seemed to think it possible to impose upon Jehovah himself, and bribe him to hold his own principles in abeyance.

In all this he closely resembled the Pethorites of our nineteenth century who know how to build their altars in as many varied positions as he, and to carry on their mongrel worship in loving company with bloody despots, in as many varieties of ceremony and form. If the cause of crushed humanity, admitted to be right and just in the ab-

stract, cannot be spurned aside under one plea or pretence, another is dexterously and adroitly substituted in its room, if one course of ecclesiastical action fails to suppress the dreaded truth, another can be instantly put in requisition. If one interpretation of God's word cannot make of none effect the self-evidently right and true in the abstract, another can be resorted to, and yet another, till ingenuity is exhausted, and even once relinquished subtleties can again be resorted to, and so round in a ceaseless circle, but never finding the termination that Balaam did when “he went not, as at other times to seek enchantments, but set his face towards the wilderness.”

Had Balaam been surrounded by scores and hundreds of equally subtle clerical advisers, in regular ecclesiastical council organized and assembled, it is possible that he might have stood it out as long as they. He might have learned that “we may not, in all circumstances, insist on that which is abstractly right, i. e. as a test.”—“True Christian experience comes in and dividen among lawful things, i. e. decides what and how many of them shall, in a given class of circumstances, be insisted on.”—“We ought not to take up all the righteous measures of civil government as tests.” Thus fortified, it might have been easy for Balaam to have suppressed his testimony, persuaded, as he must have been, that Balak was “not able to bear it” at that time. He might have persuaded himself, (as he seems not to have done) that his earnest wishes were in accordance with God's word, and governed himself accordingly.

And thus, in a community as enlightened by the philosophy of improved Pethorism as is ours, he might have saved the “wages of unrighteousness” at least, and his reputation for piety, at the same time, (whatever might have become of his soul) as so many prudent and learned Doctors of Divinity are now doing.

Convenient Church Discipline,

OR, HOW TO SILENCE AND CRUSH TROUBLESOME ABOLITIONISTS IN THE CHURCHES.

At a time when Salutory Church Discipline against evil doers is notoriously and confessedly out of fashion, and Biblical criticism and moral philosophy are tasked to their utmost possible tension to find out apologies for such laxity, and even reformers are preaching up the duty of forbearance, charity, and continued fellowship for godly man thieves, and evangelical kidnappers,—precisely at such a time, (as the reflecting student of ecclesiastical history might have anticipated) all the usurped powers of the hierarchy are equally tasked

to cripple and intimidate the friends of liberty and primitive Church discipline. All over the free States, the process is going on, and has been, for years, while most of our reformatory ministers (mild or over-awed by their ecclesiastical entanglements) are still crying—"peace—peace"—"it is not time to succeed!"

Volumes of such facts as the following might have been collected within twelve or fifteen years past, had there been any profitable demand for that kind of literature, in our market. The story we tell in the words of a correspondent on whom we think we can depend.

"There is much force," says our correspondent "in what you are publishing on the subject of ecclesiastical despotism. The purity and liberty of the Christian Church are in more danger than most of its members are aware of. Even good men who have long exercised a controlling influence over the religious community are very loath to yield a particle of that ascendancy, and they will do great violence to the principles of religious freedom, rather than yield to the common people. I have had some experience for four or five years past. I have witnessed some most arbitrary ministerial acts, under the aristocratic form of Presbyterianism.

"A brother of a neighboring Church was brought before the Church Session, on a charge no less than that of *forgery* for the value of *ten pounds of wheat*, worth one dollar a bushel! The story was picked up by the Pastor, was prosecuted by the Pastor, the Session was be-fooled and overpersuaded by the Pastor, justice and truth were trampled in the dust, and the brother was convicted against all rules, and without a particle of evidence or even a single witness. I speak that which I know, for I was present. The case was carried to Presbytery on an appeal. The Church records relating to this trial, which were kept by the Pastor, were successfully *impeached*. The appeal was unanimously sustained (except one member was excluded from voting) upon every point without exception. The grounds of the appeal were irregularity, prejudice, want of testimony, and injustice. The case was so glaring and flagrant, that even the personal friend of the Pastor, who endeavored to sustain him by speeches and actions, did not dare to vote against the evidence adduced, and so to get out of it, he was excused from voting. In this case I witnessed the triumph of truth. The majority of the Presbytery meant to act right, but there were a number who would have sustained that Pastor if they dared to do it.

But mark! To save that Iago of a minister, after the vote was taken to sustain the appeal, some one hinted that it left *the Session* in an unfavorable place, and so the Presbytery *amended* the vote and added—"for reasons not reflecting on the Session"—when every ground of appeal *did* reflect on the Session, and was so urged before the Presbytery. Where was justice? The Pastor was shielded when he deserved the severest censure. The brother was restored, but the Pastor went home, and added insult to injury already inflicted, until his Session were ashamed of him and of their own conduct, and finally told him, in a little more than a year, that he had better leave, without any sympathy even from his professed friends.

"Having said so much, let me briefly state the pretended evidence against the accused brother. About six months before the charge was made, he had sold about 200 bushels of wheat at a neighboring town, at one dollar per bushel. The wheat was delivered at a mill in wagon loads, each load being weighed by the miller, as agent for the proprietor, and the amount put upon a little piece of paper in figures, and when money was wanted, these tickets were handed to the proprietor. The wheat was all delivered, and the cash received. Now, by some means, it was reported that this anti-Slavery brother had fraudulently altered one of the tickets from 1415 lbs. to 1425 lbs. making a difference of 10 lbs. Now, mark, the miller never saw the ticket after he gave it, so he could not say it was altered. The proprietor only knew that the figure 1 was altered to a 2, *with the same colored ink, and without any disguise*. The money was paid, and the papers taken by the proprietor, and this was the whole of the matter, until the foolish and contemptible story was out. Now, on the trial there was no living witness. This Pastor had gone, in a private manner, to persons, and obtained affidavits same before a magistrate, and some before a Commission of a Church Session, which Commission was appointed three weeks before the prosecution commenced, and of all this the defendant was kept in entire ignorance. And yet, the Pastor could dupe his Session into the belief that this was proper testimony. In this way a respectable man was nearly ruined, his wife, a very excellent woman, was nearly made crazy, under the torture of mind which she experienced."

So writes our Correspondent. We learn further that the gentleman, (a member of a Presbyterian Church, we believe,) who assisted this persecuted brother in bringing

his case before the Presbytery, and exposing this piece of mal-administration, incessantly assailed, on that account, by two or three Presbyterian clergymen and Church Sessions. If, in some way, they do not contrive to victimize him, it will probably be because the edge of Presbyterian power is getting a little blunted, in that particular locality, by such rough service.

We do not often think of recording the scores of similar incidents that, in one way or another, have come to our ears within a few years past. We have had other work to do, and our memory is not particularly retentive of such details which, like the narratives of fugitive slaves, become monotonous and confused, after having listened to so many of them. We thought it well enough to publish this account, as we had so full a statement of it before us, in reliable manuscript. It may serve to carry to distant parts of the world, and possibly to a generation or two that may come after us, some faint impression of the deceptive arts and knavish expedients by which, in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in the very heart of the American "free states (!)" respectable citizens and members of Churches are systematically hunted down for no real crime but that of sympathizing with the poor chattelized victims of Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist oppression, in the Slave States. The specimen we thus casually hit upon for publication, is, on several accounts, a particularly favorable one, for the dominant hierarchies. It is a case in which the intended excommunication was not reached, and in which the guilty persecutor was made to feel the reaction of his licentiousness. Rare specimen, in these respects! The characteristic prudence of the clan, forsook the very "reverend" gentleman when he selected as a victim, a farmer able to sell 200 bushels of wheat at once, on a charge of a forgery for 10 pounds of wheat, and who, (it seems) had an educated friend, well versed in the tactics of ecclesiastical persecution, to manage his case for him.

We are willing our readers in Europe, at the Sandwich Islands, and (may hap) in the next century, should know that we consider cases of this description to furnish, fair illustrations of the workings of the organized priesthoods of our times, against which we have assailed to raise the standard of accusation. If decent men, if Christians, if professed reformers, will continue to hug these pestilential carcasses, it shall be no fault of ours. One source of their deception is the almost universal impression that such cases are rare, except in our own neighborhood.

with the clergy of our own personal acquaintance. A volume or two of condensed facts of this kind, from eight or ten men—if any one would be at the trouble of compiling them—might dispel this delusion.

Misplaced Sensitiveness.

It is curious to notice the sensitiveness of our dignified conservatives and their apologetics, at the increasing want of confidence which the "fanatical ultralists and disorganizers" (as they affect to consider them) are supposed to manifest in respect to them.—How "uncharitable" to intimate or even to imply that Doctor Such-an-one is a time-server—that the minister of a certain Church and Parish shapes his course in reference to support to be retained by his silence and action—that this ecclesiastical body, and this Missionary Society pursue the line of policy they have chosen in respect to Nationalism in which the Churches are known to be implicated, for fear of losing the popular patronage and hazarding the unity and efficiency of their operations! What an unchristian spirit—it is said—do those men, who can have "no more charity" than to judge of "the wisest and best men in the country" in this uncourteous and denunciatory manner!

Just as though these same dignified gentlemen had not advertised us and the publisher and over again, that the very politico "uncharitably" imputed to them is by which they choose to be guided.—as though they had not exhausted all stores of their biblical exegesis, their logical acumen, their wit and smooth eloquence, to persuade us every body within the reach of their voice to act upon the very same policy has been described!

The gentlemen should know that if any has slandered them, they are the guilty persons themselves. In almost every variety of language, for a dozen years past, have been telling every body that lie to them, or that reads their writings, they are not the men to do what their sciences testify is right, unless, by a relation of consequences, they can persuade themselves that it is expedient and right to do so! And who, among all "uncharitable and denunciatory" ultralists that have assailed them so rudely, have intimated any thing worse of them than that?

Doctor Such-an-one is scandalized at the being called a time-server, but he enters into an argument, in almost the next breath, to prove that the present is not

the time in which to do that which he admits to be right, nor even to advocate the doing of it. Ask him his reasons and he will answer that the "public are not prepared for it," which is only saying, in equally intelligible language, that he would be ready to go with you, in the course you propose which he now condemns, if it were only popular, and if the majority of respectable people were only ready to go with him. This dictionary might tell him what name belongs to those who reason in this manner.

"Time-server.—One who adapts his opinions and manners to the times; one who obsequiously complies with the ruling power."—*Noah Webster*.

It is simply waging war with the English language to complain that men are called time-servers who will not say nor do what they admit to be "right in the abstract" because "the times" do not favor it—because the "people are not prepared for it."

The minister is most uncourteously suspected of acting with a sly reference to his salary, in holding back from a given moral enterprise. Who was it that first maligned him? Why! The prudent gentleman himself! His co-operation was invited. He professed great interest in the object—deep sympathy with the enterprise—and with those who were engaged in it—but—he was "very delicately situated"—it was an "exciting topic"—its agitation would "tear the Church all to pieces"—He must beg to be excused, just for the present. Does it need a reference to Webster's Dictionary to render this language into plain English?

The Ecclesiastical body cannot deny, (though its guarded and cautious language plainly betrays the strong desire to admit as little as possible) that here is something wrong—or very nearly wrong, in the Church or the Sect, something that has to be called an evil, nay, a wrong, a moral wrong, if not exactly a sin; something that is admitted to be "wrong in the abstract,"—at any rate, not "abstractly right"—but no definite action must be taken on the subject. Why? It would disturb the peace of the Church. Does any man of common sense, when he reads this, in the proceedings of a grave and learned ecclesiastical body, receive any different impression of the course pursued, than he does when he hears it said that the body declines action for fear of losing the popular favor, or of hazarding the unity and efficiency of the body? Point out—whoever can, the broad distinction between the story as told by *themselves*, and as told

by those who are regarded as being so very "uncharitable" for telling it.

The Missionary Board cannot do any thing that could be construed into a condemnation of Slave-holding. Why? It must stick to its "one idea" of sending the Gospel to the Heathen, and not suffer its councils to be distracted or its efficiency hazarded by any of these "exciting topics." In other words it must take such a course that the pro-slavery portion of the community shall not be displeased and withdraw their co-operation and patronage. This is the plain meaning of the language held, if it means any thing intelligible—any thing except sheer evasion. So all men understand it who take the pains to reflect on its meaning. Very well! Let them take their chosen course. But let them not raise the pusillanimous cry of "uncharitableness and denunciation"—because men listen to their language and re-echo it in bold, honest, Saxon English!

Why! The whole ethics of expediency—the entire philosophy of utility, from beginning to end, so constantly resorted to by the leading ecclesiastics of the country, at the present time, not only in defence of their own course, but as a directory of those who listen to their instructions, on all moral questions, is nothing more nor less than a system of deferring the Right and the True, for the sake of GAIN OR ADVANTAGE. As the greater includes the less, so does this philosophy include all the minor derelictions of principle that spring from it. Who has ever charged upon the conservative clergy of this country—who has ever charged upon the Jesuits—who has ever charged upon any body, any where, or any *when*, a giving up of truth and righteousness, for the sake of gain, or advantage, that is not included in this philosophy—that could not be justified by it?

If our learned ecclesiastics would not be charged with being time-servers—with seeking the praise of men—with deferring the Right for the *advantageous*—the *holy* for the *profitable*—the *equitable* for the *popular*—they must cease charging THEMSELVES with it, by the act of teaching to OTHERS the philosophy that has its definition and its essence in its commendations of the same thing.

Their sensitiveness should be directed in another channel. Instead of being scandalized by the name, they would do well to abandon the thing.

If they will not do this, then let them take the other horn of the dilemma. Let them glory in being time-servers, who abandon the right because the multitude or the

respectable are not, at present, on the side of the right. Let them do this, in the use of the same philosophy and ethics by means of which they are so constantly laboring to persuade others to hold the *right* in any-
 ance for the sake of the *expedient*. If that philosophy be trust worthy let them not betray their shame and sensitiveness when the practical exemplification of it is attributed to them. If it be good enough for their hearers to practice upon, it is good enough for themselves. Let them cease to cry out against the "uncharitableness" and "denunciation" of those who merely impute to them a practical conformity with their own laborious teachings.

When we say of any man that he is a time-server, that he prefers gain to godliness, advantage to virtue, ease to equity, peace to purity, enjoyment to holiness, and honor to honesty, no man that understands the meaning of language can suppose us to mean any thing more or less than that the man is a consistent and practical disciple of the philosophy that exalts happiness over holiness, that makes utility the foundation of virtue, that teaches the expediency and propriety of abandoning the *Right*, from considerations of *advantage*.

"Personalities."

"He means me"—"Somebody has been telling the preacher about me"—exclaim scores and hundreds, and thousands, under the pungent preaching of the Gospel. This is the sort of preaching under which, if at all, impenitent men are to be reached, and cut to the heart. Those who heard Peter, on the day of Pentecost, must have thought he meant *them*. How important, how unclerical, and undignified to deal in personalities, after such a sort! Prudent and dignified preachers never intend hitting their hearers. They would blush, bow, apologize, and ask pardon, should a respectable pew-holder suspect any such thing of them. Editors, especially clerical ones, are learning to be as polite as preachers.

Never to impeach any gentleman's motives, is a well known maxim of genteel, fashionable life. A maxim that now commonly reigns in the pulpit and in the Editor's chair. By the side of another kindred maxim, snugly ensconced in the same resting places, it has power to disarm truth of its terrors. That maxim is, that it is of little or no consequence what a man's *motives* are, provided only that his motives are praiseworthy.

Here then, we have the sovereign recipe, with which to plaster over men's consciences. Gentlemen's motives are always to be

accounted good, to begin with. Here endeth the first lesson. And where the motive is only good, the action, however devilish in itself, becomes pure and heavenly! Here endeth the second lesson. Putting the two Lessons together, we readily people heaven, earth and hell with seraphs (saving and excepting, always, the fanatical ultraists, who, not being gentleman, are not included in the maxim)—and thus the preachers of Universal Salvation are left far in the back ground, by many a Doctor who forfeits not his evangelical and orthodox standing.—There are no "personalities"—with the exception already noticed—from the pulpits and presses over which these celebrated maxims preside.

A great part of the benefits of a living ministry consists in its adaptation to apply the truths of religion and morality in the very way that is commonly accounted *personal*. Whoever has a bible in his hands can learn its doctrines at his leisure, by his own fireside. What he wants of a preacher is to apply to himself personally, these well known truths, as an impartial hy-stander is able to apply them, but as every man's self-love makes it difficult for him to apply it, in his own case.

A similar remark may be applied to living writers, whether editors, contributors, or authors. To apply truths when and where they are needed, is the great work of the living writer.

We have, long since, settled it in our own minds, that we can never do much good either by preaching or writing, without being what people call *personal*. And whenever we do succeed in hitting the mark, we always expect to hear complaints about "personalities." Many a time, a single paragraph of ours has been claimed as *personal*, in a great many different *localities*, far apart from each other, far distant, some of them, from our habitation, and where we had no personal acquaintances. Then it happens that somebody is suspected of having furnished us with particulars of which we had never heard a syllable. In one or two cases, persons thus suspected, have been threatened with a Church trial, on a charge of slander, and we have been obliged, in all good conscience, to testify that we know nothing of the accused, had never received a scrap of intelligence from him, and knew nothing of the local circumstances supposed to have been alluded to in our publication.

Very recently, we have come under the imputation of being "*personal*." The article in our April number headed "Suspicious Spirituality" has been claimed as applying in quite a number of different locali-

ties. "He means me"—or "It means our Minister" has been repeated concerning this article, in neighborhoods which we had never visited, and of which we were altogether ignorant. We learn this, in part, from an itinerating brother, visiting different sections of the country, and who has been much amused to meet with the complaint so frequently, in his travels. We have no disclaimer to make. We did mean some of them. Yes, we meant all of them, and sometimes as many more who have probably claimed the picture, or had it claimed for them by their friends:—to say nothing of scores and perhaps hundreds who—wretched as it may seem of getting a copy of the mirror that was designed for them.* Had we never seen any *original*, it is not likely that we should have succeeded in drawing so exact a picture. "But does the Editor mean me?" Yes! we do mean you. We mean every man whose own conscience prompts him to make the enquiry. The position is an unsafe and a guilty one. Look no time in getting out of it, and you will then bless God for the "*personalities*" that now trouble you.

Inherent Sinfulness.

There has been a good deal of dispute between abolitionists and their opponents about the inherent sinfulness of slave holding:—but it comes out, at last, that the real controversy is in respect to the inherent sinfulness of any thing.

The popular philosophy, pervading almost all our rival theologies, and fusing them ethically, into one, makes nothing inherently sinful, in itself, but sinful only under circumstances that produce what this philosophy calls mischief; and in this same mischief, too, according to this same philosophy, is wrapped up all the ill desert, and the punishment of sinning.

A man may do what he pleases, provided he can only contrive to prevent his doing any mischief. He may steal a sheep, for good motives; that is, for the purpose of giving good with it, and if nobody has to be hungry or cold, in consequence of it—if nobody finds it out, and no "excitement" is up about it, to "disturb the peace of the Churches" and "divert attention" from the godly work of soul saving; it is no very great matter. "The sin,"—as Paddy O'Flannegan instructed his son, when he whipped him for stealing—lies, "firstly, secondly, and thirdly, in getting caught. In it, in getting a sore back in consequence,"—which," as our very philosophical orthodox hath it, "no decent Christian body should ever be aghast over." The matter

man stealing is to be estimated, (so our Doctors of Divinity teach us,) very much by the same rule, only with this difference; this business of man-stealing is so much more honorable than that of sheep stealing, that the getting caught in it would do no special "mischief," provided the Slaves were kindly treated, were it not for the troublesome fanatics, who get up such an "excitement."

Unfortunately, our reformers, not a few of them, are almost as deeply implicated in this philosophy, as the conservatives. Certain classes of them who have been loud enough, in times past, in their assertions of the inherent sinfulness of Slave holding are giving us reason to doubt whether they intelligently believe in the inherent sinfulness of any thing. Nearly all the prominent advocates of the abolition of the gallows have reasoned as though they thought the ill desert of the murderer was next to nothing at all; and as though every thing in the way of punishment beyond the prevention of "mischief," was to be set down to the account of revenge and sheer malice!

Moral ideas, strictly speaking, seem scarcely to enter into the conceptions of these philosophers, whether called radicals or conservatives. The phrase "inherent sinfulness of slaveholding," has no distinct meaning, in the presence of such a philosophy, which fully accounts for and endorses the dogma that the "mischief," of slaveholding, and not slaveholding itself, should be called sinful. Paul saw "the exceeding sinfulness of sin." The modern philosophy instead of this, discovers only the mischievous effects of mistaken calculations!

"A Little too Late."

"The Lord is not slack," says an inspired apostle. "Be ye followers of God,"—says another divine messenger. The Lord our God is a punctual God. The planets are the wheels of his chronometer, and he never allows them to be behind the time, the ten thousandth millionth part of a second. He made an appointment ages ago, to appear in a certain point in the heavens, on the wing of a comet, or, perchance, on the car of a certain planet, gliding athwart the sun's disc,—in such a year, in such a month, on a certain day of the month, at such an hour, minute and second, "true time." Assembled astronomers from different nations, at a convenient spot, with their powerful telescopes, duly adjusted, are watching, in breathless silence, to witness or to impugn the punctuality of a God! "Will he come?" "Has the time arrived?" "No,—It lacks thirty seconds." "Give us the signal when it expires." "It is given; and still, the pre-

sumed traveller is not there! "Nay—but it is!" And the divine punctuality is honored!

Christian! Is *this* God, *your* God?—Are you a follower of *Him*? Are you? Do you imitate, so far as you are able, the sublime, the glorious punctuality of your Great Father? Or, are you noted for being always "behind the time?" At the praying circle—at the Sabbath worship—nay, at the Bank, where your promissory note is to be honored—at the polls, where crushed humanity is waiting for your mandate—wherever you have given your pledge to meet a fellow man and he is depending on your veracity and waiting for you—how is it with you? Are you "slack concerning your promise" wasting your brother's precious time, as well as your own?

To fail in punctuality is to fail in veracity: It is to become a covenant breaker: It is to forfeit your word: It is to divorce the holy union, Heaven imposed between the word and the deed.

"Time is money." You would scorn to steal a shilling of your neighbor's silver. Will you pilfer from him that same shilling's worth of time? Can you be an honest without being a punctual man?

Time is much more than money—It is life! Should you rob the *whole* of your neighbor's time, you would rob him of his *whole life*. You would be a Slaveholder. What portion of that same life can you innocently take away from him, while he waits your coming, beyond the appointed time?

Time is even more than life itself. Time is Eternity; for Eternity hangs suspended upon it. Yet he who fails in punctuality squanders time and mutilates eternity!

Among the glorious attributes of the Deity, punctuality holds a high place. His promise has never yet, even for once, failed! Among the god-like virtues of the righteous man, punctuality is a priceless gem. His word is like the word of his God. He promises "to his own hurt and changes not."

Did you never ponder the history of the busy bustling, hurried, unhappy man, who went through life, arriving at every point of his earthly pilgrimage five minutes "too late," and consequently dying five minutes "too soon?"

"If I have told you of earthly things," said the Savior, "and ye believe me not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?" If, every where else, the man is "a little too late" how can he be in season with "oil in his lamp," watching and ready for the coming of the Great Master? If habitually too late, at his heaven-appointed tasks here on Earth, how shall he be in

season for the great reckoning above? Is it not, here "in the body" and in the midst of our daily activities, among the natural relations of life, that our moral habits are to be moulded, our characters formed, and our destiny settled? And if so, how can one be slack in his duties and yet sound in his religion? Or will the dilatory man, who cannot be trusted to keep his appointments in worldly things, be likely to be more punctual (where most men are *less* so) in his transactions with his God—in his attention to heavenly things? If "unfaithful in the unrighteous mammon, who shall commit to you the true riches"? Or what marvel that those conversant with religious awakenings bear testimony that men lacking in promptness and punctuality in the common concerns of life, can very seldom be brought to a *present* decision on the great question of serving God *now*?

A want of punctuality! Who does not know that the great question of becoming or of not becoming a Christian, is to be determined just here? All men *intend* to serve God and to save men, at last. "Now is the *accepted* time." But they are not *quite* ready *now*! Under the sermon, they must wait till the closing prayer. During the prayer they must wait till they go home. And then they must wait till they do this—till they do that—and so on, till they die.—They are "a little too late"!

Punctuality—why! Here hangs the great controversy between God and the demons that possess our bewitched race.—"Torment us not before the time."—"Yet a little more sleep." When humanity is in chattelhood, and the Churches rivet the chains, and the cry is heard—"Break every yoke"—the response is still re-echoed—"The time is not yet." Wait a few centuries more! Only fifteen hundred years has the Church had to learn self evident truth.—She is "waiting for more light"—with every avenue closed *against* light. "The time is not yet"!

"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

"Yet a little more sleep—a little more slumber—a little more folding of the hands to sleep."—"The time is not yet"!

For the Christian Investigator.

Four Puzzles

I. If a man admits that Slavery is sinful, and also teaches that all men ought to repent of all sin immediately, how can he be opposed to the immediate abolition of slavery?

II. How can one who is "as much opposed to slavery as any body," continue to sustain it in the church and in the nation, as much as any body?

CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

NEW SERIES, VOL. VI—No. 7.
Whole Number 77.

HONEOYE, ONTARIO CO., N. Y., AUGUST, 1848.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor
AND PUBLISHER.

"The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times."—DANIEL, ix, 25.

THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR

TWELVE NUMBERS IN A VOLUME.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, OR AS OFTEN AS PRACTICABLE.

TERMS.—Subscriptions for one year, or the twelve numbers, 50 cents, always in advance, and free of postage.

Any person who will procure four subscribers and forward the money without expense to the publisher, shall have one copy for his services;—Or, if procuring six subscribers, shall have two copies for his services;—Or, if procuring ten subscribers, shall have four copies for his services.

SERMONS FOR THE TIMES.

SERMON IV.

CHRIST'S TEST OF WISDOM AND OF FOLLY.

"And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock."

"And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it."—MAT. vii. 24—27.

Thus closed the wonderful sermon of Christ on the mount, the power and authority of which astonished the multitudes who heard him. So familiar have the words become to us, that, instead of hearing them with astonishment, we scarcely apprehend their true meaning.

The dust and darkness of antiquity that gather over the sacred pages, while they add to our vague veneration of them, obscure at the same time, our perception of their import, and we almost deem it a sacrilege to examine them with the minuteness of critical inspection.

But it is this very propensity of mankind to admit, tacitly, and yet to perceive dimly, the truth of divine revelation, that renders the expositions of the living preacher the more needful. A just paraphrase that shall modernize the sacred text, that shall translate into the vernacular tongue the living spirit of the lively oracles, suggests to us, not infrequently, our first conceptions of the true meaning. It was partly on this account, perhaps, that the Jews, who well knew the words of their prophets, knew little or nothing of the truths they insisted on, till teachers arose, who had drunk deeply into the same spirit that had inspired the scriptures, to unfold to them their true import.

No language can be plainer than that of the text we have selected, yet nothing is more certain than that it is repeated by dignified and learned ecclesiastics, from Sabbath to Sabbath, who are ready to do-

uble as madmen, all those who presume to utter, with any appearance of sincerity, and in the phraseology of our own times, its most evident and undeniable import.

To test this, we have only to expound the text, in its most obvious light, and apply it, in all its practical bearings. In order to do this, we must so modernize and localize this simple, yet magnificent paragraph, as shall bring it into the ethical discussions of our own age and nation. We cannot hope to make the language more clear and intelligible—perhaps no other phrases could be equally so—but it is needful to present the sentiment in a new dress, that it may be ascertained whether it is the thought itself, or only its outward garb, that gains our attention. If this can be done with fidelity, the paragraph may perhaps astonish our Anglo-American ears, as much as, in the original, it did the ears of the Jews, who first heard it.

EXPOSITION OF THE TEXT.

What then, were those "sayings" of Christ which they had just heard? And what was that "doing," or not doing of those sayings, of which the Savior here speaks?

No one will deny that the sermon on the mount is mainly occupied with compendious and condensed statements and illustrations of the elementary and fundamental principles of religion and morals. This feature of this discourse of the divine carpenter of Nazareth has won for it a more solid, enduring, and extensive reputation than has ever yet been awarded to any other discourse that ever fell from the lips of a son of Adam. All thinking men, of all nations and ages, to whom it has been carried, are ready to recognize in it the most profound and yet self-evident, the most exact and yet comprehensive, the most sublime and yet most simple theory of moral and theological science that the world has ever yet seen.

From beginning to end, it is one pure, living, breathing stream of moral and spiritual philosophy—one unbroken golden chain of glorious first principles, that shine, as it were, in their own light, transparent, yet adamant, the sun-light of Paradise, the pillars of the divine throne, the basis and the atmosphere of all true holiness and virtue.

The discourse opens with brief declarations of the inherent blessedness of sound

character, and of those who are the possessors of it—of the poor in spirit—of the penitent mourners—of the meek—of those who hunger and thirst after the True and the Right—of the merciful—of the pure in heart—of the peace-makers—of those who are villified and derided for their unwavering adherence to the True and the Right.

From this, as from a starting point, the Great Teacher proceeds to propound an authoritative law, one great principle after another, with just so much of specification and detail as was necessary to illustrate and confirm the principle; interweaving so much of review and commentary upon other teachers as was necessary to set his system and theirs in marked contrast, and denouncing with severity, as wolves in sheep's clothing, the teachers whose fruits did not correspond with their fair professions, whose measures and expedients were not in harmony with their correct theological principles. He then extends the same sentence of condemnation to all who profess allegiance to those principles, calling him "Lord! Lord!" while their activities are not brought into subjection to those principles. And finally, he closes his discourse with the words of our text, in which, adverting to the "sayings" he had just uttered, to those declarations of fundamental first principles which he had all along been propounding, as authoritative, he declares that the truly wise man is he who, having understood and acknowledged those principles, adhered to them resolutely and unreservedly in his practice:—while the foolish man was he who, perceiving and admitting the truth of those principles, adventured, from his own notions of policy or expediency to diverge from them in his activities.

Can it be questioned that this is a fair exposition of Christ's words in our text?—What did those "hear" who listened to his "sayings" but the fundamental first principles of religion and morals?

What could Christ mean by their "doing" those sayings but their adhering to those principles in their practice? And in what manner could they fail to "do" those sayings but by failing to reduce those principles to practice?

The sentiment of the text then, generalized, and translated into the technicalities of our times, and into the phraseology in which moral controversies of the present the

ent day are conducted, is evidently that:—

True sanity and wisdom consist in following implicitly, and without deviation, the known and admitted principles of religion and morality in all the arrangements and activities of human life. While folly and insanity consists in yielding to any of those inducements which would tempt men to any practice involving the least departure from them.

Or—more briefly still. The wise, the sane man, is he who always does that which he sees to be Right and True, in the abstract:—but the fool, the madman, is he who presumes to do otherwise.

How many of our modern exponents would recognize the sentiment of the text, in this new dress? Which of them will attempt to show wherein and why our exposition of it is not the correct one?

THE SENTIMENT VINDICATED.

As this pointed declaration of the Savior according to the paraphrase we have now given of it, stands in direct and striking contrast with the ordinary teachings of our modern theological schools, and the favorite maxims of our principal ecclesiastical leaders, we will proceed to vindicate the sentiment of that declaration by an appeal to the reason and common sense of mankind in general, especially of those accustomed to deep reflection and efficient action.

1. Every science rests upon certain fundamental first principles by which the science is ascertained and defined. These principles shine in their own light, and they form the basis of all correct reasoning on the topics which the science involves.

All the sciences may be applied, more or less directly, and extensively, to the practical purposes of human life, and in this adaptation we perceive, at once, their truthfulness and their value.

In order thus to apply any particular science, it is found necessary to follow implicitly, without deviation, and with the most scrupulous care and exactness, the fundamental principles of the science, and this is the indispensable condition of success, in the practical application of them.

In nautical astronomy, for instance, no one expects to be benefited by the science in the guiding of ships at sea, unless, in all his nautical observations, and mathematical calculations, the navigator adheres as closely as possible, to the fundamental principles of the science with which he has to do.—The least deviation vitiates the whole process,—and exposes him to shipwreck. In the science of mechanism, in the various applications of chemistry to the processes of agriculture and manufacture, in the appli-

cation of steam, of electricity, or of any of the known powers or principles of nature for the production of desirable results, the same observation holds good.

To fail of applying the principle, wherever it belongs and is appropriate, is to fail of deriving from the principle, the benefits sought. The mere knowledge and verbal recognition of the principle is of no value, any further than it is actually applied.

He is the sane person, the wise man, the true philosopher, the skillful practical man, who closely and implicitly follows the principles of the science he would press into his service. All useful inventions and discoveries that are not purely accidental, owe their origin to this close adherence to principle. And he is the foolish man, the dreamer, the visionary, or (what is worse) the quack, the mountebank, the pretender, the cheat, the impostor, who, while dabbling in experimental philosophy, attempts, proposes, expects, pretends, or promises any useful discoveries in the physical sciences or beneficial applications of them, without following as closely and as implicitly as possible, the principles of the science under the jurisdiction of which he is operating.—There is no exception to this universal rule.

2. Now, what is thus universally true, in respect to all the sciences must be emphatically true of the Science of Morality and Religion, which is the central, the all inclusive Science, if indeed there be any such science at all, or any comprehensive and fundamental principles of morality and religion, on which a rational being may depend,—in other words, if every thing like certainty or trustworthiness in religion and morals is not to be scouted as vain and delusive!

Our Colleges, our Theological Seminaries, our schools of philosophy, of religion, and of civil polity, nay, our common civilized world's literature, every where, recognizes, and teaches, in some way, what, by common consent, is denominated Moral Philosophy, Moral Science, Theological Science. Nor is it altogether forgotten that this science, like all the other, the minor sciences, has its fundamental first principles, of sufficient importance, to be laboriously studied, of sufficient clearness and certainty to be understood, of sufficient authority to be of some practical value, of sufficient dignity to be taught, too, and at an expense denoting somewhat of confidence in the teaching, and of the practical benefits to be derived from it.

More than all this—the fundamental principles of moral and theological science somewhat in detail, and reduced to some-

thing like order and system, are spread out before us, by our teachers, propounded as authoritative, and in certain favorite directions, (when no prudential considerations appear to forbid it) they are applied to not a few of the practical purposes to which they are obviously appropriate—just as though, like the principles of all the other sciences, they were to be followed.

All this points us in a direction indicating the soundness of our exposition, and corroborating the sentiment we have derived from our text. All this looks as tho' it were the part of true wisdom to follow as closely and implicitly as possible the fundamental principles of religion and morals.

Otherwise, we must say that there are no marked analogies, but, contrawise, the most decisive violations of analogy, between all the other sciences and that science of morals, which, if it has any existence, is, of necessity, the centre, the essence, the comprehension, the ultimatum of them all. We must say that the God of the material universe is not the God of the moral world, or that he has failed to adjust the laws that govern the one to the laws that govern the other, inasmuch that our success, in the common activities and concerns of life depends upon our disregard, to a certain extent, of the moral laws of our Creator. And to say this, would be equivalent to a denial that anything like scientific certainty is to be expected in the department of morals; or that there is any such thing as moral and theological science.

And this would be downright skepticism in morals, as palpable as any thing ever broached by Tindall or Hobbs, or Hume. To be "skeptical" is to be "hesitating to admit the certainty of doctrines or principles." There have been skeptics in respect to the other sciences as well as in respect to the science of theology, and their skepticism has always consisted in their doubting the principles of the sciences in question, or, doubting whether those principles could be depended upon, as connected with, or as securing, the appropriate results attributed to them. Thus, he is a skeptic in respect to nautical astronomy who doubts that the principles of that science may be safely depended upon, when closely followed, to guide the mariner at sea. He is the skeptic in respect to chemistry who doubts that the principles of chemistry closely followed will produce the appropriate results attributed to them. He is the skeptic in respect to electricity who doubts that the principles of that science closely

followed, will produce their appropriate and promised results. Just so, he is the skeptic, in morals and religion, who doubts that the principles of religion and morality, closely followed, will produce their promised and beneficial results.

The scriptures everywhere treat the fundamental truths or principles of religion and morals, not as probable, conjectural, or hypothetical, but as fixed and certain realities; in other words, they claim that those principles constitute a science, as reliable and just worthy as any of the natural or physical sciences. This must be true, if the facts and principles to be recognized as pertaining to the unseen and spiritual world are as real, as permanent, and as significant and important as those that pertain to the material world, and if our Creator has as kindly and as wisely provided for the wants and necessities of our spiritual natures as he has for our corporeal wants and necessities. Every reader of the scriptures will recall to mind, here, the marked precedence given by them to the spiritual over the material, in respect to the permanency and the certainty of the laws or principles that govern them, as well as in respect to the importance and durability of the effects resulting from them. "The things seen," are represented as "temporal," temporary, "but the things unseen" are characterized as "eternal." "Heaven and earth shall pass away" said the Great Teacher—"but my words"—the great principles of religion and morality I have taught you "shall not pass away." In the discourse containing our text, and in the very midst of his authoritative announcement of these principles, as the irrevocable law of his kingdom, he says, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle of the law shall in no wise pass, till all be fulfilled." These principles he came to magnify and make honorable. The whole plan and work of redemption, the great propitiatory sacrifice, in particular, are based on the fact that God cannot compromise moral principle, not even for purposes of mercy, and that forgiveness can only be exercised in such a manner as shall harmonize it with the claims of moral principle.

Just as certainly, therefore, as the God of nature is the author of the Scriptures, and the teacher of the fundamental principles of religion and morality, they reveal to us—just as certainly as there is any reasonableness or authority in the divine law, any grace or wisdom in the gospel—just as assuredly as the sublime philosophy of our Lord's sermon on the Mount is not mere fanaticism and rant, a visionary theory, an

idle speculation, or a dreamy sentimentalism, just as certainly are those principles to be followed as exactly and as implicitly as possible, by all who would obtain from the use of them, the great ends they propose.

To say otherwise is either to charge those great principles with imperfection and folly, or else it is to utter the grossest absurdity and self-contradiction. It is to say that Truth may be followed so closely as to become transformed into Error, or that a divorce has been effected between Truth and beneficial accomplishment:—that a certain amount and degree of falsehood, ie, for practical purposes, to be preferred to un-mixed Truth—and all this, too, in the department of morals and religion, where the false, one would suppose, should be held in the most marked and indignant abhorrence.

The light in which the inspired writers regard the truths, the doctrines, the testimonies, the precepts, the commandments, the statutes of the Lord, which are identical with the "sayings" of Christ, the first principles of sound morality and pure religion, we are not left to conjecture. Every where they exalt and extol them as their light, their lamp, their directory, their guide, enlightening the eyes, making wise the simple, converting the soul, rejoicing the heart—more desirable than gold, yea than much fine gold, sweeter also than honey or the honey comb, in the reverent following of which there is great reward:

3. We further vindicate the sentiment of our text, as already expounded, by observing that the great principles of morality and religion which shine so conspicuously in our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, are identified with the essential nature and immutable character of the Great Author of our being. They are the ground work of his moral law, and embody its very essence.—They are the pillars of his own throne.—they comprize the vitality of his authority—they furnish the rule and reason of his own actions—they suggest and determine all his methods of operation,—they are the end of his ultimate designs. So nature and conscience may teach us. So the Bible, every, certifies us. The Lord our God is a righteous God: Justice is the habitation of his throne—the sceptre of his kingdom is a right sceptre—his precepts concerning all things are right—his judgments are true and righteous altogether. His kingdom is a kingdom of righteousness. The Lord maintaineth the Right.

Though God does sometimes depart, in his activities, from those "laws of nature" so called, that lie at the basis of the physical sciences, for the purpose of promoting

those high moral ends to which all the outward frame work of the material universe is subservient, yet he never departs from any one of the foundation principles of moral law, and he will forever and invariably conform all his activities to them, when the earth and the planetary system shall have been dissolved; when the elements shall have melted with fervent heat, and when the "laws of nature" that now regulate them shall exist only in the annals of the past, in the records of Time.

To affirm then, as our exposition of the text does, that it is the part of true wisdom to follow as closely as possible the fundamental principles of morality and religion, and that it is the definition of folly and madness to refuse or neglect doing so, we only say that it is wisdom to follow God, and folly to refuse or neglect to follow him—we only say it is wise to form our characters on the model of the divine character, and foolish to do otherwise—that it is safe and practical to shape our activities by the same rule by which our Creator shapes his activities, and it is folly and madness to do otherwise. We say that success is to be secured only by proposing the same end that God proposes, and seeking that end by the same methods; while disaster, defeat, and overthrow, must inevitably result from proposing any other ends, or resorting to any other methods.

When charged with madness and fanaticism for maintaining this position, we quote the sentiment of our Savior in the text, to show that the fanaticism and madness are on the other side of this controversy. We affirm that there is no delusion on earth more palpable and lamentable than that which attempts to secure beneficial result by deviations, in any direction, from the Right and the True in the abstract. We charge upon those who invite us to do so, that they take the position of skeptics in morality and religion—that they betray their want of confidence in the great principles of truth and righteousness revealed to us: that they are unphilosophical in their speculations, and unscientific in their activities:—That they act the same grotesque and ludicrous part that an Arkwright, a Franklin, a Fulton, a Bowditch, a Sir. Humphrey Davy, or a Morse would have acted, if, (instead of reverently and implicitly following, as closely as possible, the ascertained principles of the sciences they sought to wield for useful purposes,) they had deliberately and knowingly departed from those principles at certain points in their experiments, to avoid the expenses and labor of a closer adherence to them, or to

populate the patronage of the great, or the co-operation of the multitude who might be prejudiced, or unprepared to follow implicitly the *principles* by which the operations of nature are conducted! We point to the desolations all around us, to the temple of our God in ruins, to the darkness of a world lying in wickedness, to the intolerable burdens and nuisance of a disjunct state, and of a corrupt church, brooding like an incubus upon the bosom of bleeding humanity; all over our nominal Christendom, in evidence of the shallowness of their philosophy, the hollowness of their pretensions, the impudence of their quakeries! And we proclaim to the wide world that its miseries can never be relieved till the chantry is exposed, the delusion dispelled, the madness thoroughly cured. There is no insanity in Bedlam more dreadful than that which dreams of securing beneficial results in the moral world by any other process than the most rigid adhesion to the great principles that authoritatively control the moral world under the government of Him who created it upon the model of those principles, and who will never sanction the least possible departure from them.

4. We proceed further, and affirm that it is as impious as it is absurd, as atheistical as it is unphilosophical, as anti-christian as it is insane, to say (as it is said, in high places,) that the great principles of Truth and Righteousness, of morality and religion, can be followed too closely, or with an intensity indicating an aberration from right reason. These principles are the perfection of reason itself, all variation from them is a departure from reason, and "madness is in the heart" of those who affect to be wise in departing a hair's breadth from them! God never departs, for one moment, nor in the least conceivable degree, from the line of conduct demanded by strict moral principle, nor is it possible that he should regard those who do knowingly deviate from them in any other light than as rebels against his authority—conspirators against his throne and against himself. There is no rebellion against God, the core and essence of which do not consist in this very thing.

Until men become wiser and better than God, their whole wisdom will consist in conformity to his will:—their characters, to be of any value, must be modelled after his character. But his will and his character are wholly conformed to the principles of Righteousness and Truth.

All the virtue or holiness in the universe consists in strict conformity with those principles. All those who are sanctified are

sanctified through the truth, that is, by the power of holy principle, upon their hearts and their lives. And perfect, unvarying, undeviating harmony with those principles, in reflection and action, is all the moral perfection or sanctification of which the mind can conceive. What then do those teachers of moral philosophy, those expounders of gospel sanctification mean, who invite us to compromised moral principle, to deviate from what they admit to be right and true in the abstract—who tell us that to follow moral principle too closely is a mark of a disordered mind, bordering upon insanity and madness?

Do they deem it madness to make the divine character their model, the divine law their directory? Would it be lunacy for them to take the same principles for their rule of conduct that God does for *his*?

So Festus must have thought, when he listened to Paul. So thousands have thought since that time. So thousands and tens of thousands think in our own day. So all men think who are unwilling to submit to the unwelcome restraints of moral principle—of moral law—who wish to walk after the imaginations of their own hearts, in the light of their own fleshly wisdom, and in the sight of their own eyes. And they are encouraged to do this by all those false teachers in religion and morals who magnify that philosophy of utility or expediency that figures so largely at the present day. If their premises were sound, their conclusions might be legitimate. Were there any thing in the universe to be compared, in value, with integrity of character, with Righteousness, Truth, Virtue, and true Holiness, then there might be sound philosophy and practical wisdom in degrading all these into the mere means and instrumentalities of that supposed *higher* good they are running after, and consequently of setting these instrumentalities aside, whenever they appeared to stand in the way of that supposed higher good—call it pleasure, happiness, enjoyment—whatever you please. But if righteousness and true holiness, if undeviating conformity to moral principle, be the chief excellency and glory of our Creator, (as he assured Moses,) then madness and folly, atheism and impiety must be inscribed upon all deliberate deviations from what is recognized as the inherently True, the immutably Right.

And this, if we understand him, is the lesson our Lord teaches us in the text. He was surrounded by learned Doctors who knew, well enough, what was right and true in the abstract, but who spent all their

time, and exercised all their ingenuity, in trying to get rid of it, in practice; in devising excuses for the departures of themselves and others from moral principle, making the commandments of God of none effect by their plans of expediency, by the glosses and traditions they had introduced for this purpose, setting up utility or advantage as the great end of human action, and thus teaching the ungodly and the policy of committing the virtue of filial piety with the "corban" of its estimated market value!

It was in the midst of such teachers—the perfect counterparts of their successors of the present day—and in a discourse plainly pointed against their sophistical and demoralizing teachings that our Savior pronounced the severest condemnation of their sophistries, admonishing the multitudes to beware of them and shun them, assuring them that their prospects for eternity were suspended on the issue—that if they built the superstructure of their hopes upon any such sandy foundation as their knowledge of first principles in morality and religion while adventuring to depart from them in practice, as their teachers taught them to do, they must expect nothing but the most terrible disappointment and overthrow, as the result of their madness and folly.

REVIEW.

1. The view we have taken of the Sermon on the Mount, and especially of its closing paragraph, may help us to appreciate the account Matthew gives us of its effects upon the hearers. They "were astonished at his doctrine, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

No doubt they must have been greatly astonished! It is easy to see *why* they were so. They had never heard any thing like it from their teachers, who only taught (and to a limited extent,) the great truths of religion and morality, as mere empty attractions, not insisting on a rigid observance of them in practice, but contriving a variety of ways, to neutralize their power, and turn aside the edge of the reproach implied in them. There could be little or nothing authoritative in such teachings. The solemn weight of moral and religious principle, is taken away, and it falls into contempt, when it is no longer held up as the authoritative rule and directory of human action. Our modern teachers of the theory of utility and expediency are now complained of, as being too authoritative and overbearing. They leave the consciences of their hearers untouched and uncultivated, and set them at work at their own arbitrary task of estimation, each for

himself, and in the light of his own fatted sagacity, the consequences of his own actions, with full leave to diverge from abstract Truth and Right, whenever they are deemed disadvantageous or inexpedient.— And this course corresponds exactly, with the course of the scribes and pharisees, whose preaching had no little effect upon men's hearts and characters and daily activities as does the popular preaching of the present day. But Christ's discourse on the mount, from beginning to end, was of an exactly opposite description. He insisted upon the divine authority of fundamental principles as a rule of action, and denounced as the height of folly and madness the least conceivable departure from them. Here was an assumption of authority that startled, that nationalized them. And any preacher or writer of the present day, who insists upon the uncompromising claims and holy authority of moral principle, as Christ did, will soon be regarded as too authoritative, dictatorial, and overbearing, too uncharitable, denunciatory, and unyielding.

2. We see the real point in controversy between the conservatives, so called, and the radical reformers of the present day.

The occasion of the controversy is the effort for reformation, and now, as in the third century, when the standard of reform was raised by Novatian, the division is not so much on account of "a difference of faith as corruption of manners." And this corruption of morals in a community adhering, verbally, to the foundation principles of morality and religion, could be excused and palliated, in no other way than by such pleas of utility, necessity, or expediency, as implied the propriety and wisdom of diverging from the True and the Right, in the abstract, when found to be inconvenient or disadvantageous in practice.

This is the natural history of the philosophy of utility in every age, and the portrait is true to the letter, in our own day. "We agree with you, in your principles," say the Conservatives—"we only differ about measures,"—in other words—"we only differ in our activities, our actions!" And this is said when the difference lies in advocating the abolition of human chattelhood, on the one hand, and the peremptory prohibition of all agitations of the subject, on the other! This is repeated, when the one party insists on choosing wise and good men to rule over us, who shall rule in the fear of God, and the other advises and exemplifies the policy of attempting to "choose the lesser devil of the two," to rule over a professedly-Christian people!

Very manifestly the wisdom of this lat-

ter policy must be comprized in what our Savior stigmatized as folly—the holding of correct principles in theory, but refusing to make them the rule of our activities.

The parties are agreed in respect to their professed principles. The only difference is on the question, whether or no it is wise and safe, to follow those principles, implicitly, and without deviation in practice.

There would be less embarrassment if this philosophy prevailed only in the ranks of the open opposers of reformation. Professed reformers themselves, to a great extent, are deeply involved in the entanglements of the same shallow philosophy, and consequently are perpetually reduced into unholy compromises with error. There are religious teachers identified more or less with reformatory efforts, and generally confided in by the friends of reformation, who do not hesitate to deride the more uncompromising, for adhering too closely to the dictates of moral principle.

"You have good general principles" said one of these grave teachers, recently, to an "impracticable" young disciple, "but you follow them too closely!" This was said, because the young man hesitated to follow his teacher's advice and example in continuing to support the American Board, for the sake of "retaining the more influence for reforming it." Its violation of Christian principle he admitted and deplored. He continued:—"You have too little regard for circumstances. God has made both principles and circumstances for our guidance." "Your course will very seriously affect your prospects for life." "You ought to preserve your influence." His reason for continuing to support the Board himself, was the same. To withdraw his support would "greatly injure him, in view of the Board, and impair his influence with them." Just as though God had so made principles and circumstances, and had so adjusted their relations, that they could conflict with each other, and therefore we must needs depart from the former in order to make ourselves masters of the latter!—Just as though there could be any increase of moral influence from forbearing to comply, fully, with the demands of moral principle! As a further expression of his sentiments, the teacher added, in alluding to one who, he apprehended, had exerted an influence upon his pupil—"He follows principle with a closeness, bordering on insanity!" He also thought it an evidence of another teacher's insanity that he had called it a sin to worship with and sustain a decidedly pro-slavery Church. And he fortified the whole by saying, "You do not

pretend to be perfect, do you?"—implying that the attempt to follow principle as closely as possible was a profession of absolute perfection, altogether indecent—just as though a refusal to depart, knowingly, from admitted Christian principle, were to be deprecated as heretical perfectionism! And so we must throw aside principle, to a certain extent, lest we should think ourselves perfect!

When such sentiments as these come from a Pastor, a President of a College,* had in reputation among reformers themselves, one who has been an anti-slavery Agent and Lecturer, and who still claims to be a voting abolitionist, it is not difficult to conjecture the state of the religious community at large, and of the country in general. If such ethics prevail among reformers, when and how are the Church and the State to be reformed?

3. And this leads us to inquire into the character of the current religion of our times. To study it thoroughly, we must compare it with the religion of the scribes and pharisees as described by our Savior. We shall find it to be the religion of those who "say and do not"—who "hear" and recognize the great principles of religion and morality, but are dumb to insanity to follow them so closely as to hazard their influence, that is, their reputation among men.

Does Christ characterize the chief religionists and religious teachers of his day as whitened sepulchres presenting a fair exterior, but inwardly filled with putrefaction and rottenness? What further evidence of this could he give than that they deliberately, and of set purpose, declined to carry out, as closely as they could, the great principles which they admitted to be true and right in the abstract? If we are to give credit to the religious professions, and sound Christian character, and reliable Christian labors of those who deride as insanity, the attempt, even, to follow as closely as possible, the principles that control the moral and spiritual world, let us cease applying such terms as quacks, cheats, and pretenders, to those who, in the department of the physical sciences, are forward to claim the rank of philosophers, inventors, machinists, operators, practical work-doing men, while they intentionally disregard, in their efforts, the known principles of the sciences from whence they promise us beneficial results, and who should deride those as insane who would follow as closely as possible those principles! Let us do this, like consistent men, or stand

*NOTE.—Rev. Jonathan Blanchard, President of Knox College, Illinois.

convicted of skepticism ourselves, in all that pertains to the science of religion and morals.

In the name of all that is manly in common sense, that is trust worthy in moral integrity, that is reliable in the sciences, that is holy in religion, that is excellent in righteousness, that is beautiful in holiness, that is glorious in the Great Fountain and Author of all Truth, we pronounce that religion a cheat, an imposture, a delusion, however high sounding its pretensions, and in whatever quarter it may be cherished, that undertaken to please God or save the souls of men by any cheaper or easier process than that of following as closely and as implicitly as possible, the great foundation truths or principles of moral and theological science, applying them in every direction, wherever they can be applied, in all the healthful activities of human life;—in the Church, in the State, in the neighborhood, in the family, at the ballot box, at the communion table, in the hall of legislation, in the intercourse between nation and nation, and even in the Missionary Board.

If this be folly, let us be fools for Christ's sake. If this be insanity, write us down insane. If this be madness, let us have the reputation of madmen. "Ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise."

4. We hear much said of infidelity—skepticism—atheism. Our subject lets us into the secret, the natural history—the core, and definition of it. It is all comprised in attempting to secure beneficial results without adhering to the fundamental principles, the foundation truths of the spiritual world—the truths that define the character, that shape the purposes, that fill the heart, that move the hand, of the Infinite Creator and Governor of all things—the truths by which he himself defines and characterizes himself, when he reveals himself to the creatures he has made. How can he believe in JENOVAN who has no confiding belief in the attributes, the characteristics that enter, of necessity, into the definition, (into any *worthy* conception,) of such a sublime Being?

A popular preacher, once, in our hearing, expressed his views of the radical reformers, by charging it upon them, as an impiety, or lack of spirituality, that they "made a God of moral principle." Why did he not charge upon them that they made a God of JENOVAN, whose "name is holy"—whose essence is Love, whose definition is infinite rectitude, a God of moral principle, a living God, moving and governing all things?

The Atheist is he who rejects the *true* God, whatever imaginary deity he may set up in the room of him. And all practical

atheism is that of those who *in works* deny the true God, and will not govern themselves by the *principles* he has made known to them. And this atheism is none the less dark and deadly, because it is found in the Church, ascends the pulpit, presides at the Missionary Board, and sometimes stalks into the Conventions of Reformers, with its selective wiles.

5. We see something of the work to which true Reformers are called. All this bubble of Babel, this blasphemy of Babylon, that prates of the wisdom of departing from moral principle, is to be rebuked into silence, before the world can be converted to the true God, before its abominations can be purged, before its wounds can be healed. And this involves the exposure and overthrow of the false prophet that has deceived the nations, for ages.

6. Finally, the admonition of Christ, in the text, addresses itself to all men, of all nations, to whom, in the very structure of their moral being, their Creator has revealed, in some measure, the moral law of their rational natures, the True and the Right, especially to all who are acquainted with the Scriptures, who hear and understand the sayings of Christ, the great truths of religion and morality which he taught in the sermon on the mount.

To each one of us, whatever may be our position or our professions, whether we call ourselves Christians or moralists, conservatives or reformers, philosophers or practical men, the Savior speaks with authority, and demands that every, where, on all occasions and in every department of our activities, we conform ourselves strictly to our highest conceptions of the True and the Right, in the abstract. To do this, he assures us, is the highest wisdom to which we can aspire:—to fail of doing this, he forewarns us, is the depth of all the folly, madness, degradation, and wretchedness, into which it is possible for us to plunge ourselves! Fellow travellers to the judgment seat of Christ! hear this, from the lips of your Redeemer and final Judge. And, as you value your souls, beware, as He bids you, of the false prophets whose teaching or whose example would encourage you to do otherwise! Listen no longer to the voice of the Syren that sings to you, "Peace! Peace!" because you have "*heard*" and approved the great principles of Righteousness, and admitted their self-evident truthfulness in the abstract. Remember that—not the hearers of the word, but the doers of the work, shall stand approved before God. Be not deceived—God is not mocked with the lip-service of wordy adhesion to empty abstrac-

tions! "Thou believest that there is one God"—that the fundamental principles of morality and religion are revelations of His will, "in whose hands thy life and breath are, and whose are all thy ways." "Thou doest well! The devils also believe and tremble!" If *thy* belief of first principles makes *thee* tremble, then, but no other-wise, has thy faith done as much for thee, as Satan's lies for him! But it only leaves thee to scoff at others, for following those principles too closely, let me say, in the language of Saurin—"What a front, what a brazen front is yours!" You tell your Maker to his face, that you admire the great principles of righteousness he has revealed to you, and which he makes the standard of his own conduct, you think them highly ornamental, to hang around your neck, as decorations, and calculate to claim a seat in Paradise upon the credit of having patronized them, but as for making them the rule of your daily conduct, any further than you find to be convenient, or judge to be expedient, for the time being, you understand human nature and human necessities too well—you are too much of a practical man to be guilty of any such insanity! How can a God of purity and righteousness reveal himself to thee, as he does not to the worldly minded? How? but by creating in thee a clean heart, and renewing a right spirit within thee? May he grant thee, speedily, this favor! Amen.

Power of Councils among Baptists, &c.

(EXTRACT OF A LETTER.)

"I thank you for sending me the Investigator. I bid you God speed in faithfully exposing, for the honor of our divine Master and the salvation of deceived men, the deformities of Anti-christ which have so long been imposed on the world as the truth which abideth forever.

About forty years ago, it pleased the Lord, I humbly believe, by his own favor, to influence my mind to bear testimony against the great sin of the nominal church, and of true christians making void the commandments of the Lord, by the traditions of men.—Though conscious of my own unworthiness and imperfection, I could not avoid seeing, (in considering the character of the church generally, in the light of God's holy word,) that there existed an awful corruption from the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus. I was first led to an examination of this subject when I was pastor of a Baptist Church in New England, by the manifested grief of a few godly members, in view of some practices of the church which they deemed to be a violation of their Lord's

will, and, consequently, injurious to the true interest of Zion. The result of a prayerful examination, by the word, of their objections, was a cordial union with them in presenting the Church to purify itself by the word of truth from its carnal associations, and to follow the denomination to which it particularly pertained, no farther than it followed Christ. After much labor, we obtained the concession of the principal and most intelligent members, that our views were sustained by the divine precepts, and also by the examples of the primitive churches; but alas! in the wisdom which is foolishness with God, it was decreed that it was *expedient* to exchange the inventions of men for the commands of the Lord.

We objected to all religious association with carnal and ungodly men, as incongruous in the nature of things, as well as a plain violation of plain scripture precept and example. We contended that the New Testament recognises no such association, but that which consists of those who are hopelessly born of God, and thereby become new creatures in Christ Jesus. That a departure from this holy principle, was an attempted union of the living and the dead, and a false exhibition of the true church, which is "a spiritual house, built up of living stones, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." It was admitted to be matter of experience and fact, that the union supposed to be so expedient, had induced conformity to the views and desires of carnal men respecting things pertaining to the worship of the Holy One.—The praise of Him who will be worshipped in spirit and in truth, was given up, in a great degree, to those to whom the Almighty says, "What hast thou to do to declare by statutes, &c.?" The imperative command to the disciples of the Lord to be found, when assembled together, "exhorting one another;" speaking "one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted," was violated lest the fastidious taste of enemies of God should be offended!—The coming "together on the first day of the week to break bread," (Acts 20: 7) was neglected three-fourths of the time to conform to other churches of the same denomination rather than to conform to the oracles of truth.

After much labor and heartfelt grief, a majority of us considered it our duty to separate. The purpose was occupying a position in which we could obey Him who had loved and given himself for us. A council was called by the Church on my account specially. I was permitted to state my reasons for separation. They were deemed inadequate.

The Council adjudged me to be worthy of excommunication if I would not return to the Church. And although they acknowledged the independence of each individual church, they prohibited, as far as they could, every Christian Church receiving me as a minister of the Gospel. The letter of the persecuted minister in your last number, will, in almost every particular, apply to my case.

After the Council had declared the result of their deliberations, I remarked to the Moderator, that "as I had brought into view those passages that, in my judgment, prove the illegality, according to the laws of Jesus Christ, of any connection of the Church with the world, I humbly ask my brethren of the Council to offer me one passage of Scripture in support of it." The Moderator mentioned 1 Cor. v: 9-10. "I wrote unto you an epistle not to company with fornicators. Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, for then must ye needs go out of the world." I replied that this referred to our intercourse with the men of the world in a civil, and not in a religious or church capacity. No other passage was offered.

The duty and privilege of the disciples of Christ, of returning to the simplicity of the New Testament from which they have been corrupted, cannot be too highly estimated. I rejoice that your little sheet is devoted to this important object. O, that the followers of the Lamb might stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ makes us free. To do this they must come out from mystical Babylon, in obedience to the call, "Come out of her my people," &c. The dominion of Anti Christ is not confined to the devotees of Romish superstition. Alas! how many, protesting against the Pontiff sitting in the place of God, have assumed the same position of impious dominion over the consciences of men! Some measure of that sympathy and lamentation which is exercised in behalf of Papists, might well be reserved by Protestants for themselves who have received the mark of the beast in their foreheads, by submitting to the ecclesiastical dominion of those who make void the truth and commandments of God, through their own dogmas and traditions.

In the spirit of meekness, dear brother, let us instruct those who oppose themselves to the truth as it is in Jesus, praying that God may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. Let us cherish a spirit of patient endurance amid all opposition, in conformity to the example of Him who hath suffered for us."

The Manna that bred Worms.

There is no Truth so precious that it will not, like the manna of the Hebrews, breed worms and become offensive, if it is idly and idolatrously hoarded up, instead of being put to the present and daily uses for which God designed it. Our national declarations of self-evident truths—our orthodox Church creeds—what avail them? What makes them smell so? Alas! They have only been held "in the abstract." In the hands even of reformers themselves, they will become putrid, unless daily used, and for all the objects, on all the occasions, to which they are naturally adapted, and for the sake of which they are committed to us. The food of angels becomes good for nothing, becomes intolerable and loathsome, unless used *in due season*, when it ought to be used. Conservatism, so called, becomes destructionism, destroying the richest provisions of heaven, whenever they object to the unhesitating, immediate, impartial and free use, in every appropriate direction, of all the holy principles God has revealed to us. While they are waiting for "a more convenient season," their principles become putrid and breed vermin.

CHURCH INDEPENDENCY-SIONS.—A Pastor of a Presbyterian Church writes us—"I am a stranger to you and to your 'Investigator,' but believing that Church Independency is natural, desirable, scriptural, and evangelical, that it is *a la New Testament*, I wish to learn your peculiar views. A number of your paper fell into my hands, last week, and I thought there were considerations there worthy of my attention, and by which I might be aided to solve an important problem. Please send me the back numbers of your Investigator, especially those containing your 'Lectures on Church Reform'—'Church Organization'—'Spiritual Despotism,' &c."

Luther Lee, Editor of the True Wesleyan, has an editorial in that paper, (Aug. 5) on "Church Government," &c. in which he maintains that the primitive Churches were independent, and that such independence is inconsistent with the rule of the Wesleyan Church "which prevents a preacher from laboring with the same congregation for more than three years in succession." He was "opposed to this rule, at the Utica Convention, when it was adopted—is opposed to it still, believes it to be unscriptural, and in contravention of the rights of both Churches and ministers." He still thinks, (and here we differ from him) that Churches may "enter into an association, and form themselves into a general connexion, for the pur-

power of promoting greater unity and efficiency, provided they do not allow their personal liberty and rights to be swallowed up in the power and general government of a connexion thus formed." *Provided!*

But how is this proviso to be maintained? If no Congregational, Baptist, or Quaker congregations have ever been able to maintain Church independency in the presence of such arrangements (which we hold undeniable) is it likely that our Wesleyan brethren would be able to succeed? Quaker congregations have no ministers to settle, but reformatory Quakers find the action of the local congregations hampered and virtually superseded or nullified by their Quarterly and yearly meetings. Congregational and Baptist Churches profess to exercise the right of choosing and retaining their own ministers. They certainly have no three years' rule to restrict them. But if Bro. Lee had been a lay member in either of those sects, for the last ten years, we should not much wonder to see him escaping out of them even into Wesleyan Churches, in search after more freedom, as some others have done, whether wisely or not. Bro. Lee has sometimes thought us prejudiced against Wesleyanism, and we do see faults in it; one of which Bro. Lee describes. And yet we cannot say that—on the whole—there is much more freedom in Congregational Churches retaining "the connexional principle" by "Associations and Conventions" than there is in the present Wesleyan connexion.

AUTHORITY OR PRINCIPLE.—There can be no higher, or more authoritative revelation of the divine will than the revelation of a principle, whatever may be the particular form or medium through which that revelation is made.

Whoever in any manner, God gives us evidence that he requires or forbids certain particular actions, we are bound to obey him, because we know his authority is supreme, and that what he commands and prohibits is in accordance with the Right and the True. The nature of God and the relation which he sustains to us, in connexion with the excellency of his moral character, clothe him with this authority, and assure us that his commandments and prohibitions are holy, just and good. So that our obligation to regard the commandments and the prohibitions of God is based upon the fundamental principles of righteousness and truth, which reveal to us his essential nature and character, and the relations which we sustain to him.

These principles underlie all the commandments and prohibitions of the decalogue, and without them the thunders of Sinai could only frighten and alarm us, without inspiring the sentiments of *ought* and *ought not*. It is on these principles that we must plant ourselves in order to

feel the obligation to do what God commands and abstain from what he forbids.—Those principles, all the divine requirements and prohibitions take for granted, and they take for granted, likewise, our previous knowledge of those principles and the authority they hold over us. In other words, specific commandments and prohibitions derive their sanction and authority from the fundamental principles which they take for granted and on which they repose.

This is true, even in respect to commandments and prohibitions, the particular reasons of which may be, in a measure or even wholly unknown to us. In those cases, it is enough for us that God commands or forbids, and it is enough because of the fundamental principles already adverted to, revealing the foundation and reasonableness of his authority over us.

But when, in addition to this, God reveals to us, in his word, or by our own conclusions, or both combined, the principle that lies at the bottom of his specific commandments and prohibitions, and which reveal the reasons of them, (as for instance, the great principle of impartial benevolence,) then we have the highest possible revelation of the divine will, and the divine authority including the *why* and the *wherefore* of his legislation. To hold a principle of morals in abeyance, not reducing it to practice, is to trample upon the highest and most authoritative "thus saith the Lord," that can possibly be uttered or conceived.

Christian Convention for the State of New-York.

At Canastota, the 26th, 27th, and 28th of September, 1848.

It will be recollected that at a Christian Convention, held at South Butler, Wayne Co., on the 21st and 22d September, 1847, the following Resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to enquire into the expediency of calling a State Convention of anti-slavery Christians, for the consideration of two points:—1. What is the Order, Discipline, and Government of Christ's House?—2. Can denominational differences be so far merged, that those who, in particular localities acknowledge each other as Christians, may be one in communion and church-fellowship."

A Circular was accordingly issued by said Committee, inviting correspondence on the subject of the proposed Convention.

During a Convention of friends of Liberty at Rochester, in June last, a Committee of five was informally appointed for the purpose of calling a State Christian Reform Convention, with the understanding that a co-operation should be had with the Committee appointed at South Butler.

As the result of both these movements a **GENERAL CONVENTION** of the friends of Christian Liberty, Unity, Reformation and Progress, is now invited to be held at CANASTOTA, Madison

Co., (on the line of the Rail Road and the Erie Canal) on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the 26th, 27th and 28th of September next, for the objects above mentioned, and for general mutual edification, counsel and encouragement. A full and general attendance from all parts of the State, and elsewhere is earnestly desired.

Signed on behalf of the two Committees above mentioned.

OID MINER,
WILLIAM GOODELL.

Aug. 1. 1848.

It is easier to move masses of men than it is to guide them—easier to guide them than it is to learn them the art of self-guidance—and easier to set them upon the experiment of self-guidance than it is to persuade them to accept the guidance of infinite wisdom.

It is a sad thing when the love of the world lures men into the Church, and when the fear of the world's frown keeps them there. Yet this is a very thing sought by those who love to make religion palatable by worldly compromises and respectable by showy appearances.

All reformations have their end at a precise time when the reformers imagine they have gained their point, that the community are coming rapidly into their views, or are very closely approximating to them. At such a time, reformers are commonly led to lower down their high standard, to meet the community half-way:—from that moment instead of leading the community, they are led by them, and the entire mass ultimately settles down where it was, and refuses to move forward.

It is easier to move masses of men than it is to guide them—easier to guide them than it is to learn them the art of self-guidance—and easier to set them upon the experiment of self-guidance than it is to persuade them to accept the guidance of infinite wisdom.

PAYMENTS AND DONATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN INVESTIGATOR.

To August 1848.

J. H. Hopkins, Sharon, O.	50
E. Johnson, do	50
P. Z. Gates, Augusta	50
M. Keith, W. Winsted	50
H. L. Burdick, Dryden	50
G. Thomas, E. Winfield	50
C. Haight, Ithaca	50
A. Hartwell, Oaks Corners	50
D. K. Hawley, Ithaca	50
J. Hawley, N. Albion, Pa.	50
H. F. Brooks, Wyoming	50
Mrs. Dwight, Clinton	50
G. Avery, do	50
M. D. Hitchcock, Canastota	50
C. Probert, Palmyra	50
Papers sold	125
Total	1000

Those in arrears for the Christian Investigator are requested to make remittances immediately, and continue to publish, unless we receive the money for the paper and printing.

J. J. MATTISON, PRINTER,
at the Ontario Messenger Office, Canastota, N. Y.
Book and Job Printing of every description done with neatness, accuracy and despatch, and on the most reasonable terms.